

**From:** Jody Gibbs <j.gibbsarchitect@gmail.com>  
**To:** Demion Clinco <demionc@yahoo.com>, <mayor1@tucsonaz.gov>, <ward1@tucsona...>  
**Date:** 04/16/2015 12:16 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Mitigation of Adverse Effects of the Proposed Four Story Building

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jody Gibbs <j.gibbsarchitect@gmail.com>  
Date: Thu, Apr 16, 2015 at 12:04 AM  
Subject: Mitigation of Adverse Effects of the Proposed Four Story Building  
To: Sally Stang <sally.stang@tucsonaz.gov>

Sally Stang, Director of Housing and Community Development  
City of Tucson

RE: 1) Comments on your "Revision of Findings of Adverse Effects"  
of the proposed four story building Letter of April 8 to SHPO"  
2) Recommended Mitigation of the Adverse  
Effects of the Proposed Four Story Building on the surrounding  
Historic Districts

Dear Sally,

In your letter of April 8 to SHPO you suggested that the proposed building was a "new addition" to the historic Joesler Building. On the contrary the proposed four story building destroys the historic Joesler Building causing it to be de-listed.

Further you classify the "new addition" as being compatible with the "massing, size, scale" of adjacent historic buildings in the district." That statement is false.

To be compatible by the Tucson code, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and good practice, the proposed building needs to be compatible in many criteria including height, setbacks, proportions, roof type, surface materials, site utilization, projections and recessions, details, building form, rhythm, and other criteria.

i would refer you the following:

UDC 5.8.6 A.3

"new construction shall reflect the architectural style of and be compatible with the contributing properties located within its development zone".

UDC 9.02.1.3 Definitions

"Compatible - to be in agreement with or fit architecturally with the surrounding development. Also, not to contradict a street scene, view, or adjacent development"

UDC 5.8.6 lists the basic criteria to be employed to provide compatibility of a building design:

5.8.6 B.3 Height - "conform to the typical height within the development zone"

5.8.6 C.3 Setbacks - "maintain the prevailing street and interior yard setbacks existing within its development zone"

5.8.6 D.3 Proportions - "reflect the prevailing proportions of contributing properties within its development zone"

5.8.6.E.3 Roof Types - "have a roof compatible in configuration, mass, and materials to the prevailing historic style and period of the existing structures within the development zone in which the proposed structure will be constructed"

5.8.6 F. Surface Texture - " appropriate to the historic style of similar structures within the development zone"

5.8.6 G.3 Site Utilization -" consistent with the site utilization of contributing properties within the development zone"

5.8.6.H.3 Projections and Recessions - " have projections and recessions such as porches, steps, awnings, overhangs, entrances, and windows that are compatible with the existing historic styles within the development zone."

5.8.6 I Details - "have architectural details- cornices, lintels, arches, grill work, shutters, window and door trim ...compatible with existing historic styles and periods of contributing properties within the development zone".

5.8.6 J Buildings Form - "shall have a size, mass, and scale that are compatible with the existing contributing properties within the development zone".

5.9.6 K.3 Rhythm - "shall reflect the proportion, pattern, and rhythm of openings of contributing properties in its development zone"

The proposed four story building is incompatible with the historic contributing buildings surrounding it in Barrio Historico and Armory Park using these appropriate criteria per good historic preservation practice.

The development zone of this property is bordered by stone, 14th, 15th ,and russell plus the properties on stone one block north and one block south. The property is on the boundary edge of armory park and across the street from Barrio Historico.

The criteria refer to historic "similar structures" within the property's development zone. the proposed project is housing. Note that a theater or convent would not be a similar structure. Note also there is no convent in the actual development zone of this property.

The mitigation required to avoid damage to the two historic districts is to change the design of the proposed building in accordance with the above criteria listed above to make the proposed building compatible.

The de-listed historic joesler building when demolished will have lost its integrity and will no longer exist as a contributing property. hence the de-listed demolished joesler building can not be used as

a source when looking at applicable conditions of the criteria among contributing properties in the development zone.

Perhaps to make it simpler to understand the mitigation needed to mitigate the proposed building, one could refer to the "Design Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts" developed in Philadelphia in 2007 in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It suggests that the mitigation needed to the proposed four story design would be the following:

- 1) match the height of the adjacent historic contributing building to the south of the property
- 2) align the windows to those of the adjacent building to the south
- 3) use materials similar to the building to the south
- 4) construct a roof profile similar to the building to the south
- 5) use setbacks, doors and windows, proportions, details, projections and recessions, site utilization, building form, and rhythm similar to the building to the historic contributing building adjacent to the south of the property.

Your letter of April 8 suggests that other than the demolition of the Joesler building, the proposed project has no other effect on Armory Park Historic District or the Barrio Historico Historic District. On the contrary the proposed building (in addition to being incompatible for the reasons listed above) causes extremely negative and irreparable damage to the character, environment, scale, fabric, context, and experience of both historic districts.

I refer you to UDC 9-02.3.0

"The character of a HPZ depends to a great extent on the integrity of its buildings and streetscapes. Development patterns, design relationships, landscape designs, and architectural styles and details together create the historic fabrics of these districts. Key development criteria relating to heights, setbacks, proportions, roof types, surface textures, site utilization, projections and recessions, details, building forms, and rhythms have been identified to guide future development within each HPZ..... Although new construction does not require a specific architectural style, it must be compatible with the overall design context of the neighborhood and streetscapes".

I wish to clarify that the conclusions of your April 8 letter did not arise as a result of the 106 process. You sent the letter and then asked us to discuss it.

I request a roll call consultation of the consulting parties at the meeting April 16 clearing voicing whether they believe the proposed building is compatible in "massing, size, and scale" with the buildings of the historic districts as your letter suggests.

Also I request a roll call consultation of the consulting parties on whether they believe the proposed four story building causes a negative effect on the character, environment, character, scale, fabric, context, and experience of both historic zones.

I request also a clarification of the required incomes, employment, and

rents of the proposed project's renters. the information received suggests tenants must have a job, be able to pay rent of approximately \$633/month for a one bedroom unit, and have an income of \$24,000 per year. In the case of the two bedroom units tenants are required to have a job, be able to pay approximately \$832/mo, and have an income of \$28,000 per year. Four of the 44 units proposed will be for tenants with have incomes. could you please clarify the income and job requirement for the tenants of these four units. and could we please clarify and and confirm all of these requirements.

At the same time i have heard the project referred to as "housing for the homeless" and "housing for homeless veterans". The Pima Vera Foundation, experienced in working with and for the homeless in Tucson, estimates there are 10,000 homeless. They also clearly state that most homeless are unemployed with typically no income or they are trying to live on social security or disability payments of \$600 to \$700 per month. Hence the proposed project appears to have nothing to do with the homeless. can we please confirm this.

It also appears the City of Tucson has no data on homeless veterans other than an estimated 1704 "point-in-time" count, but no data including names, incomes, addresses, or employment. Can we confirm this.

The "Project Action for Veterans Project" also appears to have no data beyond the estimated "point in time" figure above.

None of the parties I consulted believed that homeless veterans would have incomes of \$24,000 to \$28,000 or even employment.

Can we clarify who the proposed tenants of this project would be ?

This project has also been referred to as a non-profit project, but it appears that 99% of the project is owned by a for profit corporation (who will also build the proposed \$10 million project) and 1% of the project is owned by a non-profit corporation. Could we please clarify and confirm this ?

And can we clarify when the project will revert to market rates and where the rent collected after that time goes?

Additionally the "meeting summary" of the last meeting sent by Ramona Williams yesterday is the first of its kind. there have been no minutes or recordings of previous Consulting parties meetings to my knowledge. can we confirm this ?

The "meeting summary" failed to report there was considerable disagreement with your "revisions of findings of adverse effect" in your january 8 letter, particularly its statement that the proposed building is compatible in massing, size, and scale with the historic buildings and its statement that the proposed building causes no damage to the historic districts beyond the demolition of the joesler building and its loss as a contributing building.

Nor did the "meeting summary" report that a presentation and evidence was submitted indicating reason to doubt your figures indicating infeasibility of rehabilitation of the joesler building into low rent housing.

Nor did the "summary report" include the request for the 106 process to devote time and effort into examining the alternative of rehabilitation of the existing historic joesler building into low rent housing.

will you schedule meetings for the consulting parties in the 106 process to examine that alternative ?

I believe Demion Clinco of the Tucson Preservation listed five financial alternatives to rehabilitate the historic joesler building into low rent housing and suggested we need to devote time to looking at design, consulting with developers with experience in rehabilitation of a historic motel in armory park, and to visit that rehabilitation as well as to examine alternative designs to rehabilitate the historic joesler building.

Do you intend to schedule time for this 106 process to seriously examine that alternative or other alternatives ? Could we please have a roll call of consulting parties regarding this ?

The "meeting summary" also failed to report the request for a public hearing to present the conclusions of your April 8 letter and the proposed "final design" (item #6 of the previous meeting) to the residents of the two historic districts, the public and the media.

Are you going to call such a public hearing ? Could we have a roll call of consulting parties on this matter ?

I also request an additional meeting of the consulting parties to work with the developer on the mitigation outlined above and the alternative of rehabilitating the historic joesler building into low rent housing after a public meeting to explain where we are at this point ? Can we have a roll call of consulting parties on this request ?

Sincerely,

Jody Gibbs  
Barrio Historico Historic District Advisory Board  
Representative to the 106 Consulting Process