



APHZAB  
P.O. Box 27210  
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210  
(520) 791-4213 (Voice)  
(520) 791-2639 (TDD)  
(520) 791-4017 (FAX)

**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board  
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, February 16, 2021 at 6:30PM  
Virtual Meeting**

**AGENDA**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm. A quorum was established with seven members of the board present: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Mr. Glenn Furnier, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Pat O'Brien, and Mr. Maurice Roberts. Members absent: Ms. Helen Erickson (excused).  
COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO, moderator. IT: Mr. Ken Taylor.  
Guests: Mr. Jack McLain, property owner; Mr. Leo Katz, architect; AP resident: Ms. Jan Mulder.

**2. Approval of Minutes —September 15 and November 10, 2020**

The LAR/Minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. Mr. Beal made a motion to approve the LAR/Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion was approved by 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

**3. Call to the audience**

No comments were made prior to the meeting.

**4. Reviews**

- a. **HPZ 20-086, 634 S. 5th Avenue (T20CM08630)**  
**Remove existing double hung windows, enlarge opening and install French doors.**  
**Full Review/ Contributing Property**

Mr. Leo Katz, architect, presented the project as on behalf of the owner, Mr. Jack McLain. The project proposes to replace one pair set of double hung windows (within a single opening) on the north facade with a custom set of wood French doors within the existing opening and header, by removing the sill and lower brick courses below the opening to floor level, with a new threshold. Mr. Katz showed the Development Zone map, photos of the existing elevations, the site plan and elevations, and the enlarged elevation of the proposed changes. Mr. Katz also showed additional photos of the specific window that clearly show previous replacement brickwork for a former door opening that was closed up to create the current window opening configuration. The building also already has a set of original design (though replaced) French doors on the east facade. It was also established that little if any original exterior woodwork, doors or windows exist on the building.

Discussion ensued. It was noted that the location of the proposed change was quite distant from the street-front, was substantially screened by extant railings and would be generally unnoticeable from the public view. It was established that historic French doors are part of building, and evident in the development zone. The proposed French doors would be similar to the existing French doors on the east facade, being all wood, single light, though scaled to fit the wider opening. The new doors will provide access from the building to the only useable outdoor space on the site. Further discussion established the previous history, damage to, and rehabilitation of the structure over the last two decades. Generally, no Board members had any concerns about the proposed project as presented.

**Action Taken:** The Board recommends approval of the project as presented, (noting the French doors shall be all wood single-light doors). Motion made by Mr. Beal and seconded by Mr. Roberts. The friendly amendment to the motion to specify “wood” doors, made by Mr. Burr was accepted by the motion maker and second. Seven votes in favor, 0 opposed.

## 5. Design Guidelines Project

### a. Update on the design guidelines

Ms. McClements updated the board on where the Design Guidelines process is currently. She outlined the history of the project, and the impediments that have happened along the way. She expressed an interest in paring down the proposed changes that the City will review/approve to “achievable goals”. She proposed that we perhaps should merely update the existing guidelines by adding perhaps 10 changes to the standards and by updating the older APHZAB trifold guidance page but using the current effort (40+/-page revisions) as an APHZAB publication for reference only. She then asked the Board, HPO and IT for their thoughts.

Discussion ensued. Several members were unsure if the existing process would ever lead to an approvable document of the scope currently envisioned, considering the fine tuning that has so far taken place. An approved “Flow Chart” discussed last year would simplify and streamline the current document. Some revisions to the current draft (version 5) will still need to be made based on guidance, even if it is only a supplemental reference document. The older trifold document would be fairly easy to update, with some new information added (i.e. possibility of revised guidance on materials for windows and doors, on a case-to-case basis, or stressing repair vs. replacement). It was noted that the trifold document was available on the COT website, but under “Historic Preservation”, but not linked to the codes. After further discussion, it became apparent that the easiest route to some changes being adopted would be adding a few additional items to the Technical Standards Manual (TSM), section specific to Armory Park (TSM 9-02.7.2) Ms. Brown suggested this might be a fairly achievable goal, that the revisions should be succinct, noting that changes to the permitting process as it moves forward to a wholly online process will further make the original revised document somewhat obsolete. It was noted that the existing TSM 9-02.7.2 should be largely retained and revised/expanded rather than replaced.

One item of discussion—the accessibility of the guidance/codes to the average homeowner lead to a conversation about what could be done to improve communication between the COT, the Board, and area homeowners, especially recent ones. It was asked if we could have a live portion of the call to the audience during meetings, much like M&C do. It is not a part of the current City Clerk guidance on public meetings, but Ms. Brown will ask. It was noted that the APHZAB public meetings were advertised and made available to area residents via the neighborhood list-serve. A possible solution might be to add contact information for the APHZAB chair on agendas, in addition to the HPO contact info. Also, a sample packet (as long as it contains no copyrighted materials) of what would be needed for a review could be created for residents as a concurrent new project.

In conclusion, Ms. McClements requested each board member send her 5-10 specific changes they would like to see considered as bullet point items to be added to the TSM before the next meeting. We will again take up the issue at the next meeting. Ms. Brown said she would provide updates at the next meeting.

## 6. Minor Review Update

### a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews provided

No minor reviews of note have happened over the last few months (besides simple ones) but Ms. McClement expects to be scheduled for a window review in the next few weeks. The Board again mentioned an outstanding case of a project that does not appear to be following its approved design/construction plan. Staff will continue to look into it.

## 7. Call to the Board

Several members discussed opinions on the current state of affairs. A brief update on the ongoing construction of 5 Points projects was mentioned. No updates regarding current City or Board business were made.

**8. Future Agenda Items - Information Only**

Ms. Brown said although several projects have been discussed, she is unsure which, if any, may be ready for the next scheduled meeting. She will provide updates as they come in.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 pm.

*The next regularly scheduled APHZAB meeting is March 16, 2021*