

**CITY OF FLAGSTAFF HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**MEMO – Headline Salon**

**Grant Correction & Request**

**PZ- 21-00257**

**Address: 113 E Aspen Ave**

**DATE: May 9, 2023**

**MEETING DATE: May 17th, 2023**

**REPORT BY: Mark Reavis, AICP, NCARB**

**BACKGROUND**

The Historic Bikker Office Building aka “Power Hat Shop” is a storefront of an intact 1915 remodeling of a 1897 building. Its unique features are its corner entry and column and decorative brick and pebble finish. The property is listed in the National Register and is a contributing element within the Railroad Addition National Register District and is within the Downtown Overlay Design Review District.

**PREVIOUS HPC DECISIONS**

This property had previous HPC reviews working through compatible additions to a window replacement project. The project received a Certificate of Appropriateness on December 15, 2021 with the requirement that compatible custom milled grid work would be added to the replacement windows along with matching window trim millwork.

A grant request was submitted to pay for the additional compatibility work to make modification to the replacement window per the Certificate conditions. The HPO, when preparing the grant, only agendized the last line of the request for \$900. The \$900 was only one of the items included on the application and not the total. The Commission voted on and approved a \$900 grant as a result of this error. The submitted construction budget in the original application for the window improvements (window grids + required work) was \$9,816. The 50/50 grant should have been \$4,908. The mistake wasn’t discovered until the property owner submitted receipts for payment. The property owner has been paid \$900. This oversight by the HPO requires correction by Heritage Preservation Commission.

In reviewing this initial error, Tesano Contracting called out confusion with the Grant application. At the time, they misunderstood that the total for both the grant and the match could not exceed \$10,000. Therefore, they submitted a budget of \$9,816 and would have submitted additional costs directly related to the compliance work totaling the full cost of preservation work for a maximum grant of \$10,000. Tesano on behalf of the building owner is requesting consideration of the full grant amount allows, due to these miscommunications.

**REQUEST**

The contractor representing the property owner is requesting the grant be increased to \$10,000 to cover half of the \$22,330.28 in work completed because it was all additional costs due to the Certificate of Appropriateness compliance as was the original intent of the grant.

Alternative Request: If the Commission does not support the full grant amount of \$10,000 then the HPO requests that the grant amount be adjusted to correct the HPO’s oversight with a matching grant payment of \$4,008, noting a previous payment of \$900.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The HPO recommends approving all preservation costs associated with the Certificate of

Appropriateness and thereby approving the \$10,000 grant less the previous \$900 payment to the building owner.

**OPTIONS FOR COMMISSION DECISION-MAKING:**

- 1) The Commission could approve the submitted grant application package per originally submitted for a payment of \$4,908 less the \$900 payment -or-
- 2) The Commission could approve the additional documented preservation work of \$12,514.28 on top of the \$9,816 total project cost for preservation work of \$22,330.28 with grant participation not to exceed \$10,000 50/50 match less the \$900 previously paid in the amount of \$9,100 -or-
- 3) The Commission could request modifications to the proposal and include them as conditions of approval – or –
- 4) Continue the HPC review to a date certain and ask the applicant to come back with a modified proposal.

---

**HPO Recommended Motion**

***Approve \$9,100 in additional funding to the grant for window and door replacements at 113 E Aspen Ave.***

---

**DISCUSSION**

**COMMUNICATION BACKGROUND**

The Contractor and HPO have had many quick meetings (in person, email, phone) that included inspections to establish requirements to achieve no adverse effect to the historic property. All preservation determinations and monitoring was assigned to the HPO per the motion passed by the HPC to monitor new compatibility requirements for treatment of façade improvements and preservation measures.

The Contractor has made a strong commitment in meeting the goal of no adverse effect to the historic character of the building. This long-term commitment to the building’s preservation has also been reinforced by the building owner’s investment in the property.