

NOTICE
Notice to Property Owner of a City of Flagstaff
**Heritage Preservation Commission
PUBLIC HEARING**
Regarding this property considering the following:
Certificate of Appropriateness
This is a proposed for addition to a duplex located at 608 W Aspen Ave. Flagstaff AZ 86001. The proposal includes an addition and modifications to a duplex built in 1996. Work includes three entry porches with traditional adobe tile compatible with neighborhood, a 5,115 sq ft two story addition to the rear and to expand the existing 2 bedroom, 2.5 bath unit into a 3 bedroom 4.5 bath unit. It existing parking, garage will be all of existing. Site, Windows replaced and structure repaired. The property is located in the Townsite Overlay District.
Interested persons may appear at the hearing and be heard, or may file a written statement to the commission by the Commission.
Date: 7/15/2020 at 4:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual Hearing, contact Mark Reavis for login information
Mark Reavis, AICP, NCARB
City of Flagstaff - Heritage Preservation Officer
(928) 213-2633 Mark.Reavis@flagstaffaz.gov
Townsite Overlay District (TOD) Ordinance
Application Form 100 8/10/19 Rev.

608



NOTICE

Notice is hereby given of a City of Flagstaff

Heritage Preservation Commission

POSSIBLE RECONSIDERATION AND PUBLIC HEARING

Regarding this property considering the following:

Reconsideration of Certificate of Appropriateness

The Heritage Preservation Commission will decide whether or not to reconsider the Certificate of Appropriateness for additions and improvements to 608 W Aspen Ave approved on Wednesday, August 19, 2020. If a majority of the Commission votes in favor of reconsideration, then a new public hearing may be held on the application at the same meeting.

Interested persons may appear & speak at the meeting virtually via Microsoft Teams and be heard, or, may file a written statement to be considered by the Commission by emailing sdechter@flagstaffaz.gov. Please submit your comments by 3:45pm on September 16, 2020 and include the address 608 W Aspen Avenue in your subject line.

Date: September 16, 2020 at 5:00 p.m.
Location: City Hall – Online, request link

Mark Reavis, AICP, NCARB

City of Flagstaff • Heritage Preservation Officer

Mark.Reavis@flagstaffaz.gov (928) 213-2633

Townsite Historic Design Review Overlay District

Application for: 608 W. Aspen Avenue

From: [Mark Reavis](#)
To: [Ellen Ryan](#)
Cc: [Sara Dechter](#)
Subject: RE: 608 W. Aspen Ave
Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 8:57:25 AM

I acknowledge receiving and reading this email.

Mark A. Reavis, AICP, NCARB

Heritage Preservation Officer/Neighborhood Planner
Planning & Development Services, 211 W. Aspen Av.
Community Development, Flagstaff AZ 86001

Phone/message: (928) 213-2633

Mark.Reavis@flagstaffaz.gov www.flagstaffaz.gov

From: Ellen Ryan <rrrellen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 9:41 AM
To: Mark Reavis <mark.reavis@flagstaffaz.gov>
Cc: Sara Dechter <SDechter@flagstaffaz.gov>
Subject: 608 W. Aspen Ave

Mark and Sara,

I heard that the project at 608 W. Aspen Ave was approved yesterday at the HPC meeting. I sent my comments below to Sara earlier on August 17 and received an automated response that Sara would be returning to work on the 19th. I did not "attend" the meeting yesterday, but heard that my comments were neither read nor acknowledged.

I am wondering if you realize how much effort went into creating the Townsite Historic Design Review Overlay District in 2007. How can a project be approved if it varies from the code in the overlay? This opens up the possibility to other properties to begin building large bulky buildings in the historic district - affecting smaller homes nearby and changing the character of the district.

Please respect the Townsite Overlay Design Review District document.

Thank you,
Ellen

The following is included in the Overlay document which also addresses mass, bulk and scale and fitting into the character of the neighborhood:

E. Roof Pitch

Very shallow main roof pitches are not consistent with the historic development within the

district.

1. Pitches for main roofs in new construction shall be over 6:12. Porches, dormers, and similar lesser roofed areas may have shallower pitches.

My Comments submitted in the Aug 17 email:

Sara - below are my comments about the 608 W Aspen Ave property addressing scale, massing and form in the Townsite neighborhood. They are based on drawings submitted with the July agenda for HPC. Please include my comments at the August 19 HPC meeting.

1. The entire east side is one long two story bulky building which is not appropriate for the neighborhood.

2. The north side is too bulky, other than the entry area, providing little interest to the alley view.

3. The roof pitch should be in compliance with the Townsite Overlay and be a 6:12 pitch, not as drawn with such a massive look. To match the same roof pitch as the original is not a good enough reason to make it so large and bulky.

4. I am uncertain if the sf numbers are correct - seems a bit confusing to me.

5. I only see an addition of 4 bedrooms, 3.5 baths - one downstairs and 3 upstairs - so I don't know why it is being called a 5 bedroom, 4.5 bath addition. Still the number of bedrooms could turn into a "rent by the bedroom" situation.

6. The homes on all four sides are smaller and more in scale with the neighborhood. This building would loom over the neighbors even more than it does now. It did not fit the character of the neighborhood when it was first built, and it certainly won't be any better with the addition.

For these reasons, I suggest going back to the drawing board. The building would become too massive and inappropriate for the character of the Townsite neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Ellen Ryan
807 W. Aspen Ave

Heritage Preservation Commission meeting 19 August 2020

Duffie Westheimer
720 W. Aspen Ave. Flagstaff

Comments on two agenda items.

Item II 1.: PZ-20-00107 608 W. Aspen Ave. Requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness

I do not support the Commission granting this project a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- An addition almost doubling the square footage with a larger second story in the back unit of the duplex is not in keeping with historic development patterns. Also, a larger portion of the structure on top hanging over the ground floor is not in character with the historic neighborhood.
- No historic structure in the area has 30% lot coverage. This proposed addition almost doubles the existing size and is much larger than the adjacent small, single story structures.
 - To the east is a single-story church—which, according to the County sits 2' on the lot to the west and the house for the church sits on the W property line. Looking north along the church buildings they are in line so are they both 2' over the W property line?
 - To the west is a 700 sq. ft. single story house, with a matching house to the west (this 1996 duplex replaced the original third house in this set.
 - The proposed addition will loom over both the E & W properties and invade their privacy. Installing transom windows for privacy is the acknowledgement of this fact.
- The elevations and plans show only one conifer on the east side of the W. Aspen St. frontage. I have to believe the plan is to remove trees—could be as many as two in the front yard and two in the back. The neighborhood is known and valued for mature trees. The two trees on W. Aspen have hidden the two-story boxy so losing these trees will have a huge impact on the streetscape.
- This addition is so large that the City Architectural Design Standards 10-50.20.020 would need to be followed for the entire building.

The Applicability section says,

- 1.b. “Include [duplex] expansions greater than 25% of gross floor area, building additions...” “Applications involving façade changes to building and structure elevations that are visible from a public way, ... and alleys;” This proposed addition will be visible from two streets and an alley.
- 4. “Applications for new development in historic districts which shall comply with these standards as well as any design standards established for the district.” The Overlay states,
“In the case of any conflict between Flagstaff Townsite Historic Overlay District Design Standards and Guidelines and any other City regulatory documents, the

Flagstaff Townsite Historic Overlay District Design Standards and Guidelines, or the most restrictive, shall prevail.”

- The 1996 structure roof pitch is 4:12. Townsite Overlay document says in E. 1. “roof pitches shall be over 6:12.” New construction of any type needs to be compatible with the Overlay and historic structures in order to not dilute the neighborhood’s historic character.
- Under the Architectural Design Standards Building Massing and Scale it says:
 1. “It is important that a building be scaled to its context.” It does not say the context should be scaled to the building. That would dilute the neighborhood’s historic character.
- Also, under the City Architectural Design standards it says in 1. d. 2. “Avoid large panelized products of extensive featureless surfaces.” T1-11 siding, and in particular with a vertical orientation matching the 1996 part of structure, is not historic in character. Historic residential structures clad with wood had and have horizontal lap siding.
- The Design standard 4. b. addresses windows “Recess window frames, ... from the typical wall plane surface to provide a shadow line ...” Based on the elevations there is no shadow line and windows appear to be at the façade, not recessed. In addition, neighborhood historic windows are wooden double hung, and metal casement, not side by side sliders as shown in most of this structure and addition. Based on the Architectural Standards, with the addition, all the windows need to match the historic character of the context.
- Plans say the alley setback is 15’ but the Overlay requires 20’. Also, with the proposed parking space off W. Aspen the yard will be significantly smaller. Can the Overlay standard of a 1,000 sq. ft minimum contiguous yard be met when this is recalculated with the correct setback and additional parking space excluded?

If the owners want a large family house—and in this neighborhood adding so many bedrooms would make it a very large home—an alternative would be to remodel the existing structure into a single-family house without adding much if any square footage.

The current owners may have a large family but subsequent owners may turn the duplex with so many bedrooms and bathrooms into what we call a, “mini-dorm.” That addition would turn the property into high density and this zone is R1N—single family/duplex. Every historic duplex in this neighborhood, and there are many, are within the historic scale. They don’t dominate adjacent properties or change the neighborhood’s historic character. The City does not monitor what owners do with their property. Our City relies on complaint-driven code enforcement. To get along, neighbors will have to bear the burden of insufficient code requirements, and non-existent enforcement.

The Overlay addresses and allows exceptions. The text reads,
Finally, it is impossible to create regulations that cover every situation. And, since the standards and guidelines were based on the general character of the district, and knowing that non-

conforming yet historic structures do exist, the standards and guidelines accommodates exceptions.

The Historic Preservation Commission may, at its sole discretion, modify the requirements of these standards and guidelines when in the opinion of the Commission, an exception is warranted based for design consistency such as in the case of alterations to existing non-conforming structures, cases where an exception is necessary to accommodate an appropriate architectural style, cases where an exception is warranted based on the development of immediately adjacent properties, and other similar circumstances determined by the Commission.

This project does not meet these requirements. 608 W. Aspen is not a non-conforming historic structure, is not an appropriate architectural style, and it is too different from the immediately adjacent historic properties.

This project is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness. I cannot see how that can be granted. The addition is too large, and too visible. There are proposed character improvements to humanize the scale but over all it does not work in *this* neighborhood with a historic Overlay. The existing structure does not carry forward the Townsite Overlay specifics or intent. The building will hopefully one day be “historic” and if ever modified it should be made to fit into the area as a contributing property.

Please deny this proposed project the ability to move forward. Thank you.

Comments on agenda item II 2. PZ-20-00140 Lepler home.

I fully support granting funds to assist in the preservation of the historic Brown home. According to the application, it “was constructed in 1909 by architect/builders J.C. Milligan/D.L. Hogan.” For some context to how integrated these people were into Flagstaff past and present, the historic Milligan family house is two doors to the east. Dan Hogan’s family still lives in the 700 block of W. Cherry. Mr. Brown sold his jewelry business to his brother Willis Brown who in the 1920s built a house in the 700 block of W. Aspen. That house is still in the family and the next generation is going to continue the family’s neighborhood presence. Flagstaff was a small tight community of people who worked together.

I want to acknowledge the owner’s attention to the home’s unique details and their willingness to follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Thank you for being proactive toward preserving the property. By providing this City grant you, Commission members, are continuing this historic Flagstaff tradition of helping each other in the present.

From: [Melissa Bernasconi](#)
To: [Sara Dechter](#)
Subject: Participation for Agenda item PZ-20-00107
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 3:55:23 PM

Melissa Bernasconi

928-225-3176

Agenda Item: PZ-20-00107–Certificate of Appropriateness-608 West AspenAve.

As long time residents and supporters of Flagstaff's historic townsite, we are incredibly fortunate to live in such a diverse and beautiful neighborhood. The architectural character and charm of any historic home/building/site should be valued and important for all to respect, recognize, and preserve.

We had the opportunity to be a part of the historic townsite overlay many years back. We spent the time to meet with our neighbors and discuss the importance of keeping the standards for preserving the homes in our townsite. The proposed plans for 608 W Aspen Ave does not conform to downtown and should be re-evaluated.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our input today.



Information contained in this e-mail message and in any attachments thereto is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy this message, delete any copies held on your systems, notify the sender immediately, and refrain from using or disclosing all or any part of its content to any other person.

From: [JONATHAN SCHULMAN](#)
To: [Sara Dechter](#)
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 3:57:18 PM

AZ 20-00107

As a resident on west Aspen Street I feel this type of structure is not appropriate for this neighborhood. We established a townsite several years ago to maintain the flavor of this historic area.

Jon Schulman
819 W. Aspen St.
928-890-8453