



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, August 17, 2021
Virtual Meeting**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 6:36 pm when a quorum was established with six members present: Ms. Sara Bachman- Williams, Mr. John Burr, Mr. Glenn Fournier, Ms. Helen Erickson, Ms. Martha McClements. Mr. Tom Beal joined the meeting at 7:15 pm. Members absent: Mr. Maurice Roberts.
COT staff: Mr. Michael Taku, moderator; Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO (6:39 pm, 7:15 to 7:17pm).
Guests: Mr. Ken Taylor, IT for APHZAB.

2. Approval of Minutes—July 27, 2021

The LAR/ Minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. Ms. Bachman- Williams made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed.

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

The Board discussed the frustrations with the apparent stalling of the process and where now to go from here. After lengthy discussion several important points were clarified.

- 1) A process with a revised flowchart that reflected input from various reviewers was put into place in June 2020 for Version 5.1. That revision is ongoing. Ms. BachmanWilliams offered to help work on sections at a time with Mr. Taylor.
- 2) Mr. Taylor has made a refined version of the Version 5.1 Guidelines available to the public at his website: historicarmorypark.net. This version was approved by APHZAB and reflects it thinking on guidance. However, it is not a binding or approved guidelines revision and is not currently a part of the UDC or applicable codes.
- 3) Mr. Taku provided input on a M&C approved text amendment (from 2016) that could be adopted by APHZAB at a future meeting where the approval would be on the agenda. If approved, it would at least allow for the Board to consider, on a case

by case basis, possible alternative materials such as clad wood for replacement windows. WUHZAB approved the text amendment but the other HPZ boards did not, including Armory Park, previously.

- 4) After further discussion, it became apparent that the Board could revise the 1990's fold-out fact pages as a document to share with residents (and staff), with revisions that reflect changes in guidance developed/approved in Version 5. This page would be available on the Historic Preservation section of the COT/ PDS website and could be used without further (PRS) review. (HPO guidance and approval would be needed.)
- 5) The ongoing agenda item on both the APHZAB and PRS meetings should be removed and only on the agenda of either, if further discussion or review was needed at a specific meeting. Since both BHHZAB and WUHZAB are also in the process of revising their guidelines, but not generally on the agenda of PRS meetings, this needs to be changed.

Conclusions

- 1) the Text Amendment and relative documents will be forwarded by Mr. Taku to the Board and the item will be on the next scheduled meeting agenda for consideration and approval.
- 2) Ms. Bachman-Williams and Mr. Taylor will work on a draft of a revised pamphlet for discussion and review in the coming few months. Hopefully this process can be completed this year.
- 3) Ms. Bachman Williams, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Burr and others will work to update and forward for review to the Board individual sections at a time for Version 5.1 along the flow-chart plan so a Version 6 can then be forwarded to PRS for further review. Other possible revisions that should be considered will be integration of guidance for ADU's and the transition of T-PCHC into two distinct entities. The timeline for this process is yet undefined.
- 4) Mr. Taku will remove the standing item from both agendas (PRS and APHZAB) and will only put them on as necessary or requested.

Note: Mr. Beal joined the discussion at 7:15pm. Ms. McClements left the meeting 7:18- 7:22pm.

5. Call to the Board

The previous item brought up a discussion about the transition of the T-PCHC to two separate boards under each Certified Local Government (CLG): City of Tucson HC and Pima County HC. That process, requested by SHPO in 2016 is now in process and expected to be completed early next year. What those two distinct entities will be is yet to be determined. It was noted that it could be difficult to "people" those two entities because of an overlap and limitations on qualified candidates.

The discussion then focused on implications for the HPZ boards. It was noted that they were different conversations and that because the HPZ boards are created by M&C and specifically serve the COT, and are part of the UDC, any process to change or decommission those boards would be a lengthy and involved a public process that is not anticipated at this time.

Ms. Erickson provided a brief update on the I-11 discussion. Ms. McClements had previously provided information to the neighborhood on the possibilities for comments on the draft, whose deadline was August 16. Both M&C and the PC Commissioners have taken stands against an Avra Valley alternate route, so the discussion may revolve around changes to the alignment and design of the segment of I-10 that goes through Tucson. This could have immediate and severe impacts to historic communities along the corridor including Barrio Anita, El Membrillo, and South Tucson. The discussion is ongoing.

Other board updates:

Mr. Burr noted that the Planning Commission Public Hearing on ADU's has been continued to September 9. M&C will again hold a Public Hearing in September for the portion of the Sunshine Mile District south of Broadway.

Ms. Erickson noted that M&C had initiated Historic Landmark status for Campus Farms.

Ms. McClements noted that Mr. Lundgren, who's plans were reviewed here in July, pulled his proposal at the PRS meeting and will be coming back to us with a new plan in the future.

6. Future Agenda Items-Information Only

Mr. Taku noted that several projects are slated for the near future—some for full review and others possibly for minor reviews:

- 1) 133 E. 17th St. a new ramada and wall—full review
- 2) 733 South Stone —full review
- 3) 725 South 6th Ave. —full review
- 4) 624 East 16th Street one window—minor/ multiple windows—full review
- 5) 125 E 16th Street—awnings/ fence—minor review
- 6) 811 South 4th Avenue—multiple changes to approved designs

Mr. Taku also noted that an ongoing discussion is now happening at PRS about cumulative small changes that can create over time significant impacts to historic properties. Where the fine line between maintenance and changes requiring review is being discussed.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was officially adjourned at 7:32 pm.