



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, March 16, 2021 at 6:30PM
Virtual Meeting**

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 6:33 pm. A quorum was established with 5 members of the board present: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Pat O'Brien, and Mr. Maurice Roberts. Members absent: Mr. Tom Beal, Ms. Helen Erickson, Mr. Glenn Furnier.

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO, moderator. IT: Mr. Ken Taylor.

Guests: Mr. Michael Becherer, Swaim Associates; Ms. Hillary Van Alsborg, Exec. Dir. TCM; Mr. Thomas Saylor-Brown, TCM board (item 4a); Mr. Alex Lee, owner/developer; Mr. Gabriel Vargas, GGV Designs (item 4b); Ms. Diana Amado, Ward VI office; Mr. Robert Erbe, Ms. Jan Mulder, and Ms. Sue Ellen Schuerman—AP residents.

2. Approval of Minutes —February 16, 2021

The LAR/ Minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. Mr. Roberts made a motion to approve the LAR/ Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. O'Brien. The motion was approved by 5 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

3. Call to the audience

Ms. Brown noted that she had received 14 written comments from the public and read those complete comments into the public record. One comment (Mr. Steve Grede) was a concern about the site plan on HPZ-20-052 (Item 4b). The other 13 comments were regarding HPZ 21-008 (Item 4a). All were in opposition to the proposed fence at the Tucson Children's Museum. Those comments were made by Ms. Amanda Maass, Ms. Betts Putnam-Hidalgo, Ms. Sue Ellen Schuerman (2), Ms. Elizabeth Garber, Ms. Denise Grenier, Mr. Kevin Bond, Ms. Mary DeCamp, Mr. Robert Erbe, Ms. Sloane Haywood, Mr. Stephen Bess, Mr. Liam (Bill) Duffy, and Ms. Helen Erickson (board member- absent). Though varied, the primary concerns were the enclosure and privatization of longstanding public space, a reduction of the already limited public green space in the downtown area, and inappropriate/ incompatible design to both the historic building and historic designed landscape.

4. Reviews

a. HPZ 21-008, 200 N 6th Avenue

New fence enclosure on the south side of the property.
Full Review/Contributing Property

Mr. Becherer, representing the Tucson Children's Museum (TCM), presented the revised project. (See 9-15-20 APHZAB LAR for reference.) Mr. Becherer noted the comments from the public and wished to clarify that the proposed fence is more about creating a secure outside area for the children in relation to the museum's intended programming needs rather than being exclusively a response to the current pandemic; and also, that the museum had no further plans to "take over the block". He then presented an aerial view, simplified site plan, and a perspective rendering of the fence. The revision includes a simplification of the geometry of the fence (trapezoidal to rectangular), a reduction in the

area enclosed and the removal of the masonry base wall element to the fence design thus reducing its impact to the site. Mr. Becherer noted the simplified post-hole design makes the fence “technically reversible”. The site plan is approximate and will be verified on site during construction to ensure no impacts to the existing trees or irrigation systems. It’s anticipated that the western gate will be larger to aid in maintenance. However, the fence height and ironwork design still match the existing front fence from 2008 rather than a simplification of design or scale. It was clarified after questions from the Board that the fence will be approximately 9’ high and would probably enclose an area of about 72’ by 64’ and encompass about 4600 ft. sq. and that the concrete post holes will be 8” by 30” at each of the likely (+/-) 27 post locations. (The site plan has no dimensional notations). Mr. Becherer finally noted that the TCM has a long-term lease on the entire site and believes it gives TCM the option for expansion. Ms. Van Alsborg clarified that the goal was an extension of low impact programmed space and that she believed the current enclosed area was insufficient for their intended program extensions and expected on-going social distancing and outdoor use requirements.

The Board had a number of concerns about the revised proposal. Most of the Board were still very concerned about the prospect of essentially privatizing what has been open public space for 121 years, since the original development and construction of the site. It was again noted that the park- like space around the building of the Carnegie Block had been designed to complement and complete the adjoining Armory Park, according to Beaux-Arts principles. The revised design is still not balanced and symmetrical and changes the spatial relationships of the building to the site and its circulation, unlike all previous expansions (including the 1960-61 Arthur Brown additions). It was also noted that the current front fence (2008) was a compromise replacement of a solid masonry wall that had blocked public views of the historic building, but was not an ideal design vocabulary to replicate. Concerns were also raised about the practicality of maintaining the grass and trees (two of which were planted in 1901) within the enclosure without adequate access for maintenance equipment. Ms. Van Alsborg currently intends on retaining the historic trees and the grass within the enclosure and has no current plans for shade structures or other enclosure improvements. The budget is anticipated to be about \$32K and although technically “reversible”, it would in practice be a permanent extension to the museum.

The question of why a smaller removable fence used only during museum hours was again raised. The team answered in that it was an impractical solution for the museum staff, and that one of the reasons for the enclosure was to reduce the possibilities of hazardous materials left behind by other public users and the homeless population in the area. Another topic of discussion was the suggestion that relocating the fence proposal to the north would impact the historic district less because it faces the business district (and TEP) rather than the historic buildings on 13th St. While it would not address the balance and symmetry problem of the proposal, it would be a reduced impact site for the public and neighborhood. Mr. Becherer and Ms. Van Alsborg thought this could be a workable solution if that was the recommendation. The Chair noted that the project was to be reviewed by the Historic Landscape Subcommittee of the T-PCHC on 3-19-21 and asked if a continuance to after that review should be made. Both Mr. Becherer and Ms. Alsborg preferred a definitive finding rather than a continuance if the outcome was likely the same.

Action taken: The Board recommends denial of the project as presented for the following reasons: 1) It encloses formerly public space for private use; 2) A non-symmetrical design is incompatible with the design characteristics of the historic building and site; and 3) The project design proposal is incomplete in that it is not dimensioned or finalized in size, design, placement, access, nor address landscape maintenance. Motion made by Mr. Burr and seconded by Mr. Roberts. Five votes in favor, 0 opposed.

b. HPZ 20-052, 419 S 5th Avenue (continued) (DP20-0046)

Remodel primary structure to accommodate four 2-bedroom units, install perimeter fence at rear to accommodate parking, install ADA ramp.
Full Review/Contributing Resources

Mr. Vargas (with Mr. Lee) presented the project as revised. (See 9-15-20 APHZAB LAR for reference). He briefly recapped that the plan is to turn the property into a four-plex, each with two-bedroom, 2-bathroom units. They wish to clean up and remove all exterior service elements but retain/restore the exterior masonry walls and windows, recreate a matching window /opening (with matching historic

bricks) and re-landscape the entire site, add a new parking area at the rear with a new masonry wall and gate, reopen the rear porch and add a ramp.

The changes reflected in the revised plans now include retaining the existing north fence (and fence-line) and removing the walled enclosures on the front bike rack areas. The elevations were revised to reflect some of the chimneys, a simplified landscaping plan page was added as were interior demolition plans, new floor/ framing plans, and mechanical and plumbing plans. Landscaping plans now include complete removal of all existing west side landscaping (except a relocated Barrel cactus and Agave), replacing them with four new Texas Rangers, rebuild of the brick pathways for accessibility (note: actual siting is reversed from that shown on the plan), retention of the concrete forecourt (possibly historic), possibly use of fake grass, and the addition of some new trees and shrubs adjacent to the parking area on the east. An exterior wood ramp on the east would allow for ADA access to one of the rear units. New exterior HVAC units and new 400-amp electric would include underground utility work.

After some discussion, however, it was determined that the most current revised plans, including a revised and dimensioned site plan were not included in the presented package available to the board. Some of the revisions were merely cross-outs of some existing parts on the previous pages. The Board asked for number of clarifications and had some continuing concerns about the project, noting that the elevations were still incomplete and generally not dimensioned.

The site plan has not been revised to show how the proposal will work within the current fence-line, (or what will happen north of that fence line). The specifications for the exterior HVAC units do not appear to be able to fit in the proposed space(35" x 35" x 33" condenser units on 42" sq. pads requiring an additional 30" minimum clearance in an area of 38"). There are still no ramp plans to review.

There is still not a formal plan for the proposed porch railings. As mentioned previously, the door elevations on the east do not conform to the existing doors (2modern single-light doors and two older 3-panel, single light, probably interior doors used within the porch enclosures, now to be removed. A door schedule hasnot been provided. The plans for both refurbishment and replacement of non-compatible elements and removal of a door in the rear dormer structure to be replaced with an unspecified vent are still incomplete. The 24' proposed gate, withbaffle, does not appear to be able to fully open adjacent to the new shorter fence. Although a cross section is provided, no elevations of the fence from the rear are included, nor are specifications for the metal panels of the gate. The landscaping plan is problematic. It is unclear from the presented plan how many trees and shrubs are to be used on the east side, and whether the required 3' spacing from the newly exposed historic adobe wall (adjoining property) will be maintained. On the west side, the plan is even more incomplete. The previous plan suggested the removal of the oleanders (12), with some minor clean-up, but now 3 major trees (Eucalyptus and Weeping Acacia) are to be removed and all the existing, established desert landscaping (which includes Boxwood, Ruella, Pittosporum, Xylosma, Chuparosa, Honeysuckle, and 10 established Texas Rangers) are to beclear cut and replaced with 4 new small Texas Rangers and possibly some fake grass. The existing street trees (native Mesquites) are not addressed and the proposed 1" sleeve for a possible drip line is inadequate for distance and capacity as shown on the plans.

Although not generally the Board's purview, the interior demolition and revised floor plans caused further concerns, as well. The probable existing ceiling rafter configuration will likely not be sound for the complete proposed removal of all structural interior walls (except the central brick wall). The interior chimney blocks supporting the roof-top chimneys will not allow for the framing configurations and door locations shown. It appears that many of the windows will be blocked up inside with 7' pony walls for the shower enclosures. The two front primary windows (3'6" x 8') will allow for views of toilets and sinks from the front doors and streetscape. The primary rooms have no natural light from windows. It is unclear how fire code issues with the HVAC systems in the attic with closed up access/ egress points will be addressed. The interior doorways and kitchen configurations do not allow for minimum handicap accessibility requirements.

Conceptually the Board is still pleased with Mr. Lee's intentions for the property and his overall concept. However, the design iteration presented was still unresolved and incomplete for review. Mr.

Lee and Mr. Vargas acknowledged that there were considerable issues not addressed and requested that a continuance be made and specific requests from the Board be included in our recommendations.

The Board requests the following items for the next review:

—A revised site plan that shows development plans within the existing fence lines (now apparently to be retained) that is dimensioned and shows actual clearances for the proposed paths, accessibility, and revised exterior plans for actual, and reasonable exterior HVAC installations.

—A door schedule with retained (non-original) doors and proposed replacements.

—A window and screen plan for replicated elements and new screens, including materials and locations (refer to interior blocked windows).

—Plans for the repair, restoration, door removal, replacement materials and vent plans for the rear dormer.

—A revised plan for the landscaping that ensures retention and maintenance of the street-trees, non-encroachment on the adobe wall, landscaping and privacy screening for both residents and adjoining streetscape compatibility with adequate irrigation metrics.

—Revised bicycle parking plans, including bike rack design, locations and reasonable screening (possibly vegetation) that retains visibility of the historic structure from the right of way.

—Rear wall and gate elevations, materials and specifications for actual use and clearance.

—Plans for the proposed rear porch railings and ramp.

—Revised elevations showing actual existing chimneys, and planned new roof-top appurtenances (ventilation, exhaust ducts, etc.)

—Other items mentioned that may be helpful for review. A review of the prior recommendations from the 9-15-20 APHZAB LAR should be considered.

Action Taken: The Board recommends a continuance for the project at the request of the developer and to provide the above specified items for the final review.

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Ms. McClements started the discussion by noting the draft versions made by Ken Taylor of the specific highlights (10 pages vs. 38+ pages) gleaned from the larger draft document. Mr. Taylor noted that this was the basic list from which the board should identify specific changes we should include to a scaled down revision that could be incorporated in the TSM manual section 9-02.7. The Board discussed both the need to simplify revisions and other changes within current review process that should be addressed. The Board vowed to get specific comments and suggestions to the chair as the process moves forward to refine the next draft. Updates are expected at future meetings.

6. Minor Review Update

a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews provided

Ms. McClements updated the Board on the single minor review she conducted with Mr. Taku and Ms. Mulder for a wrought iron replacement fence (of a wood fence) for a property on the east side of the 500 block of S. 4th Avenue. No other minor reviews are scheduled currently. There are some possible zoning violation cases (lack of review) staff are looking into.

7. Call to the Board

Mr. Burr again reminded the Board that the Historic Landscape Subcommittee of the T-PC Historic Commission will also review the Children's Museum fence proposal at the March 19, 2021 meeting and encouraged members to join the meeting. No other Board business was reported.

8. Future Agenda Items - Information Only

Ms. Brown said she did not anticipate any specific items for the next scheduled meeting in April but would let us

know. She did note that several items in other upcoming PDSD meetings may be of interest to the board. PRS will likely do a courtesy review of the latest iteration of the 75 E. Broadway project now that it is again projected to be 19 stories. She also mentioned that a process for allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) in most zoning is moving forward within PDSD. Stakeholder meetings are ongoing this spring. She does not anticipate it will significantly change review standards in HPZ's. She noted that ADU's are historically part of older districts in the city. And finally, she clarified that HPZ's do still specifically review new 5G locations within the neighborhood, unlike most other areas.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

The next regularly scheduled APHZAB meeting is April 20, 2021