



Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, November 19, 2019, 6:30PM
Parish Hall, Saint Andrew's Church
545 South 5th Avenue
E. 16th Street and S. 5th Avenue
Tucson, Arizona

Legal Action Report/Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:31pm. A quorum was established with nine APHZAB members present: Ms. S. Bachman-Williams, Mr. T. Beal, Mr. J. Burr, Mr. M. Crum, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. G. Furnier, Mr. S. Grede, Mr. P. O'Brien, and Ms. G. Schau.

IT Support: Mr. K. Taylor.

2. Approval of Minutes—October 15, 2019 and November 12, 2019

Action Taken – Motion made by Mr. Burr to approve the meeting minutes for October 15th as presented, seconded by Ms. Factor. Nine votes in favor, 0 opposed.

Action Taken – Motion made by Mr. Burr to approve the meeting minutes for November 12th as presented, seconded by Ms. factor. Five votes in favor, 4 abstentions (Ms. Bachman- Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Furnier and Ms. Schau – Not in attendance).

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Reviews

Jodie Brown with the Historic Preservation Office clarified that items 4 a,b and c could be discussed concurrently but would require separate motions per the HPZ numbers attached to each of the current legal parcels of the combined redevelopment project.

Items 4 a, b, c: Discussed concurrently. (Motions to follow):

Mr Mackey presented an overview of the proposed redevelopment project that would combine three current parcels with two contributing structures into a new FLD project that would comprise 7 new lots, incorporate the contributing structures and build 4 new

buildings (5 total residences) on the site. He oriented the board and audience to the development zone via a site aerial, photos of the development zone and the historic inventory forms for the existing structures on the lots. He then described the new lot configurations and illustrated the flexible lot development requirements and provisions.

Mr. Mackey provided an overview of the neighborhood meetings that the project has already required, including the individual parking plan (IPP) which has been approved, and a required FLD neighborhood meeting. The concerns presented during those meetings have been largely addressed. The Board confirmed that the neighbors had not expressed design related concerns regarding the project. The Board asked for an update on the FLD process. Mr. Mackey stated that the project will need to be submitted for a final development plan review with the largest impediment to approval being TEP because of utility easement issues.

The Board was concerned with the increased density of the development in relation to the rhythm of the streetscapes. Mr. Mackey then showed his calculations of the density of the adjacent two blocks to be in the same range. He then presented the streetscape elevations to illustrate the rhythm of the development in conjunction with the development zones. The Board asked for clarification on the lot sizes for lots 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 which Mr. Mackey provided from the submitted drawings. The Board asked if any true two story buildings exist in the development zones. Mr. Mackey stated there are not contributing 2 story structures in the development zones which informed the use of one and a half story designs for buildings 4,5 and 6, all lower than the two contributing structures' heights.

Mr. Mackey then detailed the individual plans for the seven buildings.

Building 1 is the contributing Anglo-Territorial house at 811 S 4th Ave. All proposed development/ rehabilitation has already been approved and completed. The new lot will conform to the extant perimeter walls/ fencing. Photographs and site plan were presented. The board had no concerns regarding lot/building 1.

Building 2 will be a new residential structure on 4th Ave. The site plan and elevations were presented. As proposed it is a 2 bed, 2 bath home massed on either side of a central axis hall. It features both exterior brick and stucco finishes and has both gabled and parapeted roof elements, concrete sills, copper trim, 4/1 wood double hung windows, and an open rafter roof portion over an exterior patio.

The Board expressed several concerns about the design. The massing of the elements suggest joined separate buildings rather than a unified form or massing. Having no front porch is inconsistent with the contributing structures in the development zone. The use of glass block is not appropriate in the historic zone. Corrugated roofing is not generally used on principal structures (except some Transformed Sonoran buildings) and should only be considered on accessory structures. The Board asked if a front porch would be an acceptable addition on building 2. Mr. Mackey stated he and

the owner would review how to make building 2 appear more of a single principal structure in term of massing, and revise some of the details.

Building 3 will be a new residential structure on 4th Ave. The site plan and elevations were presented. As proposed it is a 2 bed, two bath home with massing to one side of a hallway. It features a tall adobe walled main living area “pod”,with framed stucco as the balance. It has parapeted flat roofs, 2/2 wood double hung windows (some in corner configurations), and metal canales.

The Board expressed several concerns about the design. The height (20') of the adobe portion, in relation to the rest of the building, or similarly styled contributing structures in the development zone is over-scaled. The metal canales are evident in Barrio Historico, but not in Armory Park. The corner windows, though evident in other historic districts with 1930's “moderne” styles, are not evident on contributing structures in Armory Park. Like building 2, it does not feature a front porch, and has an unusual street front massing. Mr. Mackey said he would bring down the height of the adobe portion, and review possible revisions of the design.

Buildings 4 and 5 are mirror image halves of a single duplex residential building on either side of a common wall, facing Railroad Ave. and using its development zone standards for guidance.

The site plans and elevations were presented. They feature one and a half story design with the bedrooms and baths in the dormer windowed second floor. The proposed roofing is corrugated metal in a hip/ gambrel roof configuration, and stucco exterior walls with a shared front porch and 2/2 wood double hung windows.

The Board was mainly concerned with the roof material, as corrugated metal is not generally appropriate for principal buildings. It was noted that the buildings were slightly lower than the contributing structure on Railroad Ave. Mr. Mackey was unsure if a standing seam roof would work with the low pitch of the gambrel, and asked if we might allow asphalt shingles as another option.

Building 6 is a two story single family residential structure, designed as a one and a half story gabled roof building. It features exterior brick walls with 1/1 double hung wood windows, with a rusted corrugated roof.

The Board expressed several concerns about the design. The overall height compared to the width of the building was not a typical massing for a structure with limited street frontage. It was noted however, that in relationship to the contributing structure and the proposed duplex, the height was less evident and problematic. It was generally agreed that the proposed design should not be a precedent for other new construction in the Railroad Ave. development zone, out of context. Again, the problem with corrugated

metal as a roofing material for a new principal structure was discussed. Either standing seam metal or asphalt shingle roofing were the preferred options.

Building 7 is an extant contributing structure currently undergoing an approved rehabilitation/ expansion. The only changes now sought are replacing the asphalt shingle roofing with corrugated metal roofing, adding new fencing, and reconfiguring the lot to be addressed on Railroad Ave. The site plan and revised elevations were presented. The Board accepted the use of corrugated metal roofing for the c. 1895 Transformed Sonoran structure, as it is commonly evident on that type of building (and the other contributing Transformed Sonoran in the development zone.) The fencing (its height was appropriate to the development zone, as it is to either side of the structure) and new lot configuration were appropriate.

All the proposed new site/structured feature new fencing elements that were generally acceptable to the Board. It was generally agreed that buildings 4,5 and 6 could generally be approved, with minor modifications, but that buildings 2 and 3 required further review. The board expressed thanks to the architect/developer for creating the variety of individual, distinct buildings rather than a replicated model for its FLD project. The board generally agreed that while the increased density allowed under FLD was problematic in relationship to established streetscape rhythms, the overall proposal was generally compatible with the historic preservation zone standards.

a. HPZ 19-98, 811-821 South 4th Avenue
Flexible lot development for the construction of 4 new residences.
Full Review/Contributing Resource

Action Taken: (Parcel# 117-08-040B) Mr. Burr made a motion to conditionally recommend the development proposal, Mr. Crum seconded. Mr. Fournier then requested an amendment to the motion to allow either standing seam metal or asphalt shingle options for the roofing replacements; the amendment was accepted by Mr. Burr and Mr. Crum. Discussion ensued to clarify the intent of the motion.

Motion (as amended): (A 12,197 ft. sq. lot with 1 contributing resource): In relationship to current parcel configuration, the board recommends denial of lots/ buildings 4, 5, and portion of building 6, due to incompatibility to the principle (contributing) structure in terms of height, setback, building form, roof form, details, rhythm, proportion and site utilization. However if FLD re-subdivision of all related parcels (117-08-040A, -040B, and -0440) is approved, lot 1 is approved as reconfigured to 5639 ft. sq. and building 1 (pre-approved) as presented: lot 4 is approved as reconfigured to 2055 ft. sq. and building 4 (and fencing) approved as presented except requiring replacement of corrugated roof with standing seam metal or asphalt shingle and all wood, non-clad windows and doors (excluding painted metal mechanical area door) and in compliance with Railroad Ave. development zone standards for principal buildings; lot 5 is approved as reconfigured to 2208 ft. sq. and /building 5 (and fencing) approved as

presented except requiring replacement of corrugated roof with standing seam metal or asphalt shingle and all wood, non-clad windows and doors (except metal mechanical area door), and in compliance with Railroad Ave. development zone standards for principal buildings, portion of lot 6 is approved if final total lot is reconfigured to 2481 ft. sq. and (total building 6 and fencing) is approved as presented except requiring replacement of corrugated metal with standing seam metal or asphalt shingle, and all wood, non-clad windows and doors (except metal mechanical area door), and in compliance with Railroad Ave. development zone standards for principal structures, with the caveat that the height and proportions are not approved unless all Railroad Ave. buildings are constructed and is not a precedent for the development zone, all subject to COT review and FLD compliance, with any changes requiring additional APHZAB review.

Motion Passed by roll call; 9 in favor, 0 opposed.

b. HPZ 19-99, 811-821 South 4th Avenue
Flexible lot development for the construction of 4 new residences.
Full Review/Contributing Resource

Action Taken: (Parcel# 117-08-040A) Mr. Burr made a motion to conditionally recommend the development project, Mr. Beal seconded.

Motion: (A vacant 2957 ft. sq. lot with no contributing resources): The current parcel is non developable as configured and the board recommends denial of any project unless the parcel is reconfigured into adjoining new parcels. However if FLD re- subdivision of all related parcels (117-08-040A, -040B, and -0440) is approved, portions of proposed lots 2, 6, and 7 are approved as presented. Please see HPZ 19-100 for further requirements for lots/buildings 2, 3, 7. (Building 6 is included in HPZ 19-98.)

Motion Passed 9 in favor, 0 opposed.

c. HPZ 19-100, 811-821 South 4th Avenue
Flexible lot development for the construction of 4 new residences.
Full Review

Action Taken: (Parcel# 117-08-0440) Mr. Burr made a motion to continue (conditionally) the development project, Ms. Bachman-Williams seconded. Discussion ensued, including clarification on the hierarchy of review criteria, starting with form then down to details. While there was no consensus on certain design details, the continuation allows for further discussion and review. (The audio recording includes the discussion of issues and clarification of intent.)

Motion: (A 14,045 ft. sq. lot with 1 contributing resource): The board recommends a continuation of HPZ 19-100 subject to the conditions of:

- i. The board recommends denial of building 2 and 3 as presented if the lot is not FLD re- subdivided, as they are not compatible with the contributing resource in terms of setbacks, proportions, details, site utilization, building forms, materials, roof forms, and will block the historic view shed of the contributing structure per its current address.
- ii. If the parcel is approved for FLD re-subdivision of all related parcels (117-08-040A,-040B, 0440) then lots 2,3,7 are approved as presented.
- iii. Building 7 is approved as presented (or pre- approved) including approval of the new roofing type/material and fencing.
- iv. Building 2 requires revisions to the proposed plans including: removal of non approvable glass block and roofing materials, reconfiguration of the front massing/ roofline/ non-porch to be more compatible in relationship to the contributing structures in the development zone and streetscape consistency. Building 2 is continued.
- v. Building 3 requires revisions to the elevations (not complete); removal of non-district canales, revision of the 3 “moderne” inspired corner windows that are not evident in the district/development zone; a reconfiguration of the height and front massing/ configuration to be more compatible to the contributing structures in the development zone. Building 3 is continued.

Motion Passed 9 in favor, 0 opposed.

d. HPZ 19-78, 524 S. Herbert Avenue

Rehabilitation of an existing building; new stucco, roof repairs and shingle replacement, fencing and gates; repair and restore windows and doors; new rear addition.

Full Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Gonzales (and his assistant, Mina) described the changes from the previous courtesy review referring specifically to sheet 2 of the large format prints. (It was noted that these revisions were not in the materials the board generally had for prior review.) The new changes include a revision to the door design, altering the size of the light to a large single light over two panels of an all wood door that is historically compatible in design, with restored transoms (above the two historic doors). The new windows have also been adjusted to show more proportionally vertical window configurations. There are also two wood single light awning type windows in the bathrooms on the north façade.

The Board expressed a continuing concern regarding the inaccuracy of the demolition plan, in respect to the west wall of the historic adobe building. Ms. Brown, HPO, was asked for clarification of what could be done to ensure the integrity of the wall, since it will not be visible after the additions are made. She provided several options.

The Board expressed continuing concern about the stucco finish on the original structure, and that the proposed finish on the addition was too similar. The Board requested the addition have a medium sand finish. The original stucco on the contributing building will be repaired, not re-stuccoed, especially since the walls are adobe, and the historic wood trim will be retained.

The Board again thanked Mr. Gonzales for revising his plans repeatedly over the multiple reviews to make the project compatible.

Action Taken: Mr. Burr made a motion to recommend the proposal with conditions, Ms. Factor seconded.

Motion: The Board recommends approval of the project as presented with the following conditions; the stucco on the contributing building be repaired and the original wood fascia trim be retained and the stucco finish on the addition be medium sand or similar finish; the 3 existing wood windows are to be 2/2 wood double hung windows (repaired or replaced as necessary to match the existing historic front window; the new wood 1/1 double hung windows on the addition are to be vertical (3'-0" x 4'-0") windows, or (2'-0" x 2'-0") wood awning type windows (not visible, and not to be used as a precedent) on the North façade; all doors to be all wood single light over 2 panels of a historically appropriate design and to fit in the openings as required; that the roof configuration and materials are approved as presented; and the partial demolition of the west wall is to be revised in plans/materials and require HPO approval that the integrity of the historic adobe building is retained.

Motion Passed 9 in favor, 0 opposed.

e. 337 S. 4th Avenue

Construction of a new two-story single family residence with a two car garage on a 12,000SF parcel.

Courtesy Review/Contributing Resource

Board member Ms. Bachman-Williams recused herself from the review (as owner) and took a seat in the audience. Mr. Lanning (architect) introduced himself and Mr. Bachman-Williams (developer) and presented a basic development project package, including aerial development zone, site plan, floor plans and an elevation of the east side of the building (only elevation presented) to orient the board and the audience. The project consists of a new two story residential building at the rear of the lot, behind the contributing structure. The lot is zoned HO3. The building will be approximately 40' x 70' on two levels with a 32' partially gabled hip roof, a wall height of 20', and has approximately 4240 ft. sq. of livable area with a two car garage and three covered porches. The materials proposed are frame stucco, wood double hung windows, doors and trim, with a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Bachman-Williams described the concept for the new principal structure: creating a co-housing building which will allow for lower income rental or shared ownership options in the neighborhood. Residents could include multiple families or separate adults living together. The building has communal shared living/working spaces on the ground floor and six bedrooms and three (shared) bathrooms on the second level. The garage is for two cars with some additional parking provided in tandem to the side or along the street frontage.

Mr. Lanning stated his goal in the review is to determine the building placement in relation to the parcel and primary structure, and get feedback on the scale and scope of the project. He stated the proposed building will be approximately 1' shorter than the principal structure on the parcel to the North (which is in the development zone), and features a similar roof type to the proposal.

The Board asked if a lot split is being proposed to allow for the building to not have compatibility requirements to the principal contributing structure. The applicant does not have that intention because the zoning allows for a second residential structure on the current parcel. The Board pointed out that an auxiliary residential structure should not be out of scale with the existing primary structure. Mr. Lanning clarified that the building is a second principal residential structure. His understanding of the code is that the code doesn't specify which building can be larger, and that the new building requires compatibility with the development zone, not the existing structure.

The Board continued to express concern regarding creating an overpowering second principal structure that will detract from the historic fabric with a different massing and site utilization than the contributing structure. The board pointed out that the primary structure is only about 1150 ft. sq. with a total roof peak height of 18'7". The Board also noted that the scale of the structures on Railroad Ave. is substantially smaller than the proposed building. The applicant stated that the new proposed structure would not be generally visible from 4th Ave. and wouldn't detract from the principal structure. Mr. Lanning reiterated that he believes the underlying "O" zoning allows for the density, use and scale. Mr. Lanning did note that at present 4th Ave. is the development zone but that it could change to Railroad Ave. if the new building is addressed there.

The Board had concerns about the setbacks and site utilization. They are proposed to be 5' to the south, 10' to the east and 21' to the north. They do not appear to relate to the setbacks of the primary structure and the footprint is substantially larger than the contributing building. It was also remarked that the south elevation will apparently be a largely blank (with the exception of two second floor windows) wall that is approximately 20' tall and 70' long, and only 5 feet from the lot line. Mr. Lanning responded that they are appropriate for the zoning, development zone and for the intended uses, and that the owners to the south are "fine with" the project.

The board asked for clarification on the details of the building, specifically the attached garage doors, and the window and door configurations. The applicants stated they would be interested in creating a historic inspired/appropriate garage door but also pointed out that garage doors are common along minor avenues. They would consider more compatible widow configurations. The Board also expressed concern that the probable required parking is not proposed on the lot. Feedback from city staff suggests that 8 total bedrooms (in both structures) would require 6 on-site parking spaces. There does not appear to be enough space on the lot, given the scale and siting of the proposed structure. Mr. Lanning does not think the requirement will be applicable to the project. The Board requested that the roof height, wall height, etc be supported by contributing structures in the development zone, and to provide that information in the next submittal. Also, how the building will be seen from 4th Ave. (in relationship to the primary building and streetscape) and in relation to Railroad Ave. structures should be shown as well. Context, in relationship to the adjacent structures should be shown.

The Board asked what options might be considered for reducing the size and scale of the structure. The Applicants stated they didn't have any proposals for reducing the building size or scale. Mr. Lanning then requested clarification on whether a building larger than the contributing structure would ever be approved by the board. The Board noted that the possibility existed, depending on the future proposal.

Action Taken: None

f. 250 E. 17th Street

Construction of a new single-family residence.

Courtesy Review/Non Contributing Resource

Ms. Bachman-Williams returned to the board.

The Applicant, Mr. Donazelf (Barrio Properties) described the proposed structure as a balloon framed 1-1/2 story, "Craftsman" style building. He went on to show elevations of the building, a basic site plan and a development zone illustration. He stated that in the development zone he saw primarily two types of structures; Craftsman and Victorian.

The Board clarified that three of the lots/ buildings indicated as contributing are in fact not contributing, as they were developed after 1994. The City map is apparently incorrect. All the buildings on the block, except one building on 4th Ave. are non-contributing. The development zone is limited to those buildings across the street and on the tangential corner lots at the Herbert Ave. intersection.

The Board also noted that the site plan, location plan and floor plan are incorrect and in some cases mirror images, as reflected by the elevations. The board noted that since the parcel is smaller than the required 5000 ft. sq. minimum for a SFD (the others in the area have been developed as duplexes without that requirement), that guidance from COT staff should be requested. The board noted it would prefer the proposed type of

building and hoped HPZ standards would allow for the use. The Board asked for clarification on the exterior feature in the the dining room pop-out facade, which the applicant clarified is a two way fireplace. The board noted that this is not a compatible exterior feature in the historic zone. The board also had concerns about the clerestory windows on the west elevation, which are not generally approved in the historic zone. The windows in the gable area on the South Elevation would be better if balanced, like those shown on the other elevations.

The Board stated the largest concern is the building height. Since the peak is at 28'-0", it would be substantially taller than any contributing structure in the development zone. 25' or lower would be more appropriate for the area.

The Board expressed some concern that the roof pitch is too steep. Most of the Craftsman architecture in Armory Park has a lower pitch and more simple forms like those typical in a California style bungalow. The proposal is more of a high style Craftsman which may be found in West University but is uncommonly complex for this neighborhood.

The Applicant also asked for feedback specifically on the balcony off the second floor master bedroom on the North Elevation. The Board asked for examples of precedent in the development zone/district of that element. The board did agree that the general project concept and overall look was appealing and in many ways compatible with the area.

Action Taken: None

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Mr. Burr provided an update on the design guidelines process, noting that PRS members have found the PDF format difficult to make suggested edits and difficult to collate. It was suggested that formats could be changed to simplify the review process and timeline.

Ms. Brown, PDSD, said the guidelines would likely come back for review at the January 2020 PRS Meeting.

6. Minor Review Update (Information Only)

a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews

A report from Ms. McClements was read into the record by Mr. Grede:

516 S 5th Ave – October 25th, Mr. Burr attended. The rammed earth and steel fence was approved.

245 S 5th Ave – November 1st, Mr. Burr and Ms McClements attended. The installed doors were not per the approved plan; a timeline to replace with wood doors was agreed upon.

500 S 3rd Ave – November 15th, Ms. McClements attended. Applicant requested aluminum coverings over the existing rotting wood fascia. The application was denied.

245 S. 4th Ave- November 15th, Ms. McClements attended. Solar panels were approved.

7. Call to the Board

Mr. Burr noted a secondary neighborhood meeting would be held at Armory Center for the Baffert project on 11-20, at 5:30. The rezoning of the 375 S. Stone Ave. parcels will be held at a Zoning Examiner Public Hearing on 12-5-19.

Mr. Beal asked if there would be a meeting in December. It is expected to be December 17th.

8. Call to the Audience

Ms. Brown, PDSD, said Mr. Taku will be out of the office until December 9th.

9. Future Agenda Items (Information Only)

No Future Agenda Items

10. Adjournment The Meeting adjourned at 9:07pm.