

PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION
February 13, 2009
Prescott, Arizona

MINUTES OF THE **PRESCOTT PRESERVATION COMMISSION** held on **February 13, 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 Marv Wright	OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE Nancy Burgess, Historic Preservation Specialist Mike Bacon, Community Planner Kelly Sammeli, Recording Secretary
MEMBERS ABSENT Elizabeth Ruffner Mike Todd	COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT Lora Lopas, Council Liaison Jack Wilson, Mayor

III. REGULAR AGENDA

- 1. Consider approval** of minutes of the January 9, 2009 meeting.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION:** to approve the Prescott Preservation Commission minutes of the January 9, 2009. Chairman Stroh, **2nd. VOTE: 5-0.**

- 2. HP09-004, 105 East Gurley Street.** Historic Preservation District # 1, Courthouse Plaza. APN: 109-01-022. Consider request for approval of a permit to install a new canvas awning cover with a 4.2 square foot graphic sign for Make a Wish Foundation (already installed without permit). Owners are Leigh- Christian LLC. Applicant is A Shade Beyond. Community Planner, Mike Bacon.

Mr. Bacon reported that the application before the Commission was for an awning with signage located at 105 E. Gurley Street for the Make a Wish Foundation. Mr. Bacon further noted that the length of the awning is fourteen feet, the color of the awning is blue and the total signage is 4.2 square feet. In closing, Mr. Bacon indicated that staff is recommending approval of the awning along with the signage and the applicant was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Wright inquired if the applicant was not aware that the location was in the Historical District prior to the installation.

Mr. Wolfgang Dieterich, owner of A Shade Beyond, 474 EZ Street, Prescott, noted that the awning was a recover project and as the sub-contractor he did not notice the location as he normally would and it slipped through the cracks. Mr. Dieterich further noted that the awning was a re-cover only and not new.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to approve HP09-004**, Make a Wish awing and sign.
Mr. DeGrazia, **2nd. VOTE: 5-0.**

- 3. HP09-005, 103 North Cortez Street.** Historic Preservation District # 1, Courthouse Plaza. APN: 113-16-065. Consider request to place new sign graphics on six existing awnings for Armadilla Wax Works. Total square footage of signage is 39 square feet. Owners are 110 East Gurley, LLC. Applicant is A Shade Beyond. Community Planner, Mike Bacon.

Mike Bacon, Community Planer reported that the business known as Armadilla Wax works will be relocating into the building at 103 North Cortez Street. Mr. Bacon noted that the location has a total of six existing awnings, and the request is to place new Logos and the name of Armadilla Wax Works. Mr. Bacon further noted that the signage totals 39 square feet where 50 square feet are allowed in the downtown business area, and staff is recommending approval.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if the signage would be placed along Cortez Street also.

Mr. Bacon noted yes.

Mr. Wright inquired if the perpendicular sign would be removed.

Mr. Bacon indicated no that it is regarded as a time and temperature sign.

Mr. Buchanan inquired if the awnings will be removed to place the signage on them.

Mr. Dietrich noted that they are proposing on using the existing fabric and the awning will be removed for about two weeks, the awnings will be cleaned, the signage will be painted on with 30 year paint and then the awnings will be reinstalled.

Mr. Buchanan indicated that he had inquired because the awnings are very dirty.

Mr. Dietrich noted that they would not be able to paint the awning; without them being cleaned first.

Chairman Stroh indicated he thought they would look very good and Armadilla Wax Works would be a nice addition to downtown Prescott.

Chairman Stroh called for other comments from the Commission. Hearing none, called for a motion.

Mr. Buchanan, **MOTION: to approve HP09-005 sign for Armadilla Wax Works.**
Chairman Stroh, **2nd. VOTE: 5-0.**

- 4. HP09-002, 425 East Gurley Street.** Historic Preservation District # 13, Southeast Prescott. APN: 110-01-002. Consider request to approve lettering that has been added to an existing sign face for Tom Kelly, Attorney. Owners/ Applicants are Thomas K. Kelly & Tamera Kelly. Community Planner, Mike Bacon.

Mike Bacon, Community Planner reported that the application was for a company that has been at the location for about two years. The signage totals 16 square feet that measures about 70 inches by 45 inches and is for Tom Kelly, Attorney. Mr. Bacon noted that the sign consists of black vinyl letters that are located on the existing white panel board enclosed by a

brown frame and will not be illuminated. Mr. Bacon further noted that the sign does meet the signage requirement, and staff is recommending approval of the application.

Mr. Wright indicated that he is o.k. with the signage as long as it meets City Code; and he was glad to see that it was not illuminated.

Mr. Bacon noted to the Commissioners that the previous tenants of the building located all their allotted signage on the building and therefore the free standing sign area was not usable at that time.

Chairman Stroh inquired what the procedures would be if Mr. Kelly decided to illuminate the sign.

Mr. Bacon reported that the current background panel is mostly white and the area would not meet the current requirements of the Land Development Code standards and 80 watts.

Chairman Stroh called for other comments. Hearing none, called for a motion.

Mr. DeGrazia, **MOTION: to approve HP09-002.**
Chairman Stroh, 2nd. **VOTE: 5-0.**

5. **HP09-001, 105 South Cortez Street.** Historic Preservation District # 1, Courthouse Plaza. APN: 109-01-021A. Consider Request to place new signage, including a single projecting wall mounted sign and awning signage. Owners are TIS Holding LLC. Applicant is Signs Plus. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Commissioner DeGrazia recused himself from this item due to a potential conflict of interest and left the dais.

Ms. Nancy Burgess, Preservation Specialist noted that the application was a proposal for two signs, a small perpendicular sign, and a logo, that will be located on the skirt of the previously approved roll-out awning for the Knights of Pythias building. Ms. Burgess reported that the wall mounted perpendicular sign extends 2' 10" from the wall, and is 2' 6" in height for a total of 7.08 square feet. Ms. Burgess further noted that the sign design is an aluminum, painted brown cabinet, with frosted acrylic faces, with vinyl letters and border. Also, the sign will be internally lighted. Ms. Burgess indicated that one suspended perpendicular sign per building, which shall not exceed four linear feet in overhang is allowed under the Land Development Code and the sign meets the criteria. Ms. Burgess further indicated that a right-of-way permit will be required for the installation of the sign. Ms. Burgess reported that the second sign only totals .77 square feet which brings the total of 7.85 square feet of signage for the location where 40 square feet are allowed in a multi-tenant building. Ms. Burgess closed her staff report by indicating that the signage request meets all the requirements for the sign code and the Courthouse Plaza Historic Preservation District and staff is recommending approval.

Chairman Stroh inquired if the flagpole was part of this submittal.

Ms. Burgess indicated no, that was under a separate item.

Mr. Wright inquired if there would be additional signage for a tenant and where would it be located.

Ms. Burgess noted that there will be additional tenants and the signage will depend on the type of tenant. Ms. Burgess further noted that it is possible for that signage to be located on the entrance door to the second floor.

Mr. Buchanan inquired if there were provisions for signage to be located above the awning area on the building itself.

Ms. Burgess noted that there could be additional signage added to the building however, it would have to be looked at individually. In addition, there could not be another perpendicular sign located on the building.

Mr. Wright asked Ms. Burgess if she was aware of how many businesses would be located within the building.

Ms. Burgess indicated she did not know however she did know that it would be a professional office type use and would not require retail type signage.

Mr. Wright inquired if TIS Holding was a retail business.

Ms. Burgess noted yes it would be an Art Gallery.

Chairman Stroh inquired if there was any public comment. Hearing none closed the public portion and called for a motion.

Mr. Rantz, **MOTION: to approve HP09-001**, signage for the Knights of Pythias building.
Mr. Buchanan, 2nd. **VOTE: 4-0.**

6. **HP09-003, 105 South Cortez Street.** Historic Preservation District # 1. Courthouse Plaza. APN: 109-01-021A. Consider approval of (1) a request for a permit to install roof-mounted flagpole and (2) support for Special Use Permit to go above the 50 foot building height allowed under the LDC. Owners are 'TIS Holding, LLC. Applicant is Otwell Associates Architects. Historic Preservation Specialist, Nancy Burgess.

Commissioner DeGrazia recused himself from this item also.

Nancy Burgess, Preservation Specialist reported that the application was also for the Knights of Pythias building and it was for a 20' tall flag-pole to be located on the top of the building. Ms. Burgess placed photographs of the building on the overhead projector and noted that they were historical photographs of the building reflecting the flagpole located on the top of the building. Ms. Burgess further reported that the building height is 55'-3" to the top of the parapet and the flagpole will be installed 3' to 5' back from the parapet, centered from north to south and 18'-3" of the pole will be visible above the parapet. Ms. Burgess noted that the project will require a Special Use Permit from the City Council to exceed the allowed height of 50' in the downtown business district. Ms. Burgess further noted that code does allow up to 100' with an approved Special Use Permit and the total height of the building with the flagpole will be at 73'-6". Ms. Burgess noted that the flagpole is a medium or dark bronze, cast aluminum flagpole, and the flag will be raised, lowered and stored automatically at certain times of the day. Ms. Burgess further indicted that the flagpole will not be lighted. Ms. Burgess concluded the staff report and noted that the applicant was present if there were any questions.

Chairman Stroh asked Ms. Burgess to put the historic photograph back on the overhead and further inquired how the 20' height came into consideration as the photograph did not indicate it was 20' in height.

Mr. Scott Westbrook, Otwell Associates, 121 E. Goodwin Street, indicated that he did not know for sure where the height came from however noted that it was possible that is the standard size of the aluminum flag pole.

Chairman Stroh noted that the building is 55' tall and if the proportions were calculated the flagpole would be about 15' or 16' in height.

Mr. Westbrook noted again he thought it was the standard size of flagpoles made today.

Chairman Stroh inquired what size Flag would be placed on the Flagpole.

Mr. Westbrook indicated that the Flag would be 3' by 5'.

Mr. Wright inquired if there were any aviation concerns with the flagpole and if it would require a light on it.

Mr. Westbrook indicted no.

Mr. Wright, **MOTION: to approve support** of the permit for the installation of a roof top Flag Pole and support of the Special Use Permit to exceed 50 feet.

Mr. Rantz, **2nd. VOTE: 4-0.**

Commissioner DeGrazia returned to the dais and the meeting continued.

7. **HP09-006, 1097 Old Hassayampa Lane.** Historic Preservation District # 15, Historic Homes at Hassayampa. APN: 108-07-165. Requests include: 1) Relocate the existing one-car garage 12 feet west (if possible); or, build a new one car garage the same size as the existing; 2) construct a new detached hobby/storage building with a ¾ bath; 3) convert existing bedroom to storage and master bath; 4) construct addition to rear and north side of existing house; and 5) Move existing wood fence forward, toward the street, to accommodate the garage relocation and construct matching fence to connect the garage and hobby room on the north side; (6) approve landscape plan. Owners/applicants are Steve Trainor and Kris Foulkes. Nancy Burgess, Historic Preservation Specialist.

Nancy Burgess, Preservation Specialist noted that the applicants and designer have returned with a new proposal that incorporated the recommendations of the Commission from the meeting that occurred on January 9, 2009. Ms Burgess further noted that she would briefly go over the new proposal and then the Commission could discuss each element one at a time. Ms. Burgess reported that the request was to (1) Move existing garage toward street, add foundation, new doors; (2) construct new free-standing hobby/storage building; (3) convert existing bedroom to storage & master bath; (4) construct bedroom and laundry room addition to rear and north side of existing house; (5) re-landscape rear and north side yard, including moving fences to accommodate project and constructing dry-stack granite walls and steps; various drainage projects. Ms. Burgess noted that the landscaping was discussed at the last meeting however, there was not enough information to really look at it. The applicants have provided a landscaping plan and they will be required to have permits for a portion of the work.

Ms. Burgess placed a site plan of the project on the overhead and noted the location of the house and the existing garage. Ms. Burgess noted that the proposal is to move the garage 12' towards the street and place it on a foundation, and install new garage doors. Ms. Burgess further noted that at the last review, the Commission had recommended extending the garage building to the east to incorporate the hobby/storage room. Ms. Burgess indicated that she would continue with the next item unless the Commissioners had any questions regarding the garage.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that the elevation change for the garage would approximately be 2' 6" and inquired if they were going to dig out the area and place the garage in or make the driveway steeper.

Mr. Carlos Leyva, 131 West Navajo, noted that they would be working with the existing grades and lower the finished floor to about 98'. Mr. Leyva indicated they would augger out the footprint and place a two foot retaining wall for the garage and relocate any leftover stone on the foundation exterior of the garage to get back to the finished floor height of the house at 100'.

Chairman Stroh inquired if that would make the inside height of the garage higher.

Mr. Leyva indicated no, the interior would be the same height however; the back side would be shortened.

Mr. Buchanan inquired if that would create drainage problems for the garage.

Mr. Leyva noted it would not; they are lowering it so the pavement level is at the 98' grade level and therefore it will not create a transition from the payment to the new garage.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that steps would have to be added to get back up to the house and inquired where they would be located.

Mr. Leyva indicated that there will be one or two steps to transition into the addition. Mr. Leyva further noted that the garage driveway will slope up and when you pull in, it will be on an incline. The front of the garage will be at 98' the rear at 99' and there will only be a one foot difference from the back of the garage to the house.

Mr. DeGrazia asked Mr. Leyva if the garage would not be set level.

Mr. Leyva indicated that it will not be set level but it will appear level.

Chairman Stroh inquired if the gate had been eliminated and the only way into the back yard would be through the garage.

Mr. Leyva noted that the gate will be moved forward 12' to match the garage and a new matching gate will be added between the garage and the hobby room.

Chairman Stroh noted it would be where the plans indicated the existing fence would be relocated.

Chairman Stroh inquired how they had come to the decision to move the garage forward and noted that before the garage was going to stay in the same location and adding onto the back of it. Chairman Stroh further noted that by moving the garage forward will eliminate parking space and will encroach into the front elevations of the site line of the other houses.

Mr. Leyva indicated that at the last meeting the Commission had recommended to move the garage forward 12' and connect the whole building however, when they looked at the impact of a huge narrow structure, they felt it would be nice to leave the historic garage as a separate entity as well as the hobby room so it is not a long structure. Mr. Leyva further noted that elevation of the hobby room in the rear, is stepping up with the hillside, to work with the existing grades of the location.

Ms. Burgess inquired if the Commissioners were ready to move onto the hobby room. Ms. Burgess further noted that the proposed door for the garage has four lites, and is a cross buck style, roll up door.

Chairman Stroh noted that the Commissioners were ready to review the hobby room.

Ms. Burgess pointed to the location of the structure on the overhead and noted that the proposal is to build a free-standing 280 square foot hobby/storage room, 12' from the back of the garage. Ms. Burgess noted that the hobby room is wider and taller than the garage and will sit at a slight angle so it will be slightly screened by the garage. The roof will be a front gable roof, the shingles to match the shingles on the house and the garage and will have horizontal siding. Ms. Burgess noted the materials on the overhead projector for the Commissioners to view.

Mr. Leyva noted that the separation would be 10' not 12' between the garage and the hobby room and there is a considerable elevation drop from the street to the buildings.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the street sits lower than the house, garage and hobby room.

Mr. Rantz noted that it will look different from the drawing and it will not look as tall and large from the street.

Mr. Leyva indicated that was correct and the garage along with the two mature trees will hide about 90% of the hobby room.

Mr. DeGrazia noted that the hobby room appears more like a guest room and inquired if a guest room was allowed by code; and what is the distance between the corner of the master suite and the hobby room; and if there would be code issues on the distance.

Mr. Leyva indicated he thought it was about six or seven feet and they are not connected.

Mr. Bacon noted that the International Building Code addresses the distance between structures, number of openings, and materials used in a structure but the zoning code does not.

Mr. Rantz inquired about the other question the Mr. DeGrazia asked regarding the guest room.

Mr. Bacon indicated that people can put a lavatory or sink in an accessory structures however, staff will note on the plans, in a staff report or another way as an advisory, to inform the owner that a guest house would not be allowed.

Mr. Rantz inquired what the zoning was on the property as he thought it was a recreational type zoning.

Mr. Bacon noted that the zoning is part of the Hassayampa Master Plan and as such the zoning is SPC, Specific Planned Community and the overlay allows numerous uses.

Mr. Rantz noted so if the owner wanted to use it as a bed and breakfast it would be allowed.

Mr. Bacon indicated that was correct.

Mr. Rantz indicated that he prefers the separate structure for the hobby room noting that he did not like the long tall garage. Mr. Rantz further noted that this fits in better with the historical character of the neighborhood where structures were placed wherever they could fit them in.

Mr. DeGrazia concurred.

Ms. Burgess indicated that the third request is to convert the existing bedroom to a storage area and a master bathroom. Ms. Burgess noted that this change would not have any impact on the historic integrity of the building and it will create a door through the back wall into the new addition. Ms. Burgess further noted that it will create a master bath, storage and a hallway to lead to the addition.

Mr. Rantz noted that the exterior wall will be retained as requested.

Mr. Leyva reported that a door will be located where the window was and when you walk into the addition you will see all the existing stone structure.

Ms. Burgess noted the next portion of the request is the addition of the bedroom and laundry room to the rear and north side of the existing house. Ms. Burgess reported to the Commission that the applicant has indicated that they will retain the original stone wall and it will be located within the new master bedroom. Ms. Burgess indicated that the new addition will protrude about two feet and will be visible from the original house however, with the fence and gates, it will be completely screened from public view. Ms. Burgess further indicated that she did not believe it would have any effect on the historic integrity of the building. Ms. Burgess then placed the drawings on the overhead projector and pointed out the locations of the addition. Ms. Burgess noted that the materials would consist of native stone veneer from the ground up to about 2-1/2 feet and wood shingles above. The ridge line will continue straight and they will match the windows that are in the original house. Ms. Burgess noted the location of the hobby room and the garage. Ms. Burgess reiterated that the material change of wall shingles will make it "compatible but different".

Ms. Burgess reported that the Commission had asked the applicants to submit a landscaping plan when they returned because the proposal included a lot of different elements to the site. Ms. Burgess noted that some of the landscaping would require permits however, most would not. Ms. Burgess noted that the applicants have moved dirt however, not enough to require a permit. The applicants have also installed drainage to direct water away from the home. Ms. Burgess noted that the water runs off of Country Club and continues to run northwest, had never been engineered in the past, and has created problems for the neighborhood from day one. Ms. Burgess noted that today, across the street on Old Hassayampa Lane there is a rock lined bar ditch, and drainage to take the water down to a retaining pond into an area for the condominiums on Old Hassayampa Lane but the homes of Hassayampa have to design drainage to tie into that area. Ms. Burgess indicated that the applicants have hired a landscape architect, Steve Morgan, who has designed a landscape plan. The plan will retain all the large trees on the site, terrace down from County Club Drive in intervals, relocate the (already approved) split rail fence with a garden wire covering, add a rubble dry stack wall, (permit will be required) relocate the four foot fence in the rear, and place pavers and planters

with drainage in the rear by the patio area. Ms. Burgess further indicated that there will be several ground levels and water catchment containers to catch the water off the roof of the house and the hobby room. Ms. Burgess noted that the applicants were present if there were questions regarding the landscaping.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired if someone could address the 3' 10 " tall retaining wall that goes across the property line in the northeast corner.

Ms. Kris Foulkes, 1097 Old Hassayampa Lane indicated that Versa Lock wall was installed by them, across the property line with the permission of the adjacent owner. Ms. Foulkes noted that it helps keep the water from running into the neighbors' garden shed and it helped to reveal the historic wall and cleaned up the whole area.

Mr. DeGrazia inquired how the city would address the wall across property lines.

Ms. Burgess noted that because it is less than four feet in height it would not require a permit and that historically there are rock walls running across property lines throughout the neighborhood.

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

Ms Burgess noted that was all five items.

Chairman Stroh inquired if it would be one motion for all five items.

Ms. Burgess noted it could be done either way.

Mr. Rantz, **MOTION: to approve** HP09-006, all five sections as presented.

Mr. DeGrazia, **2nd. VOTE: 5-0.**

IV. SUMMARY OF CURRENT OR RECENT EVENTS

1. Recap and update on 2008 Preservation Commission projects. Marv Wright.

Mr. Wright indicated that he would like to postpone the recap until March so the Ms. Ruffner and Mr. Todd could hear it and would prefer to wait until they were present.

Ms. Burgess announced the 7th Annual, Arizona Statewide Historic Preservation Partnership Conference, with the theme of Arguing for Preservation: Building a Case of Community, will be held on Thursday through Saturday, June 18th -20th in Phoenix, AZ. Ms. Burgess informed the Commissioners that registration is already open and she needed to know before the next Preservation Commission meeting date if any of the Commissioners were planning on attending. Ms. Burgess indicated that she will be applying for a Historic Preservation Grant to help fund the trip. Ms. Burgess further indicated that the fee for the conference and as well as the hotel stay will be paid for and if they carpool, the mileage will be covered. Ms. Burgess also informed the Commissioners that there will be a party at the Tovrea Castle, which the City of Phoenix owns and has restored, Friday evening which, if they attended, they would have to pay for themselves. Ms Burgess also informed the Commissioners that the Legislature stripped all the funds out of the Heritage Fund and there are no funds left. In closing Ms. Burgess asked the Commissioners to look at the 2008 goals list and come up with goals that

they might like to work on for the Historic Preservation Commission in 2009. Ms. Burgess noted that Mike Bacon, Community Planner will be working on the Historic Preservation month awards this year and he will need a Commissioner to volunteer and the same for the Elizabeth Ruffner awards. Ms. Burgess asked the Commissioners to be prepared to adopt their goals in March.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 AM.

Doug Stroh, Chairman