



WRITTEN COMMENTS

6

This card is used to submit written comments to the Board or Commission.
Written comment cards may be submitted to the Staff at any time. Cards submitted after public testimony has begun will be provided to the Board or Commission at the conclusion of the testimony for that item.

NAME (print) Colleen Klapac MEETING DATE 1-2-20

NAME OF GROUP/ORGANIZATION (if applicable) VM3

ADDRESS 4810 N 78 ST ZIP 85251

HOME PHONE 480-219-3227 WORK PHONE _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS(optional) das3fre@cox.net

AGENDA ITEM # _____ ☐ SUPPORT ☐ OPPOSE

COMMENTS (additional space is provided on the back) _____

See attached. I am submitting the attached
which is in draft form + not complete. Final
version to follow. Submitting draft for to give
the AP Commissioners + staff more time to start preparing
for Feb 2020 meeting

This card constitutes a public record under Arizona law.

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Meeting of September 05, 2019

Review of Draft Villa Monterey Historic Preservation Plan and Design Guidelines, Chapter 3, 5, and 5

Chapter 3

p. 25. 3.B.1.b. **DELETE**

“Maintain mixture of tall palm trees and mid-size shade trees in median landscape and in landscaping for common area.”

p. 26. 3.C.1.d **DELETE**

“and maintain any tile or concrete block detailing”.

p. 26. 3.C.2.a. **DELETE**

“and should be subordinate in scale and character to the original building.”

p. 26. 3.C.2.b. **DELETE**

“in height similar to the other buildings in the development.”

p. 26. 3.C.2.d. **DELETE**

“keeping the total lot coverage a small percentage of the common tract, similar to the original common tract buildings.”

p.26. 3.C.3.a. **DELETE In Entirety !!!**

p.26. 3.C.3.b. **DELETE In Entirety !!!**

Chapter 4

p. 38.4.A.1.a. **DELETE In Entirety**

p. 38.4.A.1.b. **CHANGE**

From - “...rehabilitation of the original roof form will help tp preserve the architectural style.:

To -”preservation of the original roof form is recommended but not required. HOA approval is required.”

(NOTE: not HPC)

p. 38. 4.A.2.a. **DELETE In Entirety**

p. 38. 4.A.2.b. **CHANGE part and DELETE part**

From - “..avoid changes in the original surface textures and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details.”

To - “use similar or complimentary materials and textures”

Delete - “and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details.”

p. 38. 4.A.2.c. **DELETE In Entirety**

p. 38. 4.A.3.,a.. **DELETE In Entirety**

Chapter 5

p. 39. Ch.5. Intro

paragraph 2, line 7 (last line) **CHARGE**

"...will be subject to design review by the respective HOA and the HPO"

From - "and the HPO"

To - "and some may be subject to the HPO design review"

p. 39. 5.A.1.b. CHANGE

From - "like:

To - :like or compatible to"

p. 40. 5.B.1.a., b.,c.,d.,e.,f. DELETE ALL GUIDELINS !

p. 41 Carports

p.41.5.C.1. DELETE and ADD

Delete all Guidelines a. b. c. !!!

Add - "The conversion of a carport to garage will require HOA approval and City Codes and Ordinances Approval"

(Note: Not HPC)

p. 42. 5.D.1. a. ADD or DELETE

"to the extent that is practical"

p. 42. 5.D.1. b. ADD or DELETE

"to the extent that is practical"

p. 42. 5.D.1. c. DELETE

"Do not remove paint from historic painted concrete block."

p. 42. 5.D.1. d. DELETE

"Do not paint decorative tile, concrete slump block, and brick."

p. 42. 5.D.1. f. DELETE

"stucco"

p.42. 5.D.2.a. ADD or delete in entirety

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.2.b. ADD or delete in entirety

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.2.c. ADD or delete in entirety

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.3.a. ADD or delete in entirety

"as are available or practical"

p.42. 5.D.3.b. ADD or delete in entirety

"as are available or practical"

Colleen Klapac,
Villa Monterey Unit 3, Board Director
4810 N 78 Street
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

January 01, 2020

Blair Schweiger, Commissioner & Chair
Ben Brosseau, Commissioner
Regina Buzzello, Commissioner
Linda Davis, Commissioner
Melissa Fedock, Commissioner
Peter Hosmer, Commissioner
Christie Lee Kinchen, Commissioner
Steve Venker, Staff Representative
Doris McClay, Staff Representative

3939 N. Drinkwater Blvd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Notes:
1) This is a DRAFT submission
+ incomplete
2) This does not include the information
requested for Chapter 5 and on
which will be submitted later. CK

Subject: Submission for the 01-02-20 Historic Preservation Commission Agenda

Reference: "Villa Monterey Units 1-7 Historic District Historic Preservation Plan and Guidelines" and Related Subjects

Dear Historic Preservation Commissioners and Staff,

During the December 06, 2019 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting, the Commissioners reviewed some of the comments and requests presented by the various VM 1 - 7 communities in Chapters 1 - 3 of the Guidelines. Commissioners requested that many of the requests be expanded upon. Thereupon I am submitting additional information to support numerous of the previously submitted requests as follows. I would be happy to expand and submit additional information as needed to resolve these issues in a more reasonable acceptable way to VM3 upon request. Further, please note that the requests that made it to the written document by the HP Officer absolutely do NOT include all of our requests, our comments, and our concerns.

I have expanded upon my previous submission of September 05, 2019 below. In this expansion I have also 1) quoted text of the specific section(s) of the Guidelines referred to in order to make it less cumbersome for you to read and follow, and 2) added the comments which were added by Mr. Venker.

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) Meeting of September 05, 2019

Review of Draft Villa Monterey Historic Preservation Plan and Design Guidelines, Chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 3

p. 25. 3.B.1.b. **DELETE**

"Maintain mixture of tall palm trees and mid-size shade trees in median landscape and in landscaping for common area."

Continued

b. Maintain mixture of tall palm trees and mid-size shade trees in median landscaping and in landscaping for common areas. (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted so that each HOA could determine landscaping.) (November 2019) c. Maintain the mid-block walkways in their present.

Reasons:

1. The common area is walled-in and **private**. It is like the back yard of an individual home, the back yard for the community and not the 'back yard' to be used or seen by the public.
2. Each HOA should have the exclusive authority for maintenance and changes that are not primarily in the view of the public.
3. See Footnote Number 1 below.
4. Neither HP nor the City of Scottsdale should have the over-reach to monitor, require, an/or penalize the homeowners for this section.

p. 26. 3.C.1.d **DELETE**

"and maintain any tile or concrete block detailing".

d. Maintain the block fences and ornamental metal gates that surround the common facilities for safety and privacy, and maintain any tile or concrete block detailing. (There was a public comment that "...maintain any tile or concrete block detailing." portion of this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. It does not need to be stated that gates and walls need to be maintained for safety. By law they are required for all pools.
2. Concrete block and tile (on the outside of the common area which is visible to the public) has been maintained as long as it has been practical. This also does not need to be stated. If for some reason the City of Scottsdale including the City Council, Mayor, and City Manager will not concede deleting this and similar text in this document, then at minimum a statement here and throughout the Guidelines should include at statement such as 'where and when it is practical'.
3. See Footnote Number 1 below.

p. 26. 3.C.2.a. **DELETE**

"and should be subordinate in scale and character to the original building."

a. Relate to the scale of nearby historic buildings. An addition should be subordinate in scale and character to the original main building. (There was a public comment that the second sentence of this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. The first sentence is adequate. "Relate to the scale of nearby historic buildings."
2. Keep the Guidelines simple, readable, and efficient. Do not use any extra or unnecessary text.

Continued

p. 26. 3.C.2.b. **DELETE**

“in height similar to the other buildings in the development.”

b. Additions and new construction should be one- or two story in height similar to the other buildings in the development adjacent to the community facilities. (Commissioner Hosmer suggested the revision noted above.) (Revised September 2019) (There was a public comment that “...in height similar to the other buildings in the development.” portion of this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. Redundant. See p.26.3.C.2.a. above “Relate to the scale of nearby historic buildings.” This sentence is adequate.
2. Keep the Guidelines simple, readable, and efficient. Do not use any extra or unnecessary text.

p. 26. 3.C.2.d. **DELETE**

“...keeping the total lot coverage a small percentage of the common tract, similar to the original common tract buildings.”

d. Relate new construction to the size of the lot, keeping the total lot coverage a small percentage of the common tract, similar to the original common tract buildings. (There was a public comment that “...keeping the total lot coverage a small percentage of the common tract, similar to the original common tract buildings.” portion of this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. This section begins “If any additions or new community facilities are planned,...” So, first it is not clear if d. relates to additions or new community facilities. It ‘seems’ it applies to new community facilities. ?? Nevertheless, neither townhomes nor community facilities currently engulf what is referred to as “a small percentage of the common tract”.
2. The common area is walled in and private. It is like the back yard of an individual home, the back yard for the community and not the ‘back yard’ to be used or seen by the public.
3. Each HOA should have the exclusive authority for changes in those areas that are not primarily in public view.

p.26. 3.C.3.a. **DELETE In Entirety !!!**

- a. Retain the basic landscape characteristics within the recreational areas for residents including using grass as the primary ground cover, planting palms and other trees, and providing walkways and pool decking. (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. This section begins “Preserve the lush oasis/resort-style landscaping within the fenced-in community areas for use by residents of each Unit.” The common area is walled in and private. It is like the back yard of an individual home, the back yard for the community and not the ‘back yard’ to be used or seen by the public.

Continued

2. Each HOA should have the exclusive authority for maintenance and changes that are not primarily in the view of the public.
3. See Footnote Number 1 below.
4. Neither HP nor the City of Scottsdale should have the over-reach to monitor, require, an/or penalize the homeowners for this section.

p.26. 3.C.3.b. **DELETE In Entirety !!!**

b. If landscaped areas around the clubhouses and pools are renovated, the new landscaping should be designed as a green oasis in the resort-style as originally envisioned. (There was a public comment to define the term “green oasis”. An oasis is literally a fertile location in the desert, and it can also describe a peaceful area. We are fortunate that the Sonoran Desert is a lush desert with a wide variety of plants, both native and desert-adapted, that can be used to create an oasis. A sales brochure for Villa Monterey Casita Colony suggested that owners could “...entertain in Casita Colony’s Resort Park. Enjoy protected privacy in this beautifully landscaped resort area...”. Resort style landscaping can be accomplished with both native and desert-adapted plants.) (Revised September 2019) (There was a public comment that the term “lush resort style landscaping” was inappropriate and should be revised to allow xeriscape style landscape improvements. As indicated above, the Sonoran Desert established, supplemental irrigation can be turned off and the desire for xeriscape style landscaping will be fulfilled. (October 2019) (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. This section begins “Preserve the lush oasis/resort-style landscaping within the fenced-in community areas for use by residents of each Unit.”
The common area is walled in and **private**. It is like the back yard of an individual home, the back yard for the community and not the ‘back yard’ to be used or seen by the public.
2. Each HOA should have the exclusive authority for maintenance and changes that are not primarily in the view of the public.
3. See Footnote Number 1 below.
4. Neither HP nor the City of Scottsdale should have the over-reach to monitor, require, an/or penalize the homeowners for this section.

Chapter 4

p. 38.4.A.1.a. **DELETE In Entirety**

Avoid changes in the type of roof of an individual townhouse by maintaining the roof form and slope. (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. The vast majority of the roofs are NOT seen by the public. A small portion of the townhouses have only a small portion of their roof surfaces seen by the public. It should be the sole responsibility of each homeowner to determine what materials are appropriate for their roofs, and not be the intent of HP or the City of Scottsdale to determine what materials are the most appropriate for roofs.
2. Any portion of a roof that is visible to the public should be reviewed and approved by each HOA exclusively, not HP or the City of Scottsdale.
3. Not penalties by HP or the City of Scottsdale should apply to this section.

Continued

p. 38.4.A.1.b. **CHANGE**

From - "...rehabilitation of the original roof form will help to preserve the architectural style.:

To - "....."preservation of the original roof form is recommended but not required. HOA approval is required."

(NOTE: not HPC)

Reasons:

1. The vast majority of the roofs are NOT seen by the public. A small portion of the townhouses have only a small portion of their roof surfaces seen by the public. It should be the sole responsibility of each homeowner to determine what materials are appropriate for their roofs, and not be the intent of HP or the City of Scottsdale to determine what materials are the most appropriate for roofs.
2. Any portion of a roof that is visible to the public should be reviewed and approved by each HOA exclusively, not HP or the City of Scottsdale.
3. Not penalties by HP or the City of Scottsdale should apply to this section.
4. See page 6 Reason 2 and 3.

p. 38. 4.A.2.a. **DELETE In Entirety**

a. If new window coverings, such as security grills or cloth awnings, are proposed, then select materials and types of coverings that have been used on similar style townhouses and that look appropriate for the overall façade. If security grills are added to the front windows of a townhouse then they must have a quick-release device so that the window may be used for emergency exit purposes. (The guideline about the quick-release device was suggested by Commissioner Hosmer.) (Revised September 2019) (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

p. 38. 4.A.2.b. **CHANGE part and DELETE part**

From - "...avoid changes in the original surface textures and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details."

To - "use similar or complimentary materials and textures"

Delete - "and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details."

b. If a stucco home is to be repaired or receive a new coat of stucco, then use a similar or complementary surface texture in order to avoid changes in the original surface texture and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details. (There was a public comment to revise guideline above as noted in bold-face type and that the last phrase "...and avoid heavy applications that obscure original details." should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons: Statement above should be self explanatory. If not, please contact me.

p. 38. 4.A.2.c. **DELETE In Entirety**

Reason: It appears this section was deleted from the Guidelines. If so, it is resolved.

p. 38. 4.A.3..a.. **DELETE In Entirety**

Policy 4.A.3: Retain original characteristic features of an identifiable architectural style on the front façade and avoid adding features that are not in character with the style of the home. Guidelines:

Continued

- a. While these guidelines are not intended to include a style manual for all the architectural styles represented in Villa Monterey façades, the general guideline is to avoid mixing styles or elements from different architectural styles on the front façade of each individual townhouse. (There was a public comment that this guideline should be deleted.) (November 2019)

Reasons:

1. The previous section already states:

“Policy 4.A.2: Avoid covering, removing or altering original forms, wall materials, or ornamental details characteristic of the architectural style.”

This should be sufficient.

2. When residents have asked HP what architectural style their specific townhouse is, usually the HP office has not been able to readily tell them. When HP has been able to tell a homeowner what architectural style their specific townhouse is and the owner then further asked what the differences are between the different types of architectural style, HP has not adequately been able to tell them. While it is important that we keep the overall character of the townhouses, a detailed manual of each architectural type would have to be written and distributed by HP to each homeowner to be able to implement and oversee this statement. So, it seems that 4.A.2.c must be deleted. It also seems that the intent of 4.A.2.c. is covered in other sections of these Guidelines.
3. It should never be the intent of HP or the City of Scottsdale to provide Guidelines and be able to impose penalties for Guidelines that they develop which are not absolutely easily to understand by the homeowners. It is further inappropriate to provide guidelines and be able to impose penalties when each representative of HP is not absolutely and easily able to understand each entry in the Guidelines and to be able to comprehensively explain each entry.

Chapter 5

p. 39. Ch.5. Intro

paragraph 2, line 7 (last line) **CHARGE**

“...will be subject to design review by the respective HOA and the HPO”

From - “and the HPO”

To - “and some may be subject to the HPO design review”

p. 39. 5.A.1.b. **CHANGE**

From - “like:

To - :like or compatible to”

p. 40. 5.B.1.a., b.,c.,d.,e.,f. **DELETE ALL GUIDELINS !**

p. 41 Carports

p.41.5.C.1. **DELETE and ADD**

Delete all Guidelines a. b. c. !!!

Add - “The conversion of a carport to garage will require HOA approval and City Codes and Ordinances Approval”

(Note: Not HPC)

p. 42. 5.D.1. a. **ADD or DELETE**

“to the extent that is practical”

Continued

p. 42. 5.D.1. b. **ADD or DELETE**

"to the extent that is practical"

p. 42. 5.D.1. c. **DELETE**

"Do not remove paint from historic painted concrete block."

p. 42. 5.D.1. d. **DELETE**

"Do not paint decorative tile, concrete slump block, and brick."

p. 42. 5.D.1. f. **DELETE**

"stucco"

p.42. 5.D.2.a. **ADD or delete in entirety**

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.2.b. **ADD or delete in entirety**

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.2.c. **ADD or delete in entirety**

"to the extent that is practical"

p.42. 5.D.3.a. **ADD or delete in entirety**

"as are available or practical"

p.42. 5.D.3.b. **ADD or delete in entirety**

"as are available or practical"

Footnote 1. From Attachments 2 and 3 "Fact Sheet - Talking Points- Final Document" of 10-25-19 email from Colleen Klapac to Steve Venker, requesting this be forwarded to each HPC Commissioner for the November 7, 2019 HPC Meeting:

Historic Preservation staff or Commission only reviews property modification plans when the proposed change affect the exterior of a home, and only when a building permit is required for the work to be performed. Changes to a homes not visible from the street are considered of little consequence. There is no review of interior changes.

Thank you for your attention and help with this project.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance.

Most respectfully submitted,



Colleen Klapac VM3

phone 480-219-3227

email: das3fre@cox.net