1. Call to Order / Roll Call : 3:35 PM

DRC members present were:
Chris Gan, Chair
John Burr
Fred Ronstadt
Robin Shambach
Lori Woods
Bill Viner

DRC members absent were:
All present

Design Professional Present:
Corky Poster

Staff Members Present:
Koren Manning, Planning & Development Services
Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services
Maria Gayosso, Planning & Development Services
Alexandra Hines, Planning & Development Services
Daniel Bursuck, Planning & Development Services

Agenda Items taken out of sequence:
Chair Gans made a motion to make two amendments to agenda:
• Review and approve previous LAR at end of agenda; and
• Allow for public comment to be three minutes per speaker.
Bill Viner 2nd, DRC Voted 6-0 to relocate Agenda Item 2 to the end of the Agenda.

2. IID-17-06, The Union on 6th, 340 East 6th Street (T17SA00486 & DP18-0067).

Staff provided purview of review, background of Unified Development Code section 5.12, and purpose of IID. Staff introduced members of the IID-DRC for the Union on 6th project, clarified roles of each member. Staff stated the five action options for IID-DRC: Approve as is; approve with recommendations; continue for 10 days; remand and request updated design; not recommend approval.

Staff specified that the Director will make decision based on staff’s review and advisory recommendations provided by the IID-DRC, the TPCHC Plans Review Subcommittee, and the City’s Design Professional. Clarification was also provided on staff’s role during this meeting of redirecting the conversation if it strays from purview of DRC review.

Chair Gans opened the floor to the applicant, Rory Juneman. Mr. Juneman then formally introduced the other members of the consulting team: Keri Silvyn, Lazarus, Silvyn & Bangs PC, Eric Barrett.
Rory Juneman presented the scope of the proposed project, including site analysis, subarea and standard compliance, requested modifications, and proposed site plan, landscape plan, and circulation. He then outlined the renderings as a walk around the site. Noted protection of adjacent building, multifamily lease, and outreach conducted.

Carolyn Laurie, presented staff report. She noted applicant attended three pre-submittal meetings and received more than 80 public comments surrounding the project’s design, location and adjacency to the historic 4th Avenue Sub district. Mrs. Laurie also stated IID intent and requirements have been met and is in harmony with Plan Tucson’s policy.

DRC member Burr asked if proposed refuse compactors will be approved through the Development Package review. Mrs. Laurie indicated staff will be taking a close look at the proposed refuse collection and compactors and will be part of staff’s recommendations to the PDS Director as needed. DRC member Ronstadt indicated no permits will be issued if code is not being met. Staff concurred.

Staff then introduced Corky Poster, City Design Professional, who presented his recommendation letter dated July 17, 2018, noting proposed development could be built under current entitlements, or through the IID process to achieve the goals of urban form in context with the surrounding area, by providing the developer with incentives to abandon some of those entitlements. Highlights presented from the review included: Unusual situation of project sitting in two different IID subareas, each with its own requirements; applicant achieved goal of providing architectural detail on the first two floors, especially at the pedestrian level, all around the site, including along 5th Avenue and 6th Street; addition of one more commercial site at the northwest corner of Herbert Avenue and 6th Street created more interest, but the northeast corner of Herbert Avenue and 6th Street could also include commercial use; shade is being met, but there are issues on the south elevation, where windows need more protection from the Sun, plus better visual interest could be provided for both buildings; support reduction of parking requirements being processed through the Individual Parking Plan application, to start shifting the number of automobile trips; recommend applicant to commit to annual meetings with neighborhoods for the first 5 years of the project; there is a great opportunity for a mural on the west elevation, along Herbert Avenue; support proposed setbacks from Herbert Avenue above 40 feet.

The meeting was then opened to the DRC Members for discussion.

John Burr, questioned the design professional on the revised elevations and if the consultant had addressed the design professional comments. Mr. Poster relied yes, he felt they had made a good faith effort to update the design per his recommendations.

Chair Gans, asked about the traffic impact analysis was and if it was performed during the high season or off season, when the students and out of town visitors where away. Marco Esparza indicated data was obtained from the City’s Department of Transportation, who collected the date during the month of May, during peak hours, but fall peak hours data was also utilized.

Chair Gans, asked how people would cross 6th Street in safe manner, how potential commercial uses on 6th Street and Herbert Avenue were being addressed, and expressed support for mural suggestion on Herbert Avenue. Corky Poster responded that the answer relies on the design by the applicant; exit from courtyard in only about 70 feet from 6th Street, and the Department of Transportation most likely will not support the installation of a HAWK crossing at this point.
Lori Woods inquired if shade will be provided at the roof terrace, while proposed trees reach maturity. Eric Barrett, indicated shaded will be provided with awnings and umbrellas in the terrace, and presented proposed landscape plan.

Bill Viner, inquired and received response from Matt Stuart that the minimum sidewalk width is 7 feet for the area per the interim streetscape manual, with one-foot space between planters as required by the Department of Transportation.

Chair Gans, inquired and received response from Matt Stuart that the trash is a compactor. He also asked and received response from Rory Juneman that a vibration study and monitoring will occur.

Bill Viner requested a five minute break.

Meet was paused at 5:35pm.

Hearing was reinstated at 5:45, and a Voice Roll Call was completed, all members present.

3. Call to the Audience.

Chair Gans, then took public comment. Eight members offered comments on the project including:

a) Concern about effectiveness of trash collection on Herbert Avenue – the street is heavily used by pedestrians;

b) Support idea of providing retail space on 6th Street – It will help connect business districts in the area;

c) Provide conditional support, if agreement is reached with 4th Avenue businesses and West University neighborhood to maintain the character of 4th Avenue (speaker read a communication issued by Ward 1’s Council Member Romero, where 5 individuals expressed support and 17 are against proposal);

d) Concern about prevention of motor-vehicles travelling the opposite way on Herbert Avenue;

e) No rational provided on page 62 of design package – not by simply adding more people an area can be improved;

f) Confusion about how market analysis was actually made;

g) Water fountains are needed for bikes and pedestrians at the corner of 6th Street and Herbert Avenue;

h) Project is still lacking in design – Public, community space with heart and soul is needed, influences cited by applicant are not analogous to the desert; applicant failed to capture “radical warmth” on 4th Avenue; disappointment that plaza will not be available to the general public; more trees need to be planted;

i) Supportive of project – University of Arizona needs more “Class A” properties;

j) Support parking plan – Less students are using cars;

k) Beautiful design;

l) Many issues still need to be addressed on Herbert Avenue – too many trash cans;

m) All ground floor should be commercial;

n) West building looks like Pima County jail; lacks architectural detail;

o) West building should complement the historic character of the area;
p) Concern that only one loading space is provided;
q) Project should be linking 4th Avenue and 6th Avenue businesses, not creating a barrier;
r) Residential uses should be facing the street;
s) Traffic analysis does not reflect reality;
t) Difficult for working individuals to attend public meetings;
u) Buildings should meet LEED standards;
v) University of Arizona should be providing housing in campus.

Chair Gans closed call of the audience, and turned the conversation back to IID-DRC for comments and questions.

John Burr expressed concern for permeability of site, commercial connectivity, and that the courtyard is not handicap accessible. Acknowledged that his comments over time have been addressed. Inquired if EdR Trust can commit to 20-50% off transit passes.

Lori Woods expressed appreciation for comments and concerns. Concerned about Herbert Avenue traffic, refuse collection, loading, and narrow walkways.

Bill Viner inquired and received response that the bicycle parking is on 5th Avenue, garage, and courtyard. Inquired and received response that dog relief is on terrace and plaza. Inquired and received response that Uber pick up is on 5th Avenue.

Fred Ronstadt, showed interest in public art and commercial activity on Herbert Avenue.

Robin Shambach noted the building articulation has improved, and Herbert Avenue is currently developed edge to edge. Noted discrepancy in development package calculations (PARKING CALCS?). Revisited downtown projects and seen their trash is successful and worked. Agreed that accessibility from parking garage to east building is a good point.

Chris Gans, inquired about 50% discounts on transit passes, group dwelling definition, murals, south elevation, fragility of adjacent buildings, and zip cars across 6th Street. Matt Stuart responded that first submittal waste calculation was wrong, commented by environmental services, and addressed in the second submittal. Noted the design does not accommodate for restaurant or bar and retail and office require less loading. Noted the design will maintain Herbert Avenue as low intensity with one way sign.

Rory Juneman, responded that EdR Trust is agreeable to a 50% reduction in transit pass. Addressed restriction of group dwelling. Rory addressed accessibility and flipping residential units, noting 2 foot grade difference along 6th Street. Considered unit on NE corner on Herbert Avenue and 6th St as live-work space, but build in timeline to lease as residential if live-work space does not lease.

John Burr inquired if there is a threshold of project viability based on the number of conditions imposed. Inquired if to continue meeting. Josh Wilson, pointed to copy of proforma and addressed financial return that residential is viable and retail is not leasing out as fast.
Bill Viner inquired and received response from Matt Stuart that there is neither structure nor hoods for restaurant space. Inquired and received response that space on NE corner on Herbert Avenue and 6th St is 800 square feet. Rory Juneman, noted the visibility of proposing a mural on 4th Avenue.

John Burr requested commitment to murals and work-live space. Berak Bekat agreed to improve south elevation.

Bill Viner, inquired and received response from Berak Bekat that live-work space can have storefront.

John Burr inquired and received response form Berak Bekat that the access point can be more attractive, but studies have been conducted to show a new access point is not feasible.

Lori Woods expressed discomfort with taking action today. Noted deliveries for residences on east do not seem to be addressed.

Bill Viner moved to approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commercial uses such as live/work space (commercial on the ground floor and residential on the upper floor), retail or office space shall be located on the southeastern corner of Herbert Avenue and 6th Street (Exhibit D);
2. Coordinate with Park Tucson to explore additional pick-up and drop off areas for share ride vehicles along 5th Avenue;
3. Include two murals on the structures, at least one to be located along Herbert Avenue;
4. Through the development plan process (DP18-0067) improve pedestrian safety and accessibility between 6th Street and the Herbert Avenue;
5. Conduct a vibration study and take appropriate measures to minimize the impact on surrounding structures; and,
6. Any substantial changes to the proposed project design should be brought to the IID-DRC for review.

Fred Ronstadt seconded motion.

Motion passed (6-0).

Chair Gans moved that future Major IID project be placed on an Agenda as Study Season Item first, then return as an Action item.

4. Approval of Legal Action Report of August 20, 2019 meeting. Minor comments addressed by staff. The committee unanimously agreed to approve the legal action report. 6-0

5. Adjournment.
The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.