



2016

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission
Plans Review Subcommittee

LEGAL ACTION REPORT

Thursday, March 3, 2016
4th Floor Conference Room, Joel D. Valdez Main Library,
101 N. Stone, Tucson, Arizona 85701

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 12:00 p.m.

Commissioners: Terry Majewski (Chair), Arthur Stables, Jim Sauer, Helen Erickson, Sharon Chadwick. (Quorum established).

Staff: Frank Dillon, Michael Taku, Jonathan Mabry (PDSD); Andrew Bemis, Jennifer Toothaker (TDOT)

2. Future Items:

At the request of staff, this item was discussed out of sequence. Staff Dillon informed Commissioners that the applicants of Broadway Village would like to put up temporary sign banners for the start of their business. Proposed temporary sign drawing were reviewed. Commissioners recommended installation with the following conditions: (1) The banner signs comply with all sign code requirements; (2). The banner sign plans include a note indicating that they are for temporary use until the fabrication and installation of the permanent signs; (3). The banner sign plans indicate that the sign plans will not create new penetrations or be mounted into the exterior walls of the buildings, nor will they be attached in a way that will damage the exterior walls.

3. Approval of Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes for 2-25-16

Motion by Commissioner Sauer to approve the Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes of 2-25-16. Motion seconded by Commissioner Stables.

Motion passed. Voice Vote 5-0.

4. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases

UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines

- a. **HPZ-16-13** – Proposed bike share station locations in Historic Districts; funding time line for implementing bike share in Tucson; TDOT requirement to submit environmental and cultural clearance documents to ADOT by the end of March 2016-. Review; Information and Comments- Tucson Department of Transportation (TDOT).

Presentation by Andrew Bemis and Jennifer Toothaker, from Department of Transportation. The review methodology was to review all the 46 proposed station locations noting “no concerns” and “concerns” citing potential adverse impact on the historic district. Then, summarize the outcome into a formal motion. The results show that a majority of the proposed station locations had no historic concerns. Those locations with comments and/or historic concerns included and not limited to obstruction of pedestrian traffic flow; to be reviewed; sidewalks; visual impacts; intrusions to the historic landscape, block historic arcade and intrusion to the historic park. Commissioners requested that the project be presented to the relevant Historic Preservation Zone Advisory Boards and Neighborhood Associations to be impacted by the proposed locations for their input. The local Historic Preservation Zones identified were Armory Park; West University; El Presidio; and Barrio. PDS and TDOT will partner to schedule these reviews.

It was moved by Commissioner Sauer, duly seconded by Commissioner Stables to:

(1) commend the City for proposing locations where the vast majority were found to have no historic concerns;

(2) note that our recommendations are contingent on the review and approval of these locations by the relevant Historic Zone Advisory Boards; we understand that Neighborhood Associations will be asked for input as part of the Section 106 process that is required for this project;

(3) note that our recommendations are made with the understanding that the BikeShare station design(s) will be brought back to the TPCHC-PRS for review;

(4) note that our review of the locations resulted in:

- two locations that were not listed in table form in the presentation were reviewed with no historic concerns identified: 124 (6th & Granada) and 218 (Franklin & Granada)

-one location listed in table form was not available to be reviewed: 121A (Church & Congress). 121B was reviewed and no historic concerns were identified, but 121A will be brought back to the subcommittee for review as needed

- eight locations were identified with historic concerns, largely concerns that the proposed bikeshare station in that location would be an intrusion in a historic park or landscape: 120A, 120C, 115, 110B, 222B, 222C, 112, and 224A.

- for the majority of locations with historic concerns, nearby alternatives were identified that did not raise any historic concerns:

120A: do not select 120A; either select 120B, or relocate by relocating this station into the parking area on 12th

120C: do not select 120C; 120B is the alternative

115: do not select 115; no alternatives identified (however, there is a streetcar stop nearby; suggestion to consider locating with stop)

110B: do not select 110B; 110A is the alternative

222B: do not select 222B; 222A is the alternative

222C: do not select 222C; 222A is the alternative

112: do not select 112; no alternatives identified, but it was noted that the area between the curb and sidewalk is wider at the south side of Catalina Park, possibly allowing for a bikeshare station that does not impact the ability to reintroduce street trees

224A: do not select 224A; 224B is the alternative

Motion carried. Voice Vote 5-0.

5. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

a. Minor Reviews

Staff Taku and Commissioner Erickson conducted minor reviews on Friday.

b. Appeals

None at this time.

c. Zoning Violations-Compliance Update

Staff continues to assist owners on abatement of violations in the City Historic Districts and Rio Nuevo Area. Staff Taku stated that pending violation at 600 East Speedway for a porch infill has been brought to its original configuration. A minor review will be scheduled to review and close the violation case. Commissioners requested a photo of current status or “reversion”.

d. Review Process for Approval of Complex Large-Scale and/or Multi-Phase Projects- No new information on this item.

6. Call to the Audience

No one from the audience spoke at this time.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:23 p.m.