



## **Infill Incentive District – Design Review Committee**

Tuesday, February 2, 2016 – 3:00 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Large Conference Room

201 North Stone Avenue – Tucson, AZ 85701

### **Legal Action Report**

#### **1. Roll Call**

Those present and absent were:

##### **Present:**

Chris Gans  
John Burr  
Lori Woods  
Robin Shambach

##### **Absent:**

Michael Keith  
Bill Viner  
Fred Ronstadt

##### **Design Professional:**

Scott Neeley  
Rick Gonzalez

##### **Staff Members Present:**

Frank Dillon, Planning & Development Services  
Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services

#### **2. Approval of Legal Action Report - September 8, 2015**

John Burr made a motion to approve. Robin Shambach seconded. Motion carried 3-0 (Mr. Gans did not vote).

#### **3. IID-15-10- The Marist on Cathedral Square – Diocese - 111 South Church Avenue**

Jon Mirto from Poster Frost Mirto presented a project overview.

Matt Stuart of Cypress Civil Engineering presented the IID proposal for the project.

Mr. Stuart explained the scope of work and that the project would consist of the demolition of the existing Diocese offices and the reconstruction of new multi-story residential senior living units. Mr. Stuart explained the requested modifications and gave an overview of the project's status. Mr. Stuart explained that any concerns brought up by the IID DRC could be addressed in future submittals and that the purpose was to obtain an approved site plan for the purposes of the LIHTC application.

Mr. Mirto explained the proposed building program and architectural features of the building. Mr. Mirto explained that there would be an access easement for drainage and maintenance for the Brown house. Ms. Woods asked if the easement would be accessible. Mr. Mirto explained that the easement would be gated.

Staff Dillon provided background regarding the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission Plans Review Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Dillon explained that there were no issues since the applicants were providing ample space for maintenance and access to the Brown house. Mr. Dillon added that the proposed design was also respectful to the scale of the Brown house because the ground floor maintains the same height as the Brown house.

Mr. Stuart answered questions pertaining to the design of the project. Corky Poster from Poster Frost Mirto explained the nature of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit requirements and the strategy for providing the on-site parking.

Ms. Woods asked questions regarding the bike racks and lockers and the irrigation meters. Ms. Woods expressed concern that irrigation meters were not shown at the most current location per the utility plan and that the sleeving should also be noted on the utility plan. Ms. Woods inquired about re-use of the demolished materials. Corky Poster from Poster Frost Mirto explained that most of the salvaged materials would be sold. The applicants explained that if the tiles on the exterior are removed that they will be salvaged and reused.

Chair. Gans explained that the motion would be made in two parts. Staff reminded the commissioners that Design Professional's comments should be heard. Rick Gonzalez from RGA architects recommended that the east wall but added that those concerns were addressed in the presentation. Mr. Gonzalez added that the requested exemptions were acceptable and he had no other comments.

Mr. Burr made a motion to approve the project as presented. Ms. Woods seconded. Motion carried 3-0 (Chair Gans did not vote).

Ms. Shambach moved that the applicants return for subsequent design review after LIHTC approval. John Burr seconded. Motion carried 3-0 (Chair Gans did not vote).

#### **4. IID-15-11- The Marist on Cathedral Square – Marist - 64 West Ochoa Street**

Matt Stuart of Cypress Civil Engineering presented the IID proposal for the project.

Mr. Stuart explained the scope of work. Mr. Stuart explained the requested modifications and gave an overview of the project's status. Mr. Stuart explained that the parking access would be converted from one way to two way and that the existing PAL was wide enough to accommodate the conversion.

Ms. Shambach asked about the ADA accessibility ramp. Corky Poster from Poster Frost Mirto Architects added that the City of Tucson is currently working on a road diet along Church Avenue and that the expansion of pedestrian ways and access is a part of the future plan. Mr. Poster added that the goal was to expand the sidewalk to the west of the historic wall and would return with future developments. Mr. Stuart addressed subsequent questions regarding the parking and pedestrian access.

Ms. Woods asked about the hatching pattern on the plans. Mr. Stuart explained that there had been some additional landscaping added to the plans. Ms. Woods asked how the outdoor area in front of the building would be used. Mr. Stuart explained that it would be used as a public patio space with tables and umbrellas.

Jon Mirto from Poster Frost Mirto explained the architectural renovations and detailing. Mr. Mirto explained that there was a non-historic addition to the building that would be removed. Mr. Mirto added that the opening in the historic wall would be expanded slightly to be more inviting.

Mr. Burr asked if the renovation would include incorporating the historic detailing and color. Mr. Mirto explained that the two-tone color patterns have been discussed and would be integrated into the design. Mr. Mirto explained the building finishes and added that the wood sash windows would be restored.

Mr. Poster explained how the plaster and adobe would be treated during the restoration.

Mr. Dillon provided the staff report and explained the favorable recommendations of the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission.

Mr. Neeley provided the Design Professional report. Mr. Neely explained that he understood that the site had constraints and expressed concern about the circuitous nature of the vehicular access.

Mr. Burr made a motion to approve the project as presented. Ms. Shambach seconded. Motion carried 3-0 (Chair Gans did not vote).

**5. Future Agenda Items**

Staff explained upcoming cases.

**6. Call to the Audience**

No audience present.

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.