



Infill Incentive District – Design Review Committee

Tuesday, February 2, 2016 – 3:00 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3rd 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:

Bill Viner
Michael Keith
Fred Ronstadt

Design Professional:

Corky Poster
Scott Neeley

Staff Members Present:

Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services
Michael Moreno, Planning & Development Services

2. Approval of Legal Action Report - October, 7 2016

The committee unanimously agreed to move the action to the end of the agenda.

3. IID-16-03- 7th Avenue Commons – 58 E. Fifth Street

Reid Butler presented a projected overview.
Pat Lopez presented the IID and proposal for the project.

Mr. Lopez explained the scope of work which was the development of a new 3-story apartment and parking garage. The project location will be at the corner of 5th street and 7th avenue. The project would consist of adaptive reuse of an existing warehouse and would be redeveloped for affordable workforce housing. The project was approved by the Arizona Department of Housing for tax credit with home funds attached by the City of Tucson. The plan includes the redevelopment of one of the existing buildings on-site with the addition of a second building adding 50 units. The onsite current vacant lot to the west would be used for a parking garage which is along 7th Avenue. The parking will be reconfigured for perpendicular back end parking being that 7th avenue will closed from Downtown Links and Aviation Parkway. The proposed

building will have 27 off-site parking spaces along with 34 onsite parking spaces. He also stated that it was a nonsmoking community.

Mr. Butler stated that the reason for the location of the site were the transit options within the area and that the state had placed a very high priority for the project being near transit both fixed rail, rail, and bus. This site scored well due to of the modern street car and the bus services on Stone. The project is meant to be family housing making 30 percent of the apartments as large be 1400 S.F. One of the services that they are offering their residents is a health care navigator to help residents find health care options through Obama Care and other health insurance plans. Mr. Butler then went on to state that 7th Avenue will be terminated and considered diagonal parking along the street.

Mrs. Laurie stated that they are completing an adaptive reuse of the property and bringing the entire section of the property into the code. They are addressing all health and safety issues, pedestrian circulation, off site traffic, utility concerns and have been working very closely with the City of Tucson shortly after the IID was approved. Some of the portions of the project were placed on hold, which was a request of the attorneys office to insure that the IID and the review process was not in some way going to impact the taking of the property and the realignment. The site is split by Echols Avenue which is the boundary between the two different sections in the IID. Stone Avenue and the Warehouse District are in the Stone and 6th Sub District. Both are two separate areas within that sub district and have different review standards. No truly historic property is located within the area. Neighbors stated that the parking space was a concern and were wondering how the parking garage would interact with the site. Mrs. Laurie stated that the neighborhood was pleased with some of the designs and felt it was inclusive.

Mr. Poster stated that he was fine with the concurrent review. He stated that he wanted to see the second deck of the parking garage and how they were proposing to join the existing building to become one. He was also concerned with the applicable standards that would be placed on the project. He was curious as to what control they have of the on-site parking spaces and asked if they could use the neighborhood parking program as dedicated to this site. Mr. Poster stated the architectural elements and residential elements comply with the level of detail required although was not a fan of incorporating 1920 style into the façade of a 2016 building. He had an issue with the parking structure and encouraged some type of commercial rental, retail, or store front on Stone Avenue stating it should be respectful to the pedestrian level. He also stated that the residential entry levels of the building be visible and highlighted, stating that the IID called out for emphasis of highlighting of an entry.

Mrs. Woods pointed out the scale of the structure and said it was more representative of its use with the time and character of today. She also stated that there was sufficient space along the width of the sidewalk to utilize landscaping on both sides instead of one side, and believed it would give it a better pedestrian experience.

Mrs. Shambach asked where the bicycle parking would be located. The applicant addressed that the bicycle parking would be at the front entrance of the building, 5th Street, and Echols Avenue. She asked where the outdoor use areas would be at. She also suggested they double check which plants are allowed for landscaping around the building. She also had a concern with the spacing along the curb and sidewalks, stating the choice of trees were a bit big and should consider smaller trees. She loved and approved the idea of underground rain water storage.

Mr. Gans went over the landscape treatment plan and said there would be a continuous row of trees around a portion of the building and landscaping along the parking garage. He also mentioned there would be trees and landscaping in the courtyard area. Mr. Gans stated there will be a playground to the north part of the project and to the east of that is a patio area with seating adjacent to the club house. He also stated that the southeast corner of the building had been

notched out to make room for a roof deck, a seating area, and barbeque area. The barbecue area is approximately 1400 S.F. and would be accessible to all people in the complex.

Mr. Burr asked about additional screening to protect their residence to the southern border which was next to the right-of-way and asked if transportation had a landscaping plan. He also stated that he would like to see more money being spent on amenities than on parking which he believed would make it a better project overall. He stated he would like to see some sort of offices or health management offices along Stone Avenue. He suggested 7th Street be looked at for angled parking along both sides of the street and suggested that the area should be meter exempt for the benefit of the residents.

Mr. Butler stated that the north “Bungalow” corner and that the parking garage were the most troubling. He suggested activating and incorporating the parking garage on Stone. He also proposed using the building directly south of the lot which has features that are typical in the area in terms of rhythm and scale and suggested using it on the face of the building and incorporating it to bungalow area.

Conditions:

1. The Stone Avenue frontage of the parking garage will include the establishment of usable space on the ground floor. This space may contain commercial, retail, office, or project related uses.
2. The parking garage will have a minimum of 30 spaces.
3. The applicant will update the architectural design of the exterior parking garage along Stone Avenue and 7th Avenue frontage.
4. The applicant shall pursue additional back in parking spaces along the east side of Seventh Avenue across from the project with Park Tucson. If this additional parking is not approved, applicant will only be required to provide the on-street parking shown on the existing plans. If approved, the applicant will construct this parking in addition to the on-street parking on the existing plans.
5. Refinement of the architectural expression(elevation) of the clubhouse (north elevation) of the building facing 5th.
6. The buildings entrances on all three structures, will have enhancement, highlighting and additional refinement of the design elements. These elements shall be integrated with the landscape and architecture.
7. The applicant will provide additional plans which reflect further refinement of the outdoor areas within the development for passive recreational use on the east side of Echoes.
8. The subsequent review and approval of the above conditions will be completed by staff and the design professional.

Mr. Burr made a motion to approve the project as presented. Ms. Shambach seconded. Motion carried 3-0 (Chair Gans Abstained).

4. IID-16-06- Corbett Brewery – 414 N 5th Ave., Tucson Arizona 85705

Emily Starus & Miguel Fuentesvilla Architect presented a project overview
Owner of property Scott Cummings

Ms. Starus explained the scope of work and that the project would consist of adaptive and reuse of the an 1930 Art Deco Style building. The building was originally used as a freight warehouse and was a former bottling company. The project proposal is to add two restaurants, retail spaces along 7th Street and 5th Avenue, and a Micro-Brewery in the back along Herbert. The courtyard will be revitalized for outdoor space and lounging. Under the Infill Incentive District the applicant is asking for relief in loading zones, trash collection areas, landscaping, screening and

parking. They are proposing to add four new trees on 7th Street and five on 5th Avenue. They are proposing to have a bicycle corral to meet bicycle parking requirements on-site and Park Wise has asked for two handicap spaces. In terms of parking under the IID the applicant is asking for all relief under the parking requirements. The site is one block away from the street car route and bus stops.

The applicant stated that the project would be in two phases. The first phase would be a microbrewery in the back of the building and restrooms serving the entire development. The second phase would be to build a small tap room, a courtyard and fill up the remainder of the building. The applicant also stated that they planned to bring back the original façade. She also stated that they would be adding water harvesting to provide landscape irrigation.

Mr. Fuentevilla spoke about the color of the building and explained that they would try to remove some of the paint striping it down to the brick. He was not sure if they would be able to strip the paint in fear that they would ruin the brick. He stated that they are not pursuing a TRE. He stated that they would like to extend the curb out of the corner of the building in order to get cars pushed out of the pedestrian way and bike corral. He stated that they are not in the historic registry but are in the Warehouse District. He informed staff that they would load in the existing curb cut and loading would take place early in the morning trying to limit the time the loading would be permitted. Mr. Fuentevilla also mentioned that each tenant would have their own trash can.

Mr. Burr questioned if the brewery had an exclusive agreement with Repo to use their parking spaces at night. Staff asked if the building was contributing to historic but was informed it was not although it was still eligible. Staff asked if Jonathan Marbury was aware of the opening of the southern façade. Staff informed the applicant they will have to get a determination from Jonathan Marbury in order to not make the building eligible. The IID states that if it is eligible or contributing it cannot lead to a delisting.

Chris Ganns asked if the applicant would be using historic standards for the restoration of the exterior of the building. He had a concern about the type of noise mitigation that applicant was considering. He had a question about off street loading and how a vehicle using a loading area would back in and out to load.

Ms. Woods stated she was surprised that there was no concern in regards to the trash with the future plan of having two restaurants. In regards to the street trees she would encourage the applicant to communicate with the 4th Avenue group.

Mrs. Laurie asked the applicant to clarify if a section of the wall of the building would remain colored. She stated that they are meeting the Infill Incentive District warehouse standards. Mrs. Laurie also mentioned that parking is one of the variances/modifications that the applicant could request. She said Environmental Services were comfortable with the axis points. Mrs. Laurie informed the applicant that the bicycle parking was permitted, although would need additional permitting from TDOT. She brought up that the patio for the building would be an amenity and hoped to see more pedestrians in the area.

Ms. Shambach had a question about the removal of the handicap spaces to the north, she wondered if it was possible to pull the sidewalk out and relocate the bike corral, which in turn would provide more room for bike maneuverability.

Mr. Cummings stated that the success of the business lies within their hands. Mr. Cummins stated that the first project was to the tap room and the brewery started. He plans to do almost everything concurrently as plans get approved. He said that they are planning on completing the project within a year and a half.

Mr. Neeley stated that his biggest concern was the southeast corner and appreciated that they had widened the sidewalk. He also said that he appreciated in terms and intentions of the IID for a vibrant streetscape, transit, and pedestrian friendly development. He had a concern about the bike corral and was wondering if there was a curb next to the corral. He was wondering if the building would be repainted. He also had a concern that there was not a crosswalk between 6th and 5th Avenue.

Condition: That the building shall remain contributing eligible.

Mr. Burr made a motion to approve the project as presented. Ms. Shambach seconded. Motion carried 3-0

5. Future Agenda Items

Staff explained upcoming cases.

6. Call to the Audience

No audience present.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24