

Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board (APHZAB)  
Minutes

Tuesday, 19 March 2019, 7:00 P.M.  
St Andrew's Church Parish Hall  
E. 16th Street and S. 5th Avenue  
Tucson, Arizona

NOTE: Upon calling the meeting to order, the Chairperson, APHZAB announced that PDSD was making an audio recording the meeting for posting on the City Clerk's website.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call.

- APHZAB members: A quorum was established with ten APHZAB members present: Mr. J. Burr, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. G. Hesley, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. M. Means, Mr. P. O'Brien, Ms. M. Ress, Mr. M. Roberts and Ms. G. Schau. Absent: Mr. G. Furnier and Mr. M. Crum.
- IT Support: Mr. K. Taylor
- Guests: Mr. G. Bedinger, Ms. J. Brown, Ms. J. Mulder, Mr. M. Ritzenthaler and Mr. B. Schindler.

2. Approval of Minutes from APHZAB meeting on 19 February 2019. Motion made by Ms. Factor and seconded by Mr. Roberts to approve Minutes from 19 Feb 2019 as presented. Ten votes in favor: Mr. J. Burr, Mr. M. Crum, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. G. Furnier, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. M. Means, Ms. M. Ress, Mr. M. Roberts and Ms. G. Schau. Opposed: None. Abstention: None.

3. Historic Preservation Zone Full Design Review Cases.

Proposed alterations of any design elements must comply with the Unified Development Code (UDC) Section 5.8 "H" Historic Preservation Zone (HPZ) and "HL" Historic Landmark (HL)/ Technical Standards Manual (TSM) 9-02.3.0.0 Historic Preservation Zone sections 1-7 including TSM 9-02.7.2 Armory Park Historic District Design Guidelines / Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, and other applicable guidelines.

a. HPZ-19-17, 733 S 3rd Ave, Parcel# 117-07-0620, Mr. B. Schindler, property owner. Mr. M. Ritzenthaler, architect. Demolition, addition to main house and detached garage/new construction.

- This full design review follows a courtesy review conducted on 16 Oct 2018. For ease of reference, see enclosed Minutes for that review.
- Mr. M. Ritzenthaler provided an overview of the application per UDC 5.8.9 design standards.
- The original existing principal structure is a 930 SF, single family, historic Craftsman style bungalow dwelling built in 1920. There is a 230 SF attached addition located at the rear of the principal structure built in the 1950's. There is a garage, also likely from the 1950's, which is missing from the Property Card dated in 1964 and there aren't any permit applications found in records. The first definitive evidence of this structure is in the 1998 aerial photograph. Mr. Ritzenthaler acknowledged it is unknown whether the 1950's addition and garage are

contributing structures or not. Neither is shown on the contributing properties map.

- He made multiple references to the development zone for inspiration and support for the proposed design details.
- The garage is beyond repair due to neglect by the prior owners and per proposal will be demolished. The unsafe structure has severe cracks, unstable foundations and significant water damage.
- A probably non-contributing addition, estimated to be built in the 1950s on the rear of the main house, will be demolished per proposal and replaced by a new 667 SF addition on the rear of the main house. The proposed basement addition features a double height space with interior 235 SF sleeping loft plus bath that opens up to a rear patio, recessed below grade, with terraced patio and gardens. The basement is expected to be five feet recessed (per plans) in the ground with a walkout sunken terrace. The addition is about six inches inset from each side where it connects to the main house to distinguish between the old and new designs.
- The basement will feature wood folding doors to create an indoor/outdoor space.
- The current addition has metal (steel) windows, painted exposed brick (/block), exposed concrete sill and wood headers. It is stuccoed on one side.
- The proposed principal windows on the new addition will be upgraded to wood keeping in character with the principal structure and replaced addition.
- The roof of the addition will match the height of the medium gable roof on the front porch at 16'5", one foot below the principal roofline. A dormer with window is proposed on the south elevation. The roof will retain the exposed rafter detail, a characteristic of the main house. A standing seam metal roof having a mill finish is proposed for sustainability and durability reasons.
- Formerly modified metal (aluminum) slide windows on the principal structure will be replaced with historically appropriate wood replacement windows and trim to match the original windows still extant on the building, and fit the original opening dimensions.
- Setbacks are within allowable measurements in the development zone.
- The owner is proposing a Santa Barbara smooth stucco finish on the addition and replacing the existing stucco on the principal historic structure to match.
- Less than 50% lot coverage is typically found throughout the development zone and allowing open space between the sides of buildings. The replacement addition will add 52 SF to the overall new footprint in addition to the combined footprints of the demolished portions resulting in an increase in the lot coverage of .09% from 31.5% to 32.4%.

Board member feedback:

- The Board applauded Mr. Ritzenthaler for modifying the proposed design based upon the prior feedback given in the courtesy review. There has been a great deal of thought to ensure the new design of the addition is smaller in all directions, and more compatible with the contributing structure, so that it is an obvious addition, but does not overwhelm the principle historic structure
- The Board is concerned about the proposed demolitions without a formal determination by the Tucson Historic Preservation Officer.
- The Board agrees that the garage is beyond reasonable repair.
- The Board prefers the repair of original stucco and finish on the main house rather than changing the original appearance of an historic house. The proposed finish is acceptable on the new addition to indicate its differentiation.
- The Board requested additional details on the proposed wood folding doors, including

fenestration and proportions not available during this review. Those details could be provided for the Tucson-Pima County Historic Commission Plans Review Subcommittee or at a subsequent minor review.

- The Board recommended a review of the egress criteria for the sunken addition and loft sleeping area. Steps up from the terrace may be required, as well as some modifications to windows.
- The Board notes that the proposal includes windows inspired by the demolished non-contributing building and other non-contributing replacement windows also found in the development zone rather than relating to the original structure. Although now proposed as wood, they duplicate metal 1950's windows in rhythm, proportion and fenestration. The overall proposed window openings are compatible but would be more appropriate with side by side wood, double hung windows (single pane) separated by a single post, that match those on the original structure. The architect and client were willing to accept this recommendation.
- The proposed wood casement window (bathroom) and wood double hung dormer window are supported by the contributing structure.
- The Board asked about the proposed wood folding doors on the lower level of the addition. The architect suggested that they would have fenestration and were envisioned as multi paned glass similar to the originally proposed windows. The board suggested a single light fenestration within each panel of the wood folding doors would be more in keeping with the design characteristics of the principal Craftsman style bungalow. The architect and client agreed and asked if that review could be accomplished at PRS.
- The Board indicated that the proposed metal roof was acceptable because it was not visible from the prevailing streetscape. The client intends on keeping the asphalt shingle roofing on the principal structure at this time.
- The Board agreed that the new footprint and setbacks were supported by the development zone.
- The dormer with window is acceptable and supported by the development zone and other contributing examples.
- At this time, no new above surface walls enclosing the sunken terrace are proposed.
- Although not a typical review issue, the Board expressed concern about flooding in basement terrace area during rains. Mr. Ritzenthaler assured the Board that proper drainage would be addressed (e.g. sump pump).

Action Taken: the Board recommends approval of the design as presented with the following conditions: 1) Tucson Historic Preservation Office must determine that the garage and existing addition to be non-contributing before issuance of a demolition permit, 2) windows on proposed addition should be side-by-side, wood double hung (single post between) to match existing (except the wood casement and double hung wood dormer window which are approved as presented), 3) wood folding doors on basement should have a single light fenestration rather than multi paned fenestration in keeping with the style and age of the structure, subject to review at the PRS, 4) Repair and replace (as needed) original stucco and finish on the principal historic structure (new finish on the addition approved), 5) reduced setbacks as presented are approved, and 6) return to the APHZAB for minor reviews if required for a) egress issues from the basement area requiring design modifications, or b) modification of the opening size/dimensions/proportions of approved windows on the proposed addition if they need to be modified for access issues.

Motion made by Mr. Burr and seconded by Mr. Grede. Ten votes in favor: Mr. J. Burr, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. G. Hesley, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. M. Means, Mr. P. O'Brien, Ms. M. Ressa, Mr. M. Roberts and Ms. G. Schau. Opposed: None. Abstention: None. Ms. McClements, Chairperson, and Mr. Grede, Vice Chairperson, provided the APHZAB stamp to the presented plans with comments and signatures.

b. HPZ-19-18, 515 S 6th Ave, Parcel# 117-07-0570, Mr. B. Schlegel, property owner, and Mr. M. Ritzenthaler, architect. New garage/guesthouse.

- Mr. M. Ritzenthaler provided an overview of the application per UDC 5.8.9 design standards.
- There are two existing contributing structures (principal + accessory) located on the property. Per the SHPO property data card (attached), the principal structure (515 S 6th Ave) is a 1,720 SF Spanish Colonial/Sonoran Transitional built in 1917 with a yellow stucco finish, green roof trim and blue window trim. The Accessory Structure (515 S Arizona Ave) is a 321 SF guesthouse built in 1931 with off-white stucco finish, a standing seam metal shed roof and exposed rafter tails. The two structures are on the same parcel but have different addresses. (Note: the guest house has an Arizona Ave. address because it a grandfathered second domicile on the principal property.)

Additional discussion with the Board members:

- A new two story accessory structure is proposed in the vacant area at the rear of the property adjacent to an existing contributing accessory guesthouse along Arizona Ave. The lower level features an enclosed garage, laundry, storage (427 SF) and open carport (230 SF) with a 1 bedroom, 1 bath guesthouse (500 SF) with a wrap around balcony (394 SF) over the carport on the upper level.
- The development zone was established using both of the addressed structures on the parcel (both 6th Avenue development zone and Arizona Avenue development zone). Design details were based upon features of the "Spanish Colonial" designation (not Sonoran Transitional) of the principal structure as well as contributing structures within the Arizona Ave. development zone.
- Mr. Ritzenthaler stated that the owner now desires to have a separate address for the new structure. He believes this may have implications on the design of the new structure.

Board member feedback:

- The Board could not locate the property card before the meeting. The principal structure is actually a Queen Anne/Anglo-Territorial Bungalow that was later modified (probably 1920's-30's) with a street front "facelift" incorporating some Spanish Colonial details, but does not generally conform as a Spanish Colonial style structure in general form, roof shape, details or rhythm. It's design characteristics especially wall height, pyramidal roof height, and building form should dictate the compatibility of the proposed structure to the principal historic structure rather than design elements derived from the secondary development zone at the rear of the parcel.
- The single parcel is zoned as HC-3. The typical reference for residential areas (UDC 6.6.3) that stipulates accessory usage cannot be more than 50% of the gross floor area of the principal structure does not apply. However, the reference for nonresidential zones (UDC 6.4) does apply:

*The building used for an accessory use within a nonresidential zone shall comply with the following:*

- A. An accessory building shall not be occupied as a dwelling, except as a caretaker's facility;*
- B. The area of a site occupied by an accessory use or building shall be included as part of the lot coverage calculation; and,*
- C. The structure used for an accessory use within a nonresidential zone shall comply with dimensional standards of the principal structure.*

This appears to not support a secondary dwelling as an accessory structure. Note: the guest house (historically modified from a garage) is a grandfathered secondary use on the property.

Therefore, for design purposes, the only structure to relate to is the single story principal structure with the 515 6th Ave address. A secondary (or more) residential structure(s) is/are still allowable as long as it is compatible with the principal historic structure. The proposed two story design is not compatible in either height, scale or design.

- If the lot were to be split and provided a new address on Arizona Avenue, then the new development zone would change the design criteria and compatibility issues. Other contributing structures for determining compatibility would come into play. And it would no longer be an accessory structure. It would be a new principal structure on a new lot with a new development zone.
- Although the address is on 6th Ave, the new structure is located with access to Arizona Ave, which has contributing structures with a significantly different style of a minor avenue.
- The low slope roof form of the proposed design descends towards the south to provide for solar development but would normally slope towards the interior lot based upon Arizona Ave. development standards and is not a traditional roof form. Is there a contributing example of a parapet structure in the Arizona Ave. development zone?
- Although the two story structure to the north has an overall height of 19'4", it has a gable roof form with a lower wall height (about 16') than the proposed structure and would appear significantly taller than any contributing building on Arizona Avenue.
- A new structure may need to be set back farther to prevent blocking the view of the contributing historic accessory structure guesthouse.
- Other design and details elements are more appropriate than those proposed in the Armory Park HPZ: wood posts (not steel tube), wood railings (not metal), staircases and steps; transom windows are appropriate over doors or windows; but awning and clerestory windows are not appropriate in the development zone or design guidelines because they create a different, non historic facade rhythm and recessions pattern; planters are fine as decorative landscape features (temporary) but not as structural elements of balcony design replacing traditional railings. A visible second story balcony would need to be supported by the new development zone as well.
- More details needed on the cistern to approve, formally.
- If the determination is to keep a single lot, then the application should include defining measurements of the principal historic structure including height, roof form, design details, and setbacks for the purpose of determining compatibility.
- A new address for the secondary residential structure is the purview of Pima County but is not a defining criteria for design review.

Action Taken: the Board recommends approval of a continuation at the applicant's request to reconsider the following: 1) determine desired parcel configuration to establish which design

criteria and development zone standards would apply to a revised proposal, 2) if a single parcel is retained, revise design proposal to one that is appropriately compatible to the original Queen Anne/Anglo-Territorial Bungalow (possibly including some Spanish Colonial style details that are considered historic contributing modifications) of the principal historic structure, especially overall height, roof form, setbacks and design details, and 3) provide a revised design proposal if the lot is split that would be compatible with the design criteria of new development zone based on Arizona Ave and the newly separated contributing structure.

#### 4. Courtesy Reviews. Information and feedback only. (No action required)

516 S 5th Ave. Parcel #117-07-0550. Damian Cox and Carly Langman, property owners.

Replace back gate/wall.

- The property owner did not attend the meeting. However, the Board wanted to provide feedback to members of the Board who will attend the minor review when scheduled.
- Dimensions and materials information and site plans should be provided.
- When looking at fences and walls, consider what is appropriate to the structure and the development zone. Gabion walls (metal cages filled with rocks or stones) are not found in and are not nor appropriate for the development zone. There is no historic precedent for this material use and form in the historic preservation zone.
- Corrugated metal in vertical form may be appropriate if its use/configuration is in keeping with historic precedence.
- Overall height of piers should reflect the development zone standards as well.
- Note: new block walls on the property are not stuccoed per guidelines.

#### 5. Update status of APHZAB design guidelines project and approval of minutes of the APHZAB Design Guidelines Working Group meeting on 5 March 2019.

- The feedback period for first end-to-end version of the updated design guidelines is complete. A second version is in the works based upon that feedback. Some of the feedback was minor editorial (e.g. word choice, change sentence structure). However, other feedback highlighted 'issues' the working group felt that needed broader Board input.
- The Working Group met on 5 Mar 2019 to make recommendations on 'issues' to be presented to the full APHZAB on 26 Mar.
- Approval of minutes of the APHZAB Design Guidelines Working Group meeting on 5 Mar 2019 will be postponed to the 26 Mar meeting. The minutes will be available for prior review by the Board this week.
- The next end-to-end draft is expected to be released on 7 April. Technical expertise and guidance within the content is essential to prepare the draft for release as well as providing feedback. For those who don't feel they have the technical expertise, they should provide feedback based upon assuming the role of an applicant to determine if the guidance makes sense.
- There was another meeting of the Historic Landscape Subcommittee with Jodie Brown to review the streetscape guidelines specifically with a focus on simplification. This may well affect the Armory Park Design Guidelines. Follow-up with Mr. Grede required.
- The meeting on 26 Mar will be posted as an open APHZAB meeting with a limited agenda. Recommend adding language to the agenda that enables the working group members who do not

serve on the board to also participate with the Board members in the discussion, but not in the voting by the Board.

6. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

- a. Minor reviews conducted since last APHZAB meeting. None conducted.
- b. Status of zoning violations. No change.

8. Call to the Public. (Information only) None

9. Call to the Board. (Information only)

- There is concern about the amount of material (including potentially hazardous items) being amassed in the back yard of the former Catholic school building on Arizona Ave. at 14th Street. It appears interior demolition without any permits is removing historic elements of the building. This should be addressed.
- It appears that the Height Text Amendment of the IID will be moving forward for approval by Mayor and Council on April 8, since the Planning Commission now recommends it.
- The Cursillo Building (Performing Arts Center) RFP response(s) is/are moving forward for consideration by a review committee.
- Mr. Grede will chair the next regular APHZAB meeting on 16 April as Ms. McClements is unavailable.

10. Next Scheduled Meetings:

- 26 Mar 2019, special meeting with limited agenda of the full board re the Armory Park Design Guidelines Update Project
- 16 Apr 2019, monthly meeting

11. Adjournment.

Martha McClements  
Chairperson, APHZAB

Enclosure, paragraph 5c, Minutes from 16 Oct 2018

c. 733 S. 3rd Ave, Parcel#1170072620. Michael Ritzenthaler, architect with preliminary design concepts.

The principal historic contributing structure is a c. 1920 stuccoed brick bungalow (approximately 935 square feet), with an open, inset porch on craftsman style piers facing the street, both with open-end single gable roofs, and includes a later rear addition with a low slope shed roof for a total useable 1133 square feet. The current accessory building is a single story masonry garage, with a low single gable roof of approximately 385 square feet.

Mr. Ritzenthaler provided an overview of the preliminary design concepts for proposed renovations to 733 S. 3rd Ave. These include:

- A single story bathroom suite addition to and renovation of the existing rear addition.
- A conversion of an existing garage accessory building into a secondary dwelling unit by adding a 2nd floor loft extension. Note: The lot is zoned HR3 and is allowed four units.
- Some renovation to the primary structure including partial removal of the stucco and exposure of the original brick. First, he wants to check the quality of the underlying brick. The board is concerned about the quality of the 'soft' bricks since the house was built in c. 1920 and may have been stuccoed originally. Furthermore, other similar structures in the development zone are generally stuccoed. The Secretary of Interior Standards do not support removal of long-term stucco on bricks.
- A proposed addition which includes a sloping, metal standing seam shed roof that fits underneath the eave of the primary structure, but does not relate to it in form, type, slope, materials or detailing. It was suggested the new roof should be compatible with the primary historic structure and should not relate to later non-contributing elements of the property.
- The renovated and extended addition needs to be compatible with and relate to the existing structure. This includes the stucco; window shape, size, rhythm, style and detailing; and roof slope and eave construction. Casements will be allowed as they are present in the contributing structure. Clerestory windows and unusual apertures (circular) are not recommended.
- A differentiation between old and new so it is distinguishable from the historic structure is recommended, but a compatibility with the primary structure is required.
- As a separate, non-contributing accessory structure, there is a little more flexibility in the design of the desired guest house renovation of the garage than with the addition to the main structure. However, it still needs to relate to and be compatible with the historic principal structure the lot. It was noted that its reduced setback and change of use might influence appropriate height extensions. An assessment by a structural engineer is required to determine whether the existing structure can be successfully renovated to incorporate a loft unit.

- The height of the gable peak on the historic front facade is 17'9" and its roofline dictates the allowable height of the lot. However, the lot slopes up to the rear so new additions should be below the roof line, even if shorter on grade, so as to not overwhelm the historic structure, per code.
- Consider retaining a gabled roof on the secondary building so it may have a more compatible roofline, wall height, and massing.
- The Board was also concerned that the assessor's site only shows the original structure with front porch, no rear extensions, and no permits since 1974. The 'garage' is listed a two spaced carport. It appears both the rear extension and garage may be from the 1950's or 60's as they are painted concrete block with steel casement windows. The property card was unavailable at the time of review.
- The formal application and review should show what currently exists, any proposed demolitions, and preferably any documentation to show support for proposed "restorations" and what should be retained as contributing elements in context of the buildings' extended history.
- It was suggested that he look at the over-all context of the block (development zone) and existing additions, and both accessory and secondary structures in his zone for consistent site utilization, setbacks and massing.