

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE LITCHFIELD PARK DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
May 6, 2021**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was held online via Zoom and called to order by Vice Chair Ledyard at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Chair Charnetsky; Vice Chair Ledyard; and Boardmembers Clair, Dudley and O'Connor.

Absent: None.

Staff Present: Jason Sanks, Planning Consultant; Pam Maslowski, Director of Planning Services; and Dawn Morocco, IT Assistant,

II. Business

A. Election of Officers

Vice Chair Ledyard **moved** to re-elect Chair Charnetsky as Chair for the 2021-2022 term; Boardmember Dudley **seconded**. There were no other nominations and Chair Charnetsky was **re-elected unanimously**.

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to re-elect Vice Chair Ledyard as Vice Chair for the 2021-2022 term; Boardmember Clair **seconded**. There were no other nominations and Vice Chair Ledyard was re-elected unanimously.

B. Design Plans for an Addition/Remodel Proposed for 750 Val Verde Circles

Chair Charnetsky recused herself from this item and left the Zoom meeting.

Mr. Sanks stated that this application is for approval of the design plans for an attached garage addition. Currently, there is a two-car side-entry garage on the left side. He is not sure if the intention is to convert that to livable space or not. The request with this application is to add a new two-car garage with a somewhat unique appearance. The brick from the home will be incorporated onto the front elevation, the roof pitch will generally match the roof pitch of the home, and siding will be used in the rear that matches siding found elsewhere on the home. The owner intends to start with this garage and then ultimately remodel the entire exterior home. They would like to replace the existing roof with a standing seam metal roof and incorporate the garage architectural elements onto the rest of the home, but that will be the subject of a future application. Staff finds that adding the brick and a garage door to the front, and having the same roof pitch as the home is a close enough integration to the architecture of the existing residence that the garage can be built first and the remodel the rest of the home can be done later. The garage will be attached to the primary structure by a covered walkway, so it is considered part of the main building. Staff feels that the addition will add value to the residence and the surrounding neighborhood, and approval is recommended subject to the exhibits provided and the condition that the colors and materials match those of the existing residence except as modified by the application.

Roger Williams, the applicant, stated that he wants to retain the ranch style of the home. The garage will be attached to the house with a trellis feature, and the addition will have the same brick fascia so that it will blend in with the existing house. He will be keeping the existing two-car garage as his goal

is to have a four-car garage. The modern looking garage door will be added with this remodel and a matching door will be added to his existing garage.

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the application with the condition that the colors and building materials match the existing home except as modified by the application; Boardmember Clair **seconded; approved 4-0-1**, with Chair Charnetsky recused.

Chair Charnetsky returned to the meeting and chaired the remainder of the meeting.

C. New Exterior Color Proposed for 680 Fairway

Mr. Sanks stated that this is a unique request. The applicant has requested approval for exterior colors already added to the home that are not on the City's approved exterior color palette. There are a lot of colors included in the approved palette, but they are not as eye popping as one might find on residences of the Mid-Century Modern era. The agenda packet includes pictures of the home before the new colors were added and of the home with the new bright orange colors. If an exterior color is added that is on, or closely matches, a color on the approved color palette, it does not have to receive the Board's approval. However, if the color is not within the palette, it can be reviewed by the Board and the Board has the authority to approve it. The homeowner's application notes that they have a Mid-Century Modern home and they wanted to keep that spirit which often includes adding brighter accents. The Staff Report includes examples of other Mid-Century Modern homes. Usually, the bright colors are used on front doors or very specific trim elements. Staff does not want to suppress the homeowners' desires to express themselves; however, Staff also wants to keep some consistency in applying design review principles. The City did receive some complaints about the appearance of the home. It was not about the accents so much, but the broad face of the wall that has also been painted orange, making it not just an accent color, but a body color. Staff would encourage the homeowner to bring something forward that would mute the larger wall or find a color that would be more in the spirit of what is found on other Mid-Century Modern homes where a bright color is applied to a feature of the home that one wants to stand out while the remainder of the home is a variety of generally muted textures and material types that define the Mid-Century style. Staff recommends that the owner consider an alternative approach to the use of the bold colors they desire on the home, finding a way to implement the Mid-Century style, but doing so in way that mutes the colors in the spirit of the examples he provided. It would give the homeowner the chance to express themselves with their home while, at the same time, not shocking some of the neighbors by using bright colors on the exterior walls. It is Staff's position that the homeowner should explore other ways to accomplish their goal of making their home unique, enjoying the Mid-Century Modern approach to the boldness, but doing so in a more muted fashion.

Jonathon Rios, the applicant, stated that he and his wife recently purchased and moved into this home. His family has lived in this area for some time. Historical and architectural integrity really matter to them. The majority of the home is slump block and they felt that was the unifying neighborhood architectural characteristic. From the front angle, everything that was slump block is the same color. It is the vertical siding that they wanted to highlight. Looking from the front, the orange siding is an accent. They were told there is no Homeowner's Association and were not aware of the approved paint colors. It seems that the main issue is the car port wall. That is the one that sticks out when one makes the turn onto Fairway Drive. If the home was setback like a regular house, it would not be an issue. However, it does jut out.

Chair Charnetsky noted that the Mid-Century style involves using a bright color just for accents, doors and trim and not a broad swath. She asked if Mr. Rios had an objection to toning it down. Mr. Rios responded that the two shorter bushes in front of the wall will grow and cover some of the wall. Also, the paint will fade so it should not be as garish. Novelty is what upsets people sometimes. The color

matches the ocotillo cactus in front of the home. He requests that this color be allowed. Chair Charnetsky noted that the objection is not the color, but that there is such a large area with that color. The door and the front insets are probably fine, but not the large wall section. It is jarring to the neighbors and, in the interest of the community, it would help to change that. If allowed, it would also set a precedent for other homes and neighborhoods. Mr. Rios noted that he has had people tell him they like the color.

In response to a question, Mr. Rios noted the orange colors on the home are all the same. Boardmember Clair stated that he appreciates using color as he has some on his home. However, he thinks that in this community, sometimes less is more. He does not have any issues using the color as an accent, but using it on the broad wall seems to go against the community standard. Vice Chair Ledyard noted that he drove by the home today and, as he turned to go down Fairway, the first thing he saw was the large orange side of the house. It is a very bright orange. It did not feel like an accent, but more like a large portion of the house had been painted. The window insets are also very bright. When he thinks of accents, he thinks of something that blends in with the existing building and adds something. The large wall and the front insets are overwhelming. They look like something that was stuck on. He does not have an issue with the door. It appears that some of the Boardmembers are fine with keeping the orange color on the front insets. Perhaps, the applicant could agree to paint the larger wall something more muted. It reminds him of a billboard with the orange color.

After further discussion, Mr. Rios stated he can paint the carport side wall the same color as the slump block color.

In response to a question, it was noted that the insets would remain the orange color. The entry way and front insets are all the same color, although they do look different at different times of day. Mrs. Rios stated that the current front door is a lighter orange color; however, they will be getting a new door installed in about ten weeks, and it will be a muted sandstone color.

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the existing orange color on the front accent pieces with the condition that the carport wall siding is to be repainted a color to match the existing slump block; Vice Chair Ledyard **seconded**. The **motion was approved 4-1** with Boardmember O'Connor opposed.

D. Design Plans for an Addition/Remodel Proposed for 104 Vista Paseo

Mr. Sanks stated that this is an application for an extension to the existing garage. The home has a shed roofline. The applicant intends to bring the roof forward an additional 10' and extend it to the left an additional 2'. The addition meets the setback requirements. It will look like the existing garage, just brought forward with a little more room on the side. Staff had a few concerns with the rendering included in the packet. The rendering shows the home with a brown body color and a white garage door while the existing home has a white exterior with a brown garage door. Also, there is a window on the side and vents on the existing garage that are not shown on the rendering. Staff supports the application should they match the color of the existing home and that the accents and windows are kept.

John Hall, the applicant, stated that he did the rendering on his home design program. Everything will match the existing, although the addition will be taller. Currently the garage has a 7' door, but the only way to make the garage larger is to raise it up, so he will put in an 8' door. That will give him more room and allow him to match up the old with the new.

In response to questions, Mr. Hall explained how he would tie the new front shed roof in with the existing house. Also, he will be keeping the existing side window bring the vent forward as well. The front bay window will not be changed. The color will match the existing.

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to approve the application based on Staff's recommendation with the condition that all colors, building materials, and finishes shall match those of the existing residence; Vice Chair Ledyard **seconded; unanimous approval.**

**E. Design Plans for a Roof Mounted Solar Panel Installation Proposed for 690 E. Fairway Drive
(Continued from 4/1/21)**

Mr. Sanks noted that this application is for a roof mounted solar installation on a low-pitched roof and read the Zoning Code requirements for this type of installation. He stated that the home is on a corner lot and the panels would be visible from both streets. Some of the arrays are not squared up and the panels are oriented both vertically and horizontally. Staff would like the applicant to discuss what their options might be to square up the arrays and to orient the panels one way. He would also like the applicant to confirm that the panels will not be tilted up as the roof does have low tilt.

Sherilynn Soto, representing the applicant, stated they realize this layout is not perfect, but they have run this through their program a number of times to get the best productivity for the homeowner. This area of the roof is where they found they could get the best production. There are planes, valleys and peaks as well as the 3' fire area that they have to leave open. There is a tree in front that will block visibility. The panels will be flush to the roof, with no tilting. There will be conduit run on the top of the roof in the back. They can paint it to match the roof color as much as possible.

Chair Charnetsky noted that, in the past, companies have agreed to tuck the conduit up under the eave. Ms. Soto stated she can do an attic run if there is space, but she does not think there will be. They can also take it across and tuck it under the eave and then run it to the back. Boardmember O'Connor asked what the output difference would be if all the panels were placed on the back roof. Ms. Soto said it would drop the productivity in half. Also, if there was a way that she could move the panels so they are all oriented the same way, she would have done it. In response to a question, Ms. Soto replied that the panels will be flush mounted. She does not have the total height, but with this type of roof, it will be fairly flush. It should be no more than 5" off the roof. Chair Charnetsky suggested moving the two separate panels in the back to the front array. Ms. Soto noted she could probably do that. Boardmember Dudley noted her concern is the conduit on the roof. One can be run under the eave, but there are others. Ms. Soto noted there does not seem to be attic space to run it in the attic. Chair Charnetsky commented that relocating the two lone panels will eliminate the need for that portion of the conduit. The rest will have to be painted to match the roof so they are not noticeable and the long run should be taken out to the eave and run along the eave to the service. Ms. Soto noted she can do that.

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the application with the condition that the two lone panels will be relocated as discussed and the long conduit will be run along and under the roofline and all conduit painted to match the roof color; Vice Chair Ledyard **seconded; unanimous approval.**

F. Design Plans for an Addition/Remodel Proposed for 605 Bird Lane

Mr. Sanks stated that the applicant is seeking approval of his plans to extend the home's garage by adding a single, third bay garage to the right of and recessed from the existing two-car garage. The driveway will be flared out to provide access. Per the exhibits provided by the applicant, the colors, materials, architectural details, and garage door will match the existing home. It was noted that a variance had been approved for this project at a previous Board of Adjustment meeting. Mr. Sanks stated that Staff finds that the addition will add value to the home and neighborhood in general and approval is recommended with the condition that the colors, building materials, and finishes are to match the existing house.

Glenn Forstner, of Glenn Forstner Construction and representing the applicant, stated that the colors, materials and finishes will match the existing home. The new space will be recessed back, both for architectural purposes and because the electric panel is located around the corner on the right side. The addition will fit in nicely without having to relocate any items on the side of the house.

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to approve the application based on Staff's recommendation, with the condition that the colors, building materials, and finishes will match the existing house; Boardmember Clair **seconded; unanimous approval.**

G. Design Plans for an Addition/Remodel Proposed for 115 Cercado Lane

Mr. Sanks noted that Staff received this application late and tried to work with the applicant to get this on the agenda. The exhibits provided are not 100% complete, and he did discuss the application with the owner. The home has a slump block exterior and there is a proposed extension in the back for livable area. There is a note in the plans that stucco will be added later. He called the applicant and noticed that there are other changes being proposed beside the addition. It will be a total exterior remodel. The owner wishes to bring forth a new entry with two columns, stucco over the slump block, and replace the arched windows with rectangular windows. The color tones were received today and are all earth tones and somewhat mimic the current colors. Mr. Sanks displayed the colors submitted by the applicant.

Dan Marich, the applicant, apologized for the application not being as good as it should be. He is trying to completely remodel the house. It has several problems, and he is trying to fix them all at the same time. The two windows on the garage will remain but be squared off. The front will come out, and he is trying to mimic entrances he has seen on other homes in the City. He wants to stucco the house to update it. Some of the roof will be raised to raise the ceilings to 10' and 12'. He wants to update the whole house. The entrance will not be a drive-through, just an updated entrance. The body of the house will be the light color shown in the color sample. The popouts will be a different color for accent. The stone will also have some of that coloring in it. It will all match with the roof tiles, which will remain the same. Two popouts will be added to each column. The same popouts will be added to the columns in the back. The existing window popouts will be squared off, but he will try to keep them.

After further discussion, it was noted that the plans submitted are not complete, and the Board was not comfortable taking action tonight based on what was submitted.

Boardmember O'Connor **moved** to continue this item to allow the applicant time to submit a more complete application to Staff, including elevations, site, and floor plans. Boardmember Clair **seconded; unanimous approval.**

H. Site, Architectural, Landscaping and Lighting Plans Proposed for a New Taco Bell Facility to be Located at the Southeast Corner of Dysart and Camelback Roads

Mr. Sanks stated that the applicant presented this project to the Board at a study session held at the previous meeting. At that time, Staff had presented first review comments, and requested that the Board provide any additional input and direction so that the applicant could make any needed adjustments based on the comments received. The Taco Bell facility will be built on the last remaining vacant lot along Dysart Road. The Board has been consistent since the first approval of the Dignity Health facility in requiring the other facilities designs to be compatible with that first approval. Staff has also been consistent with asking drive-through restaurants in the City to provide outdoor dining. The applicant has submitted revised plans. Mr. Sanks reviewed the changes that had

been made, which were outlined in his Staff Report. He noted that a number of changes were made to the building elevations. There is now a stucco finish with some EIFS finish, introduction of stone veneer wainscoting with upward verticality to match Dignity Health, and upward projection elements. The metal paneling of the Dignity facility was emulated by providing EIFS but scoring it in a matter that makes it look like what is occurring at Dignity. There are some goose neck lights and the poster signage that did not conform with the City's Sign Code were removed. A dining area was added. A question that came up at the previous meeting was how deep will the purple color will be. His understanding from the applicant was that the purple will not be as deep as the first submittal but a bit more than what it looks like on the new submittal. Staff recommends approval with the condition that the electrical transformer for the site is to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to the submittal of construction documents to ensure compliance with site visibility triangles for ingress/egress safety. Mr. Sanks displayed the application submitted and reviewed the site plan, parking, and building elevations.

Chair Charnetsky inquired as to what material the tower will be. Greg Hitchens, architect representing the applicant, noted that Mr. Sanks covered most of the points addressed since the last meeting. Taco Bell had used a metal material for the tower in the past that rusted and made a mess. They have since found a product that looks the same, but has a coating that keeps it from rusting further. It will not be the bright orange color that it appears to be in the exhibit. It will be more of a dark orange color. The Taco Bell franchisee is happy with the revised plans and wants to build in the City. Most of the attention went into adding more of the elements from the other buildings and matching some of those colors. They have eliminated some of the purple color. Mr. Sanks displayed a copy of the purple color sample. Mr. Hitchens noted it is a plum color.

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the applications based on Staff's recommendation with the condition that the electrical transformer for the site shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to the submittal of construction documents to ensure compliance with site visibility triangles for ingress/egress safety; Boardmember O'Connor **seconded; unanimous approval.**

I. Minutes

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2021 meeting; Vice Chair Ledyard **seconded; unanimous approval.**

IV. Staff Report on Current Events

Mr. Sanks reported that Staff prepared a Major General Plan Amendment schedule for the 2021 calendar year, the progress of the Sun Health proposed sign, and an inquiry received regarding new development in Monument Point.

Ms. Maslowski reported on a letter received at City Hall addressed to the Design Review Board. She reviewed the points in the letter regarding a property within the City and stated that she believes there was some confusion in that some residents thought this address was on the agenda tonight because it is similar to another address on tonight's agenda. She noted that she will report the issues noted in the letter to the Code Enforcement Officer.

V. Boardmembers' Report on Current Events

There were no reports.

VI. Adjournment

Boardmember Dudley **moved** to adjourn the meeting; Chair Charnetsky **seconded; unanimous approval.**
The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

**APPROVED:
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Susan Charnetsky, Chair

/pjm