

PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION
January 09, 2009
Prescott, Arizona

MINUTES OF THE **PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION** held on **January 9, 2009** in the **CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS** located at **201 S. CORTEZ ST.**, Prescott, Arizona.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Doug Stroh called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

II. ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS PRESENT Doug Stroh, Chairman Frank DeGrazia, Vice Chairman Russ Buchanan Don Rantz Elisabeth Ruffner Mike Todd Marv Wright	OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE Nancy Burgess, Historic Preservation Specialist Mike Bacon, Community Planner Kelly Sammeli, Recording Secretary COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT Lora Lopas, Council Liaison Jack Wilson, Mayor
--	--

III. REGULAR AGENDA

1. **Consider approval** of minutes of the 12-12 -08 meeting.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to approve the draft minutes** of the December 12, 2008 meeting.
Mr. DeGrazia, 2nd. **Vote: 7-0.**

2. **Election of Chairman** for calendar year 2009.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to elect Doug Stroh Chairman** of the Prescott Preservation Commission for the 2009 calendar year. Mr. Todd, 2nd. **VOTE: 7-0.**

3. **Election of the Vice-Chairman** for calendar year 2009.

Chairman Stroh, **MOTION: to elect Frank DeGrazia Vice-Chairman** for the 2009 calendar year. **Mr. Wright, 2nd. VOTE: 7-0.**

4. **HP08-030, 231 S. Mount Vernon Street.** Historic Preservation District #13, Southeast Prescott. APN: 110-01-073. Request a 1,422-square foot addition to the rear of the home to create a handicap-accessible space. Owners/applicants are Robert and Susan Beyea. Mike Bacon, Community Planner.

Mike Bacon reported to the Commission that the request is for a 1,422 square foot addition to be located on the rear of the home located at 231 S. Mt Vernon Street. Mr. Bacon provided photographs of the location on the overhead, and indicated that the previous requests to add a carport on the south side, the addition of the dormer, and the expansion and reconstruction of the rear deck have all been completed. Mr. Bacon reported that the new addition will be located at the rear of the garage and will provide family living quarters on the lower level and a living space located on the second level. Mr. Bacon indicated that the addition is compatible with the area however, the side yard deck that is also being proposed is encroaching into the side yard

setback, and staff is recommending that the deck be removed. Mr. Bacon indicated that the deck encroaches into the side yard setback however, it could not be considered a hardship and it would be hard to get approval for it from the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Bacon indicated that it is possible that the applicant could provide an entry way off of the carport area into the living space. Concluding his report Mr. Bacon indicated that the addition is a substantial size however, the faux Victorian home to the South hides the addition and it is not visible from the street.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that the encroachment in the side yard was a little too much and then inquired if it would be possible for the applicant to install a window into the south wall of the addition to break up the wall area.

Mr. Wright inquired if the applicant had spoken with the neighbors on both sides of their property regarding the addition.

Mr. Bacon noted that staff did notify the neighbors by mail and staff did not receive any phone calls regarding the project.

Mr. Robert Beyea, 231 South Mt. Vernon Street indicated that he could install a window into the wall to break it up if he needed to however, he had not planned to. Mr. Beyea then noted that Mr. Bacon was not aware that he had spoken with another City planner regarding the side yard deck encroachment prior to the presentation; and that the purpose of the deck was to allow for handicapped access to the dwellings. Mr. Beyea further indicated that the deck is really a walkway to meet the ADA requirements and to allow for a turning access for a wheel chair. Mr. Beyea noted that the City planner had shown him the provision in the *LDC (Land Development Code)* to allow for the ADA requirement, without having to go to the Board of Adjustment for approval. Mr. Beyea further noted that they did not want to cut out an opening in the front of the old original masonry structure.

Mr. Bacon indicated that as he was unaware of the discussion and if the deck is permissible by the code there could be a condition placed on the request upon approval and it could be checked at a later time.

Chairman Stroh indicated that it could be approved or disapproved subject to compliance with code.

Mr. Wright inquired about the access to the elevator.

Mr. Beyea indicated that the elevator access is entered from the deck area located on the ground level and will provide access to the lower level which is the same level as the existing garage.

Mr. Wright inquired if the door on the left side was to be removed.

Mr. Beyea indicated the door is in that location to provide access to the new addition.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if an elevator with double doors could be installed to provide an entrance from the carport area and also into the new living area.

Mr. Beyea indicated that the way the structure is currently built it is the supporting west wall of the carport and the addition and it would not be allowed.

Mr. Todd inquired if there currently was someone living in the home that needs the handicapped access or if it was a future use.

Mr. Beyea indicated that it is for both a current family member and for another family member who is going to live there in the future.

Mr. Wright noted that if the deck was allowed in the side yard then it would only leave about two feet of setback between properties.

Mr. Beyea indicated that was true.

Chairman Stroh noted if there was a provision in the code for the handicapped accessibility, the building department would review it and the Preservation Commission could vote to accept or deny it based on meeting the criteria.

Mr. Wright noted that it was important that the Preservation Commission knew for sure if the deck would be acceptable by both the Building Department and the Planning and Zoning Department.

Chairman Stroh noted that he would recommend for approval based on the acceptability of all the other codes.

Mr. Bacon placed a revision on the motion on the overhead and informed the Commissioners that a suggested motion should indicate, subject to the provision of the *Land Development Code*.

Chairman Stroh noted that the deck is open.

Mr. DeGrazia noted if the *Land Development Code* does not allow for the deck encroachment, then the applicant would be required to go before the Board of Adjustment and ask for a variance.

Mr. Wright indicated for the record, that if the addition was utilized now for family members and sold in the future, then the addition could not be used as a rental.

Mr. Bacon noted that was correct.

Mr. DeGrazia, **MOTION: to approve HP08-030**, 231 South Mt Vernon Street with the stipulation that the side yard setback encroachment is approved by the *Land Development Code*. Chairman Stroh, 2nd. **VOTE: 7-0**.

5. **HP08-027, 1089 Old Hassayampa Lane.** Historic Preservation District # 15, Historic Homes at Hassayampa. APN: 108-07-161. Request placement of a 120-square foot shed to be located south of the garage. Owner is Charles E. Kennedy. Nancy Burgess, Historic Preservation Specialist.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the request is for a small hand built shed to be located in the rear of 1089 Old Hassayampa Lane. Ms. Burgess noted that because the shed is over 120 square feet it will require a building permit. (Drawings of the location and the shed design were placed on the overhead at this time). Ms. Burgess reported that the shed is 144 square feet, it has a gabled roof, (which will match the garage) there will be no windows, electricity, or plumbing in it and it will be hidden by shrubbery and trees. The shingles will match what is on the garage; the siding will be OSB and it will be stuccoed to match the house. There will be a sliding style barn door and a passage door. In closing Ms. Burgess indicated that the shed will not have any impact on the historic integrity of the property and the applicants were present. Chairman Stroh called for questions or comments from the Commission.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the doors were to be made out of OSB also.

Ms. Burgess noted that Mr. Kennedy stated the doors were to be plywood.

Mr. DeGrazia indicated that solid wood would be preferred, and, in addition, there should be some type of lites to break it up.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the doors of the shed would be facing the street.

Ms. Burgess indicated no, the shed would face the backyard.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that he would like to see a window installed on the west façade that faces the street.

Chairman Stroh inquired about the size of the window.

Ms. Ruffner noted that if there is a request to install a window, there should also be a suggestion of the dimensions of the window.

Chairman Stroh noted that he would like to see a pair of solid doors rather than sliding doors made out of plywood.

Ms. Burgess explained that the plywood doors would slide open and closed on a track that is located in the front of the building.

Chairman Stroh inquired if it would be a twelve foot long track.

Ms. Burgess indicated that it would only have a track at the top, the doors would slide and meet in the middle and; the doors could be faced with something other than plywood.

Mr. Todd indicated that he thought the Commissioners were not clear on what the doors would be made out of.

Mr. Kennedy [**applicant, no signature on attendance**] indicated that he intended to place hardwood handles, about three feet long, on the plywood doors and this would allow the doors to open wider.

Mr. Buchanan inquired if the door would be framed.

Mr. Kennedy noted there would be a handle on each of the doors.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that the concern is the durability of the door; made out of plywood and exposed to the elements.

Mr. Kennedy indicated that he planned on using "water proof" plywood.

Mr. Buchanan inquired about the size of the plywood.

Mr. Kennedy indicated he would use 5/8 inch to provide for extra strength.

Chairman Stroh called for other comments or questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Kennedy indicated that if the use of the plywood was the concern he would use regular doors.

Chairman Stroh indicated that is sounded as if it was a concern for the Commission and the use of regular doors would be preferred.

Mr. Kennedy noted that he would like to keep the doors wide to allow for a lawn mower to be moved in and out of the storage shed easily.

Chairman Stroh noted that a pair of swinging doors would allow for an opening of about 5'8" and inquired if that would be enough access room for Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy noted that would be fine.

Mr. Todd noted that a commercial swinging door is a better idea than the plywood.

Chairman Stroh concurred and indicated they would allow for better security.

Chairman Stroh called for a motion.

Mr. Rantz, **MOTION: to approve HP08-027** storage shed for 1089 Old Hassayampa Lane, Historic Homes at Hassayampa, with the stipulation that solid wood swinging doors be installed rather than plywood hanging doors.

Mr. Todd, 2nd.

Mr. DeGrazia indicated that he still would like to see a window on the west side facing Hassayampa Lane.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the shed would not been seen from Old Hassayampa Lane.

Mr. Rantz noted to amend the motion to include, the Historic Preservation Commission recommends a window on the west side of the storage shed.

Amended Motion: to approve HP08-027 storage shed for 1089 Old Hassayampa Lane, Historic Homes at Hassayampa, with the stipulation that solid wood swinging doors be installed rather than plywood hanging doors and, with a recommendation of adding a window on the west side of the storage shed. Mr. Todd, 2nd. **VOTE: 7-0.**

6. **HP08-028, 121 E. Gurley Street, Suite 121.** Historic Preservation District # 2, Elks Opera House/Theatre. APN: 109-01-011C. Request to install 21.3 square feet of new signage for Geoffrey's Fine Jewelry. Sign will be acrylic faced with burgundy background, lettering in metallic gold with black outlines on all. Business Owner is Geoffrey's Fine Jewelry. Applicant is A&B Sign Company, Inc. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Ms. Burgess noted that the request was to install a new sign panel in an existing panel box for one of the storefronts, Geoffrey's Fine Jewelry, which is located in the Elks Opera House building. Ms. Burgess indicated that the sign is compatible with the other signs at the location, will be wall mounted and, totals 21.4 square feet. Ms. Burgess noted that Perry from A&B Sign was present if the Commissioners had questions.

Ms. Ruffner indicated that she was ready to make a motion.

Chairman Stroh noted for Ms. Ruffner to proceed.

Ms. Ruffner, **MOTION: to approve** the request for permit for sign for Geoffrey's Fine Jewelry, 117 East Gurley Street, Suite 121. Elks Building and Theater Historic District. **Mr. Rantz, 2nd. VOTE: 7-0.**

7. HP08-029, 1097 Old Hassayampa Lane. Historic Preservation District # 15, Historic Homes at Hassayampa. APN: 108-07-165. Request is to replace a single car garage with a new one which will include a rear hobby/storage room in the rear; an addition to the rear of the house to allow for a bedroom and laundry room; and, convert an existing bedroom into a bathroom and storage room. Owner/ Applicants are Steve Trainor & Kris Foulkes. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the house is a 1940's stick built home with native stone veneer. The current owners would like to do two additions to the property. Ms. Burgess noted that the house and the garage are listed in the National Register of Historic Places and lies within the boundaries of the Historic Homes at Hassayampa Overlay District. Ms. Burgess also noted that when the overlay district came into the City it was with one hundred percent approval and it is important that all of the houses stay on the Register. Ms. Burgess indicated that although the garage is on the Register it does not have a foundation under it. Overall the proposal is to (1) demolish the existing one car garage; (2) construct a new 1 car garage that has a large attached hobby/storage room; (3) to convert the existing bedroom to storage & master bath; (4) to construct an addition to the rear and the north side of the existing house; (5) construct a new pergola between the house and the garage. Ms. Burgess further noted that the Historic Preservation Master Plan does not address the Historic Homes at Hassayampa District because it was adopted in 1998 and the Hassayampa District was adopted into the City after 1998. However, the Master Plan, in general, encourages the preservation of buildings and other features which contribute to the character of the district. Further, it encourages the continued use of historic buildings and permitting only renovations that are complimentary or compatible in design, siting, materials, etc. with existing historic structures and which contribute to the historic character of the area. Continuing, Ms. Burgess indicated that the design guidelines for the Historic Homes at Hassayampa are very particular about the design for additions and new construction.

Ms. Burgess read the Design Guidelines that recommend, in general: (1) that functions required for a new use be placed in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing additions if possible; (2) constructing new additions so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed; (3) locating an attached exterior addition in the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building and limiting its size and scale to the relationship of the building. Ms. Burgess noted that after meeting with the designer, Carlos Leyva, several times and discussing the design guidelines; the applicants have come up with a design.

Ms. Burgess provided an overview of the design on the overhead which consisted of a larger single car garage with a "T" shape attached to the rear, the addition to the rear of the house and a narrow breezeway between the house and the garage with a fence and a gate. Ms. Burgess noted that Mr. Leyva would be discussing the design in detail. Ms. Burgess indicated that, in addition, there is a lot of landscaping going on that Mr. Leyva is not involved with and the Preservation Commission would need to ask the applicant about it. Ms. Burgess provided additional photographs of the site on the overhead and indicated that the lot is a "through" lot which fronts Old Hassayampa Lane on the west and County Club Drive on the east with several changes in elevation. Ms. Burgess continued to show the photographs on the overhead and noted that she has spoken with some of the neighbors regarding the proposal

and the property owners held a neighborhood meeting at their home to discuss the plan design with the neighbors. As Ms. Burgess continued to review the photographs, Ms. Burgess noted the areas where the new garage and the proposed addition to the house would be located. Ms. Burgess invited Mr. Carlos Leyva to describe the overview of the design.

Mr. Carlos Leyva, 131 West Navajo, described for the Preservation Commission the design as the photographs were reviewed again. The location of the proposed bedroom would be located where the double doors are on the house, the single door is the entrance to the storage room and the space in between the two structures is where the proposed breezeway is located. The existing grade of the home is about 24 inches above grade and the proposal is to terrace the land to alleviate some of the water.

Ms. Ruffner inquired about the stone facing on the existing house and if new stone would be added to the building.

Mr. Leyva indicated originally, with the demolition of the garage, the siding could be used however, after conversing with Ms. Burgess it is understood that the new garage will look like a different structure by using existing boulders with new cedar siding.

Ms. Ruffner inquired if it would be natural stone.

Mr. Leyva noted yes.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the idea is, if the addition to the house is approved some of the stone veneer will have to be removed and it would be reused as far as it would go.

Mr. Wright inquired how far the structure was to the setback easement on the north side of the property.

Mr. Leyva indicated that the garage will be in the same location and the addition is within the building setback area with the overhang extending into the easement area.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the setback is 7 feet and measurements for the setback are taken from the wall and that overhangs into the setback are allowed.

Chairman Stroh inquired about all the landscaping that is occurring at the location and would that require a review from the Commission also?

Ms. Burgess indicated that the review might be in order however, the property owners would have to explain what is going on.

Upon further review of the photographs, Mr. Leyva indicated that the building line on the right side is where the addition for the master bath is located and the space in between the structures is the breezeway area that goes back about twenty to twenty five feet.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the plan was to install an iron gate at the level of the garage.

Mr. Leyva noted that the proposal is to install a wrought iron gate between the garage and the house along with a few feet of fence to help keep the animals in.

Ms. Burgess put the site plan back on the overhead and pointed out the breezeway area showing the gate location.

Mr. Leyva indicated that there is a door leading to the proposed addition and the breezeway would have an enclosed beam roof, covered with shingles to match the existing structure, which would be for weather protection.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the driveway would have to be widened to allow entrance into the garage.

Mr. Leyva indicated that they would have to widen the driveway.

Ms. Burgess indicated that they needed to discuss the breezeway area and pergola because under the *LDC (Land Development Code)* it becomes an attached garage, and in the Hassayampa neighborhood the garages need to be detached, unless it is original. Ms. Burgess further indicated that a free-standing pergola with an open roof would be acceptable but the current design could not be approved.

Chairman Stroh noted that the "T" configuration of the garage does not give the perception that the area is open and the buildings are separate.

Mr. Leyva indicated that the owners are willing to delete the pergola within the breezeway area to keep two separate structures.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that if the garage was adjusted towards the pavement area, the driveway would not have to be widened and the Juniper tree would be safe.

Chairman Stroh noted if the garage was rotated and the "T" configuration was changed to a lineal garage, it would keep the structures separate and would be cheaper to construct.

Mr. Rantz indicated that he was also apposed to the "T" structure of the garage as it does not fit in with the neighborhood and it should be a longer structure. Mr. Rantz further indicated that the addition was acceptable.

Mr. Leyva noted that he had prepared another exhibit that he put on the overhead for the Commissioners to view and indicated that if the garage could be moved up 5 feet, the twenty foot addition could be put in the rear.

Mr. Burgess noted that the materials for the garage should be discussed and indicated that the proposal is to install horizontal siding on the front of the garage and wood shingles on the sides.

Mr. Leyva indicated that was correct and that on the side, strips of wood shingles would be installed so they appear random.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that he would like to see some view lites on the arts and crafts style garage doors.

Mr. Leyva noted that was O.K. with the applicants.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the doors would be of a carriage design.

Mr. Leyva indicated that it would view like a carriage door however; it would be a roll up door.

Mr. Wright inquired what the roof line would look like on the elongated garage.

Mr. Leyva asked Ms. Burgess to place the north side view of the design on the overhead and noted that the roof line would go straight back with a revised gable end on the last twenty feet.

Mr. Rantz noted that he thought the Commission would need to see that detail on the next review and also thought the structure would need some windows to break it up.

Ms. Burgess indicated that there is a garage in between this location and the neighbors house and that it would block the view of the proposed garage to the north.

Ms. Burgess noted that Mr. Leyva was explaining, in response to Mr. Wrights question about the roof line, that instead of just having a long gable roof; that the east end the roof line would change so there would be a side gable.

Mr. Rantz inquired if there were any other garages in the area with that type of split roof.

Ms. Burgess indicated there were not.

Mr. Rantz noted that even though the gable would be long; it should be the same as the other areas of the neighborhood.

Chairman Stroh inquired if stone wainscot would be used on the north side of the garage.

Mr. Leyva indicated that the plan is to go twenty feet with siding and then place stone and cedar siding to break it up.

Ms. Kris Foulkes, 1097 Old Hassayampa Lane indicated that they really want to save the old garage however, they are unsure of the stability of the structure because it is falling down. It will be jacked up to put the slab under it, and it could fall down and if so it would have to be replaced. However, if it doesn't fall down, the existing garage will have the siding on it and the addition would look different and break up the long wall.

Ms. Burgess noted, assuming the existing garage is saved; the siding would change from the original siding to the stone and cedar on the addition.

Mr. Rantz inquired if the existing garage would be in the middle of the new one because it was mentioned that the garage would be moved forward.

Mr. Leyva indicated that the existing garage did not have a foundation under it and it is the intention is to pick it up, move it forward, place the foundation and set it back down with the storage addition to the rear of it.

Ms Burgess noted that moving the garage forward would help conceal the new addition to the house.

Mr. Todd inquired if the homeowners are o.k. with all the changes.

Mr. Leyva offered that they were.

Chairman Stroh called on Mr. DeGrazia who had questions regarding the addition to the rear of the house.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if Ms. Burgess had anything to note regarding the rear addition.

Ms. Burgess indicated that when the Preservation Commission looks at additions to historic houses it is important that the impact be less noticeable to the main structure. Ms. Burgess continued to note that the addition is located in the rear of the structure and does not overshadow the historic building. It is compatible to the original but also different, and that the addition cannot be viewed from the street. Ms. Burgess indicated that the proposed addition to the house slightly protrudes to the north at the back however; it is a minimal amount and with the fence and the gate, it will be somewhat screened.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that it appears that the proposal calls for removing ten feet of rock wall on the east side and removing another whole rock wall in the rear. Mr. DeGrazia asked Ms. Burgess to put a photograph of the rear wall on the overhead at this time.

Mr. Leyva noted that the addition has a return right next to the ridge and that the entire wall will be demolished to gain access into the house for the addition.

Mr. DeGrazia indicated that it might be less intrusive on the existing structure to go through the wall at the window opening on the east façade. Further noting to have the rock wall as a feature on the interior of the structure would be nice. Mr. DeGrazia inquired if it would be possible to move a couple of walls and remove the window to open a passage-way to the master bedroom and the rock could be on the interior of the house.

Chairman Stroh noted that another possibility would be to relocate the stacked washer and dryer and linen space to the east wall and the rock wall could potentially be left alone and become part of the interior of the house.

Ms. Foulkes indicated that she would prefer to do that however, when she spoke with the different contractors she was informed that because the addition was a wood building with a rock façade it had to tie into the wood structure of the original house and with cutting into the stone it was the belief that it would be lost anyway.

Mr. DeGrazia indicated that it would only require a small six inch slot into the rock to be able to tie into the wood and keep more of the original veneer wall.

Ms. Foulkes inquired if the window could just be cut into a door and become the passage way.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that was correct.

Chairman Stroh noted that he was sure it could be done without ripping down the whole wall.

Mr. Leyva noted that the floor plan has indicated the dashed lines as to the walls to be removed, and that those walls are not the original structure but an addition itself.

Ms. Burgess noted it is still part of the houses' history that it (the addition) was built in 1941.

Chairman Stroh noted that he preferred that they didn't have to reclaim the stone at all, and that it just stays were it has been a long time.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that it is possible the stone wall was just laid up and not tied into the building and the contractor could have a legitimate concern. Mr. DeGrazia further noted it was just a suggestion to keep the walls intact as it appears that a large portion of the building is being removed.

Mr. Leyva indicated that they could look into that and maybe change something on the interior and see what, if anything, could be done.

Mr. Todd inquired if the concern the other Commissioners had was of visual or historical.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that it was historical for him.

Chairman Stroh concurred.

Mr. Todd noted that the reason he brought it up was because, from a visual standpoint, the addition is minimal view for the public.

Chairman Stroh concurred however, the Commission needed to work on a solution for the lineal garage and that he has been in a lot of historical buildings that have been added onto; and leaving an exterior wall in place as an interior feature is very nice. Chairman Stroh further noted that if the addition is ever removed, the existing house is back. Chairman Stroh then asked Ms. Burgess how the Commission should handle this and should the applicants come back with new drawings.

Ms. Burgess indicated the applicants will have to return before the Preservation Commission again and it is the best to approach with several motions so there is record of the minutes and the applicants know exactly what they are to do. Ms. Burgess further noted that the landscaping that is occurring still needs to be discussed.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Leyva if, what the Commissioners were saying is something that is viable for the applicants.

Mr. Leyva noted that everything that was discussed the clients are o.k. with. It is feasible to move the garage and try to save it. Mr. Leyva further noted that they will revisit and redesign the laundry room walls to see what can be done to preserve as much of the rock walls as possible.

Mr. Todd asked the applicant again, if they were o.k. with all the information that was being discussed.

Chairman Stroh inquired if there was any other items to discuss before the motions were made.

Chairman Stroh invited the public to speak in the matter.

Mr. Scott Shira, 1101 Old Hassayampa Lane, indicated that most of his concerns have been addressed and that his main concern is the prominence of the house within the historic district. Mr. Shira indicated that the home is in the center of original stone buildings with front and back setbacks all the same and while the addition is within the City's setback of 25 feet the new structure will protrude well past the existing rear line of the four original homes. Mr. Shira noted that he would like the Commission to take that into consideration as well as the most important concern, that of de-listing of the house. Mr. Shira further noted that if there is any concern that the project would cause a de-listing of the home, he would ask for serious consideration of the implications of that, as all the homes are contiguous and 100 percent contributors to this district; and to have a home be de-listed would have a serious implication to the integrity of the district. Mr. Shira added, that the addition to the house is understandable for more space, it is hidden from the street, but he has misgivings about the garage with the

bath in it as it is the idea of the massing of the four homes in the area and how they relate to each other, and not just the massing of the individual homes.

Chairman Stroh and Mr. DeGrazia thanked Mr. Shira for speaking.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that it did bring up the question about the bathroom, and does that indicate to the City that this could be a possible bedroom?

Mr. Bacon indicated that he would check the code and get back to the Commission.

Mr. Todd asked Ms. Burgess to address the de-listing concern.

Ms. Burgess noted that the main issue of going through the process before the Preservation Commission is to approve a project that will not result in de-listing and she would also like to have this particular project, with the revised plans, taken down to the State Historic Preservation Office and have them take a look at it, because they are the entity who does the de-listing. Ms. Burgess further noted that they may not have a response in time for the next consideration of the revised plans however, by the time that the actual building plans are ready and submitted, there should be an answer. Ms. Burgess indicated that based on her experience, that changing the garage so it's long and narrow and not having a view of a huge addition on the back of the house, and with the changes of roof planes and the retaining of the stone walls, it is probably going to be fine; but, the State is the actual body that makes the decision, so it would be best to get their opinion.

Mike Bacon noted he had an answer on the bathroom for the Commission and that an accessory use within the garage is permitted by the code.

Mr. Wright asked Ms. Burgess if the State had requirements on the roofline of the garage addition.

Ms. Burgess indicated that they will look at the difference between the old garage and the new garage. Ms. Burgess further noted that she was unsure how they would address the roofline and whether or it would be big enough issue to cause de-listing.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that with the long, linear garage there still is the storage area and does that somehow become attached; and should it be a stand-alone building?

Ms. Burgess indicated that it should not make any difference as long as it is broken up, and that the long elevation broken up with the changes in siding should help.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that there should be a continuous gable on the garage.

Ms. Burgess indicated that would be the simplest way to keep the integrity, and it is better than adding the cross gable at the back end.

Ms. Ruffner inquired as to what the recommended action on the subject was.

Chairman Stroh indicated that the applicant is to return within thirty days based on the suggestions that the Preservation Commission is making, however they need the wording.

Ms. Burgess indicated that there should be a motion on the garage giving specific direction with the Commissions' preferences', another motion on the addition noting the retention of the

stone wall; a motion to request that the applicants resubmit the revised drawings with the landscaping plan.

Ms. Burgess asked the Commissioners if they wanted to motion at this time or review everything first.

Chairman Stroh indicated that they would like to discuss everything first.

Ms. Burgess invited the applicant to describe the details of the landscaping that is occurring so that Commission can determine if permits and a review from the Preservation Commission would be needed.

Ms. Foulkes noted for the Commissioners that two things are occurring with the landscaping. Ms. Foulkes indicated that the whole area in back of the house will be the same level as currently when you exit into the rear; Over the years, various small cement block walls have been put in at different levels. Ms. Foulkes noted that upon further investigation of an area where dirt had been allowed to build up, the termites had eaten all the wood in the wall and the whole corner was gone. They found that the stone veneer was the only thing that is holding up the roof so they dug down and found a gutter and they have had an open ditch there for about a year. Ms. Foulkes indicated that there will be a level and they will go back seven feet, and rip-rap the bank. Ms. Foulkes further indicated that no one will be able to see the area because it is like a hole. They want to install the walls to be up 30 inches to allow for a raised garden.

Ms. Burgess noted that any wall in excess of 24 inches will require an engineering detail and a permit.

Ms. Foulkes indicated that the walls haven't been built yet. It has only been excavated and that they will get permits.

Ms. Burgess informed Ms. Foulkes to bring the landscaping plans with the revised building plans and it can be taken care of then. Ms. Burgess further noted that if the wall is 24 inches or less and the face of the wall and the next wall is four feet or more it will not need a permit, but anything over 24 inches in height will require a permit. A landscape plan is required to show how it will all work.

Ms. Foulkes indicated, "o.k."

Chairman Stroh called for a motion.

Ms. Ruffner asked if the recording secretary had the three initial stipulations that Ms. Burgess requested from the Commission.

Ms. Sammeli, Recording Secretary, noted from the record there should be three separate motions, one for the garage, the addition with the stone wall, and a resubmittal of the plans with the landscaping plans to be included.

Ms. Burgess indicated it would be best to take the motions separately so the applicant and the designer will know what they need to present. Ms. Burgess gave examples of the motions at this time. Ms. Burgess noted that one would be: 1. if possible to retain the historic garage which is listed in the National Register; 2. to extend the garage straight back and to change the materials when they do the addition to make it a compatible and whatever else the Commissioners want to see on the garage. 3. "the addition" and 4. to include the landscaping.

Chairman Stroh, **MOTION: on HP08-029**, 1097 Old Hassayampa Lane, regarding the garage 1) Preservation Commission prefers to preserve the existing garage if possible, moving it forward in the same configuration would not be a problem; 2) prefer to see the storage room and bathroom addition to the garage to be the same width, in a linear configuration vs. a "T" configuration; 3) the new addition to be delineated with different materials from the original garage; 4) the garage door to be a craftsman style garage door with lites; 5) roof line to be straight with one gable. Mr. Rantz, 2nd. **VOTE: 7-0.**

Chairman Stroh, **MOTION: on the rear addition** to the house itself, that the owner and designer come back before the Preservation Commission with a possible solution that retains the existing walls and that they are worked into the interior of the building. Ms. Ruffner, 2nd. **VOTE: 7-0.**

Chairman Stroh, **MOTION: It is important** that if you are exceeding the requirements for a building permit on the landscaping, that applicant return back before the Preservation Commission with a landscaping plan so we can see what you are going to be doing, so that we may better visualize the entire situation. Ms. Ruffner, 2nd. Mr. Todd added an amendment that the applicant shall obtain a permit for the retaining walls as necessary. Mr. Stroh agreed to the amendment and commented if you are doing things that are below the threshold then it does not meet our criteria to be reviewed.

Mr. Wright inquired if all the retaining walls are able to be done without City permits by keeping them under the 24 inches and if there is any City Engineering that looks at the drainage to make sure that some of the smaller walls are not sending the water into the neighboring properties.

Ms. Burgess indicated there was not an Engineering review unless a permit is required.

Ms. Ruffner indicated that the mitigation of the drainage is a part of the permitting process so it does not need to be further expanded on.

Ms. Burgess indicated that is why they asked for a landscape plan that shows the changes in the contours and elevations so it can be seen where the water is going to go.

Ms. Foulkes indicated that it sounded like most of the process would require them to pass before the Preservation Commission before they could go to the permitting process.

Ms. Burgess indicated that was correct.

Ms. Foulkes noted o.k. and inquired if the landscaping plan was good enough for the Preservation Commission to get permits.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the project is not being approved today.

Ms. Foulkes asked if they could just get approval on the landscaping part of the plan.

Ms. Burgess indicated no, because it is all in process and permits for the landscaping would go through the same process to get approval from the Preservation Commission, otherwise they will not issue the permits.

Ms. Foulkes inquired again if they could just get approval for the landscaping so that they could start. Ms. Foulkes noted that they want thirty inch walls and steps to get up into the back

yard and the intent is that the level will be the same as the neighbors' so that it is like one continual patio. Ms. Foulkes reiterated that if they could get approval today then they could start the engineering from the City. Ms. Foulkes noted that she wanted to get half the landscaping done on the kitchen side before they do any of the building so that a temporary fence can be put up to hold the dogs in and keep them clean.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the applicant did not have enough detail on the plans that were shown. The elevations for the wall heights, the treads in the risers for the stairs, were not submitted as part of the review.

Mr. Rantz also noted that the plan does not note any of the work that is occurring at the street level of the property on the plan.

Chairman Stroh indicated that there were motions on the floor and the Commission needed to vote.

VOTE: 7-0.

Ms. Ruffner commended the property owners for being receptive to the need to protect historic properties.

Mr. Todd added that as a point of information to the applicants, that the best option is to add the landscaping to the design to make sure it is acceptable from a permitting point.

Ms. Burgess indicated that she will talk with the applicants and will help them through the process.

IV. SUMMARY OF CURRENT OR RECENT EVENTS

Mr. Bacon indicated that he thought the Commission would like to know what happened with the deck and the side yard encroachment. Mr. Bacon reported that the code does allow for a structural addition when there is a physically handicapped person needing access providing that the existing building was built prior to 2004. Mr. Bacon further noted that where the carport is connected to the addition there were some structural walls that prohibited the handicapped access to be at that location and that was the only other location to put the handicapped access.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 AM.

Doug Stroh, Chairman