

**ARMORY PARK HISTORIC ZONE ADVISORY BOARD**  
**Minutes of Special Meeting**  
**April 25, 2007 at 7:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Phyllis Factor, chair, John Bissell, Bonnie Brooks, Dolores Cannon, Marty Diamond, Michael Kennedy, Adam Ussishkin

**Members Absent:** Mike Hall

**Guests:** Anne and Roy Laos, project owners, Chris Anderson and Richard Fe Tom, architects with the architecture company, Marty McCune, Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Tucson, Carolyn Lenz, President of APNA, John Burr, V.P. and past president of APNA

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. Minutes of the previous meeting were not presented.

The Infill Incentive District map was shown. The property at 747 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Ave., which is under consideration, is within the infill incentive zone. The number of parking spaces for properties within the Infill Incentive District is negotiated with the property owner and the appropriate department at the City of Tucson. The placement of parking and the building height fall in the purview of the APHZAB.

Each member of the board was given the opportunity to express his or her perspective on the proposed structure. Dolores Cannon pointed out that the diagonal street parking is out of character for the neighborhood and would narrow or appear to narrow 18<sup>th</sup> St., the historic sidewalk would be removed, the building exceeded the height shown within the development zone, and the appearance was not compatible with the commercial properties to the north. Adam Ussishkin had talked to several people at the City of Tucson and had been advised by Frank Podgorski that the design was similar to the Alamo Apartments. Even though the Alamo Apartments are not in the development zone, it did give consistent rhythm to the intersection as to general appearance and height. Adam was also concerned about future reviews if this particular building was approved. Pictures of the development zone and other close properties were passed around. Marty Diamond stated that commercial property on 6<sup>th</sup> Ave./Five Points is not consistent with the remainder of the Historic District and that he felt the building was acceptable. He also said that the proposed building fit in with the look of 6<sup>th</sup> Ave., but that he didn't believe we had the authority to develop gateways or to approve buildings that exceeded the height standards. He asked how we modify or amend the rules. The concern is how this decision would set a standard for the future and under what conditions can the rules be violated. He also asked what the rules say. Marty McCune explained that we have guidelines, not rules, so there is some flexibility. Our decision can be worded to clarify that this project does not set a precedent for future development and the minutes should reflect the discussion of this point. Phyllis Factor gave an example of a previous decision where the APHZAB permitted a higher than usual wall because of truck parking on the adjacent property.

The function of incentive zones is to encourage high quality development within the zone.

Chris Anderson said that the precedent for parking was set on 19<sup>th</sup> St., one block south of the proposed development. It was immediately pointed out that the section of 19<sup>th</sup> St. cited was not in the Armory Park Historic District nor in the development zone.

Bonnie Brooks stated that it seemed the Infill Incentive District was about making exceptions when the proposed structure is appropriate to the continuity of the area. Don Coleman asked if we were voting on our opinions or the guidelines. He pointed out that the boundaries we use aren't visible and what does matter is what the eye sees when looking at the area. It was clarified to him that the zoning of the property is HC3. John Bissell suggested that we state in our motion that we are not setting a precedent. He also said that Tucson is growing to the south and will begin to get perimeter development and that we should realize that part of our responsibility is to

make the perimeter development appropriate and compatible. Phyllis is concerned with the appearance of the parking on 18<sup>th</sup> St. and the removal of the curb and sidewalk, especially since 18<sup>th</sup> St. is considerably narrower than most streets in Armory Park. She feels that back-in diagonal parking may be difficult due to the narrower street. She also objected to the removal of the two small windows in the existing historic building and expressed a desire to have the front of the building be renovated to give the appearance of a return to its original look, especially since the board had refused to allow the OK Market to change/remove similar windows. Another concern was the height of the building and the lack of set-back.

The architect said the building was set back about 4' more than the original design and that the 18<sup>th</sup> St. parking would be adjusted to meet city requirements. Mike Kennedy said he believed diagonal parking required longer parking spaces which would give the appearance of a narrower street.

Phyllis reminded Roy and Anne Laos that a public meeting had to be held with the adjacent neighbors, neighborhood associations and other interested parties to address any concerns they may have. Anne Laos said this had been done at a meeting at Carrillo School. However, the current and previous presidents of the Armory Park Neighborhood Association stated that neither of them had ever received any notice of a public meeting on this and it has never been presented to either the APNA BOD or at a general meeting of the APNA. Phyllis Factor stated that she had talked to Daniel Patterson, current president and past vice president, of the Santa Rita Neighborhood Association and he was not aware of the proposed building. It was suggested that a presentation be made at the upcoming APNA general meeting on May 15. The officers of APNA pointed out that the additional vehicles this project could bring into Armory Park could seriously impact the residents of the neighborhood, and that they should be consulted before a final parking plan is developed. The last parking variance that the APNA BOD approved was for KXCI which caused a lot of parking problems for residents, resulting in the implementation of a Residential Parking Program.

Richard Fe Tom, architect, said that the growth of the city, especially with Rio Nuevo, gives the opportunity to have high quality developments and that Five Points will become an important gateway to downtown. Don Coleman felt that many people in the area would walk to the services offered at the building.

Marty Diamond moved that the building as presented be permitted with the caveat that it is an exception and *cannot and will not* be cited as a precedent for future construction. The motion was seconded by Mike Kennedy and was carried, 6 to 2. The reasons for approval were that it is a high quality design and would improve the unusual location. It also blends with the existing structures in the area. The objections were based on the height of the building and the changes to the historic curbs, sidewalks and streetscape.

Marty McCune said that the need for a parking variance is waived in the Infill Incentive District. However, the need to inform the residents of the affected neighborhood(s) is a requirement of the Infill Incentive District. The final plan will go to Mayor and Council for final approval.

This proposed building is a test case for the Infill Incentive District and is a new process. The Infill Incentive District was designed to build up commercial use on major streets and excludes the residential areas.

Minutes taken by Bonnie Brooks  
Transcription by Phyllis Factor