

June 16, 2015

Ms. Sally Stang Director
Housing and Community Development Department
310 North Commerce Park Loop
Tucson, Arizona 85726

Re: Absence of Analysis and Facts to Support the City of Tucson's, the AZSHPO's and the ACHP's Findings of No Adverse Effect by the Proposed Undertaking that will Demolish the National Register Property, the Josias Joesler Downtown Motor Hotel, at 383 S. Stone Avenue Tucson, Arizona—SHPO-2014-0485 (123453) 106

Dear Ms. Stang,

I am in receipt of a copy of the City of Tucson's response to a FOIA and Arizona Public Records request by Mr. J. Gibbs, Architect, requesting substantiated professional analysis in the form of reports, analysis of hard data, and professional consultation in a clear and precise manner and substantiated by Historic Preservation criteria, guidelines, and law, to support the demolition of the Joesler and replace it with a four-story box. I believe his request is legitimate and that the developer's studies presented to date are not a balanced data set to fairly judge the historic property as they are biased toward demolition and replacement. The onus was and is on the City of Tucson and the AZSHPO to provide unbiased data, analysis and present it to the community that will be most adversely affected by this undertaking.

In my review of the City of Tucson's email with your response, Mr. Mabry's response and after a review of materials you cited from the postings on the City's WEB site for this project, I have no choice but to conclude that the entire 106 Processes to date, both the first and the second attempts, are **egregious shams and true breaches of the public trust**. You have not presented by your own admission, either substantiated independent data or analysis to support the findings that the **4-story box** designed to replace the Joesler is compatible in size, scale, and massing with the surrounding contributing properties. Nor is there compelling written evidence to support **your findings of no cumulative, indirect or direct adverse affects to the surrounding contributing historic properties in Amory Park National Register District. We are expected to take your personal opinions as facts; I think not.**

The current 106 Process is window dressing for the developer and the non-profit it has partnered with. Ms. Stang, you and Mr. Mabry have rendered a less than professional set of **opinions** without substantial analysis, unbiased research or consultation. The National Register Districts that surround this project were brought in at the last minute. They are little more than added window dressing to an already flawed process and they are not signatories to the MOA. This provided the developer and nonprofit another opportunity to show their largess by buying off the neighborhood associations and various historic preservation groups while still demolishing the building. Neither of you took the ACHP suggestions **to provide at least some analysis**. Instead, like the AZSHPO, you rubber stamped this project and believed the community that surrounds this project would not notice the absence of real analysis, a genuine transparent consultation process, real research and above all a spirit of real compromise on the part of the project proponents. The project proponents believe their compromise was to lose 1 story of a proposed 5-story box so the community should be happy with a 4-story box. After all, this has worked in all the other historic districts in which the City of Tucson has approved multi-storied boxes without concern for current residents and the effort made over the last 30 years to improve their properties.

You have provided no synthesis of the data from the substantial materials send to you by interested parties. Yes, some information is on a City WEB site however, Ms. Stang and Mr. Mabry, you have never taken a good hard look at the data nor drawn any unbiased, independent conclusions of these substantial materials that have been presented to you. **If you have, where are the written analysis and the synthesis on which to base your**

conclusion and opinions? By your own admissions there is none. The analysis needs to use standard historic preservation guidelines, criteria and law to justify your less than adequate opinions otherwise they are just that unjustified and unsubstantiated personal opinions and biases. I am sure that the City Attorney, the Mayor, and the City's planning department have provided enough pressure for you to turn a blind-eye because the City of Tucson does not want to be sued by the developer. Please let us not offend the developer or keep the City of Tucson from contributing more of my tax dollars to the loss of one more historic building, a building, by the way, that is two doors north of my historic property, at 417 and 419 S. Stone Avenue, Tucson.

The statements made in the draft MOA's are unsubstantiated by fact, research, analysis or synthesis to make the statement and draw the conclusion that "no historic properties will be adversely affected by the proposed under taking". Your finding of no adverse affect is laughable and at best you do a disservice to the 106 Process, to historic preservation, and those individuals who truly strive with integrity to competently practice within this field.

That you both consider this proposed building to be compatible to the surrounding historic buildings stretches the limits of credibility beyond what I thought possible. The buildings at 417 and 419 S. Stone Avenue, when accurately compared to the proposed building, exposes your complete ignorance of the surrounding neighborhood and these buildings in particular. The proposed 4-story box is incompatible in size, mass, height, proportions, scale, windows, materials and streetscape. For example, the proposed building will be 3 times taller than my building at 419 S. Stone and 5 times taller than my other building at 417 S. Stone.

The professionals and knowledgeable individuals who have, without much luck, tried to present the City and the developer with concrete data, synthesis, facts, firsthand knowledge and the evidence of or fact based significance of the building are not NIMBYS or the local rubes who are anti-nonprofit, anti-poor, anti-public housing, anti-low income, and anti-development, anti-veteran **nor are we so preservation minded we that we do not understand business or the need for affordable housing downtown.** Many of us have worked and lived in the downtown neighborhoods for over 30 years and whether working in the context of business or working on our historic properties we know how to compromise, meet the bottom line, and retain the historic integrity, and context of our community. The same cannot be said of those who live and work outside the downtown community. The developer, the non-profit, neither AZSHPO nor ACHP have a clue because this is just one more project that needs to be jammed through the 106 process to meet funding deadlines and at the expense of the community as a whole and residents in particular besides as some of you have articulated "who would have thought a rundown old hotel full of cats would be so important". Well the Joesler designed motel is a big deal despite the biased opinion of the AZSHPO Architect.

This is not the 1970s when City of Tucson staff and church representatives went door to door in the downtown community to persuade residents and property owners to make way for urban removal. The elderly and their families who were relocated across the Santa Cruz River by the planning department (aka Development Services/Advanced Planning) have great institutional memory of the loss (relocation) of families, demolition of buildings, the loss of historic context and the loss of the multi-cultural community due to the City of Tucson's policy's. I would suggest you learn about the downtown and do not assume you know everything (Recommendations to begin with but not end with are as follows: a video entitled *Barrio Historico: A Walk Through Time* by Katherine Wilde and Ken Bacher; *Los Tucsoneses* by Thomas Sheridan; *A Tucson Preservation Primer* (Armory Park) by Giebner 1974, U of A Press). Every portion of the community that remains standing after urban removal past and present is a battle ground because people made way once for the City's big brother knows best policies. The urban removal in the downtown continues today with each new high rise, big box within or adjacent to the historic districts. These developments are built at the expense of historic residences, businesses and communities as they marginalize and isolate historic properties and leave them vulnerable to future neglect and demolition. They have real, negative, and cumulative long term affects.

The MOA that you are in such a hurry to sign, and then have the demolition begin is not based on analysis just unsubstantiated, biased opinion. It is not about time that you do the job the 106 Process demands that you carry out rather than treat the process as a rubber stamp for development?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Heuett,

Property Owner of 417-419 S. Stone Avenue,
Woman-owned Business Enterprise (WBE),
Principal, Cultural & Environmental Systems, Inc.