APHZAB
P.O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210
(520) 791-4213 (Voice) (520)
791-2639 (TDD)
(520) 791-4017 (FAX)

# Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
# LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
# Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 6:30PM
# Virtual Meeting

## AGENDA

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 6:37 pm. A quorum was established with five members of the board present: Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Mr. Glenn Furnier, Ms. Martha McClements, and Mr. Maurice Roberts. Note: Ms. Helen Erickson joined the meeting at 6:46 pm, followed by Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams at 7:07pm. Absent: Mr. Pat O'Brien.
COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO, moderator. IT: Mr. Ken Taylor.
Guests: by virtual presentation: Mr. Bob Lanning, Lanning Architecture; Mr. Ben Sheedy and Alex Crow, Verizon Communications; Mark Donatelli, Barrio Properties. Ms. J. Brown acted as moderator and will record the meeting for PDSD.

**2. Approval of Minutes –May 19, 2020.**

The minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. Mr. Beal made a motion to approve the LAR/Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion was approved by 5 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

**3. Call to the audience**

No comments were made prior to the meeting.

**4. Reviews**

a. **HPZ 20-048, 710 S. 2nd Avenue.**
**Construction master suite addition and remodel existing house.**
**Full Review/ Contributing Property**

Mr. Lanning presented the project as proposed. The property is a 1051 ft. sq., 1917 bungalow on a 4900 ft. sq. lot. The proposed remodel and addition are for a new master bedroom suite and sitting room expansion at the rear of the dwelling, which will add 312 ft. sq. to the building. At some much earlier time, a rear porch under a rear hip roof was enclosed as a bedroom and workspace area. The proposal would demolish a small non- contributing laundry cupboard and modify the existing wood rear wall of the enclosed porch with modified openings and replacement with a new attic beam. One of the existing windows on the west will be added to an expanded series of windows on the south side. To accommodate the addition and required attic ducting, the proposal is to replace the rear hip configuration of the existing roof to extend as a new gable roof extension (c. 8'') that matches the front gable in height (15' 10"AG, 14'10' AFF) and then further extend (14') over the master bedroom with another gable roof (12' 10" AFF) that matches the front porch roofline. The new gable ends will match the detailing of the existing gable end on the east side. New double hung wood windows are proposed and two new wood French doors (multi- light). Also proposed are two small wood casements on the extended north wall. The exterior finish will be stucco to match and matching asphalt shingles for the roof extensions.

The Board asked for number of clarifications and had some concerns, although generally liking the project. It was noted that HPZ height definitions are for roof peak height, not mid-ridge height as indicated in the

plans—for future reference. As it is not a part of the project, the existing shed was not discussed. It was clarified by Mr. Lanning that all the new proposed windows, except the reused window added to the series of 3 on the south-side (which is to match those windows), will be recessed into the facade. Some members of the Board preferred that the proposed French doors should have single light configurations (rather than multi light), to be more in keeping with the existing style, age and character of the building. Others did not mind the change, as it indicated modern adaptations. No consensus on rejecting the multi-light

doors were made. It was noted that the two proposed casement windows do match the style and AG dimensions as the historic window on the south facade (within a bump-out).

The most serious concern by the Board was how the modern addition was differentiated from the existing historic building. It was decided that control joints and a weep-screed line would be enough for that differentiation. Other questions were whether the proposed demolitions on the rear of the building needed to be called out in any motion—The HPO clarified that they did not, but that a waiver for the requested setback reductions (they match existing) should be. The Board thanked Mr. Lanning for his thoughtful proposal, and complete design package made available for review.

**Action Taken**: The Board recommends the project for approval as presented, including the reduced setbacks (in keeping with existing and the development zone standards) and proposed demolitions, with the condition that the addition shall have control joints at the new construction, and a weep-screed line at the foundations of the addition to differentiate modern construction from the historic building. Motion made by Mr. Burr and seconded by Mr. Roberts and passed with 6 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

b. **HPZ 20-051, 200 S. Stone Avenue**
**Install small cell wireless facility on a non-historic streetlight.**
**Full review/ Non-Contributing Element**

Mr. Sheedy, representing Verizon Communications, presented the project. He noted that the same materials as the existing cobra- style poles were being used—unpainted galvanized metal and that generally, despite the required dimensional changes to the replacement pole, the modified streetlight would appear very similar to the existing streetlight, with the banner mounts re-attached at the same height, and a replacement cobra-arm fixture roughly matching the existing configuration. He did expressly note that a substantial change to the plans provided for review was that a new ground mounted meter box was no longer required for the project, as they had determined it could now be placed in an existing (or replaced) underground electrical box with a “power-share agreement” with the City, and was not a part of the design package.

The Board was pleased to hear that no meter box was now required, and that replicating the galvanized finish of the existing 1970’s cobra lights was preferred (as graffiti resistant). The board further noted that the historic streetlight nearby was unaffected, as was the nearby “Gucci” light from 1974, which now has become iconic in the district. Some questions were asked about small changes to dimensional standards from the existing streetlight—slightly different arm proportions and height of the light fixture and whether it would change the pattern of light at the ground level. Mr. Sheedy responded that the changes were required for modern available equipment, and per City guidance, but they expected the light pattern to match the “photo-metrics” of the existing fixture. The Board was pleased that a rather standard cobra light was chosen for the location and not an historic or historic replica light fixture, which were prohibited from replacement in the historic district. It was determined that the new proposed pole would remain COT property, with the proprietary systems owned by Verizon, as is usual. It was also noted that no plans for additional poles are anticipated, as new technology progresses.

**Action taken:** The Board recommends the project for approval as presented, including the removal of the ground mounted meter box (which was not reviewed) with the condition that this case did not set a precedent/ standard and all future proposals for small cell facility fixtures in the HPZ will require individual review. Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Mr. Beal and passed with 6 votes in favor, 1 opposed (Mr. Roberts).

c. **HPZ 20-54, 250 E. 17th Street**
**Construct new single-family residence.**
**Full Review/ Vacant Lot**

Mr. Donatelli presented the project and what had changed since the November 19, 2019 Courtesy Review of the project. The project now includes a list of required standards and how they are met; a floorplan; a roof-framing plan; revised elevations; and a color chart. The project is for a new 1320 SF (main floor), one and a half story single family residence with an additional 360 SF of ground floor covered porch areas. Few

details have changed substantially except that the main roof peak has been lowered to 26' 5" and the side gable peaks are now 24' 3" high, instead of the prior 28' proposed height (change from 12/12 to 12/10). The proposal still has the second-floor balcony, transoms over most windows, and a two-sided see-through fireplace.

The Board was pleased that the project had been reduced in height. However, inconsistencies were pointed out on the plans which will need to be revised. The site location drawing is still on the wrong corner. Page A-1 is oriented North (up), but page A-2 is oriented to the south, causing confusion. The development zone plan is still in error. Most of the buildings immediately adjacent to the building are not contributing but rather 1990's infill development, often duplexes, and does not include the east side of S. 4th Avenue.

Unfortunately, only 5 contributing structures are in the development zone (across Herbert Ave. to the west, diagonally across Herbert Ave, and the three contributing structures on the northern side of 17th Street). After discussion, is was generally agreed that instead of asking for a development zone expansion, it was probably best to determine compatibility based on general HPZ standards. The Board generally liked that a single-family home was proposed rather than a bland duplex that the site suggests, by its apparent zoning.

After discussion, the Board agreed that the second-floor balcony was well concealed in a pleasing facade. After several examples were shown nearby, the Board was not generally opposed to the transoms over all major windows, including those on the upper floor, as they balanced the facade proportions overall.

However, most of the Board members felt that the two- way fireplace on the east side of the building (in a bump-out) was an incompatible feature that was not present in the HPZ. The Board again thanked Mr. Donatelli for his thoughtful project and over-all compatibility of neighborhood "character" for infill development.

**Action taken**: The Board recommends approval of the project as presented, with the conditions that plans be revised as needed, and that the exterior facade opening for the two-way fireplace will be removed from the project as an incompatible element. Motion made by Mr. Burr and seconded by Mr. Roberts and passed with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

**5. Design Guidelines Project**

a. Update on the design guidelines

Ms. McClements provided an update on the Design Guidelines Project. Ms. McClement, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Taylor, and Ms. Brown had a virtual meeting on July 24 to discuss needed changes to the document, based on the feedback provided. After a lengthy discussion, a new flow chart for the document was developed that was perhaps clearer, less repetitive and with more references to the code rather than quotations and would make a more accessible document. As the new format will require both the merging of categories, simplifications and considerably re-written text and copy, the project will take some time before it will come back to this board as a revised draft for consideration. Mr. Burr offered to take a stab at the draft with consultation and editing by the others. Updates will be provided regularly as the draft moves forward.

**6. Discussion on Central Business District Renewal and Expansion**

Ms. McClements outlined the situation of the current proposed renewal and expansion of the CBD that Mayor and Council will be considering at their September 9, 2020 meeting. The proposed expansion map now includes all areas of the Armory Park HPZ that are south of 14th Street and west of Arizona Avenue. Although this area is zoned Historic Commercial, it is largely residential in nature. Only a portion along S. Stone Ave. is in the Infill Incentive District with those further protections for contributing historic structures. Unfortunately, to be included, the area will be designated as "blighted". The Armory Park Neighborhood has taken up the cause and attended the only two outreach virtual meetings for residents provided by the City. Many neighborhood residents are both concerned and wish to opt-out of the designation, as determined by a poll—98 against, 4 in favor. Ms. McClements asked for the Board's desire on potential actions that could be made and noted that APNA and APHZAB may have separate concerns about the proposal. After a round-robin of discussion of all the Board members, it appeared that most had attended one of the meetings and had similar concerns. It was noted that of all the neighborhoods/historic districts proposed in the expansion area, that only Armory Park HPZ was impacted. It was generally felt that new development incentives offered by the CBD would be a detriment to the Historic District and HPZ and that a letter requesting that the City omit the Armory Park HPZ from the proposed expansion was in the best interests of the District.

**Action taken:** The Board authorized/ directed the Chair to write a letter to Mayor and Council to request that the Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone should be omitted from any proposed expansion area of the CBD in their current considerations. Motion made by Ms. Bachman- Williams and seconded by Mr. Burr which passed with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

**7. Minor Review Update**

a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews provided

No minor reviews have happened over the last month, but some may be coming up. The Board mentioned an outstanding case of a project that does not appear to be following its approved design/ construction plan. Staff will investigate it.

**8. Call to the Board**

Ms. McClements noted that the digitization of the APHZAB files was proceeding and 90% complete. The current file is 22GB. She asked for volunteers to help sort extraneous data from the physical files; Sara volunteered. Apparently, only extraneous and duplicative (or blank) pages will be removed from the file. Glenn asked for clarification on APHZAB's policy on new small cell facilities, after feedback from neighbors about the facility on S. 4th Avenue. Though ugly it may go away in future as new technology comes in. No Historic fabric will be affected. It was noted that TDOT&M have a map of streetlight facilities for consideration.

**9. Future Agenda Items - Information Only**

Ms. Brown said several projects are in the pipeline, but she is unsure which, if any will be coming in September. She will provide updates as they come in.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 pm.