



Infill Incentive District – Design Review Committee

Monday, December 20, 2016 – 4:30 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3rd Floor Large Conference Room

201 North Stone Avenue – Tucson, AZ 85701

Draft Legal Action Report

1. Roll Call

Those present and absent were:

Design Review Committee Members Present:

Michael Keith
William Viner
Chris Gans
John Burr
Lori Woods
Robin Shambach

Absent:

Fred Ronstadt (excused)

Design Professional:

Rick Gonzalez

Staff Members Present:

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

2. Approval of Legal Action Report - November 28th, 2016

The committee voted 6 to 0 to approve the legal action report.

3. IID 15-09-West Pointe Apartments-10 E. Broadway Boulevard

Project Presentation: Philip Carhuff and Vance Goodman from Carhuff + Cueva architects, LLC provided the project overview. Jason Hisey representative for La Fonterra was also present and assisted in presentations. Rod Cook, owner of COPE community services major tenant on the Westerner.

Review of IID: DRC continued conditions from the November 28th, 2016 meeting date. Jason Hisey, owner representative for Cope Community Services and La Frontera, presented as the applicant.

Condition G, parking: Mr. Hisey stated that he spoke to Park Tucson and was working towards an agreement. Mr. Donovan Durban in partnership with the attorney's office where drafting an agreement for the life of the project. A condition of the Certificate of Occupancy will be based on the parking agreement. Mr. Hisey also stated that they would be providing weekly door to door transportation for their tenants, which was a requirement of the qualified allocation plans and a requirement of the services that they provide.

Condition H: Tenant drop off zone. Mr. Carhuff informed the committee that they would have a shared vehicle pick-up and unloading zone, shared on both sides of the facility. He mentioned that there are two accessible entrances on Jackson Street and that the sidewalk has curve ramps along with designated parking spots that the city (TDOT) required. He also mentioned that the front of the building is also accessible from the transit stop, light rail stop, and from the side entrance on Stone Avenue.

Ms. Woods had a question as to where the van pick-up was located and if there was a ramp at the drop off zone. The applicant informed her there was a van accessible space and that there was a curve ramp at the crosswalk along with a depressed sidewalk in front of the van space.

Condition I: Shade study. Mr. Goodman addressed the Shade Study and stated that they had extended the canopies on Jackson Street from 3 feet to 6 feet in order to provide more shade and made the requirements of providing 50% more shade on every side. He also stated that the easements requests were under review.

Ms. Laurie informed the committee that Mr. Goodman was working with the real estate department in order to expand their easement in that area, which was under process. Mr. Hisey informed Mr. Keith that he was working along with real estate and had sent them a legal description. Mr. Carhuff stated that there was aerial easement. Ms. Laurie stated that they are formalizing it with opted to purchase.

Condition J: IID compliance. Provide an enhancement of the upper portion of the west building elevation and east building elevation in order to comply with the IID agreement standards. The biggest concern was the east and west elevation to comply with Section 5.12.7 of the Rio Nuevo Area. Mr. Goodman stated that they had wrapped the east elevation with a 20 foot with EIFS and said that if you looked at it from an angle it looked like a continuous tower. They also mimicked a colonnade of store fronts that wrap around the other side of the building with the two alternating colors. On the west elevation they added some accent color pieces and added some shadow lines.

Mr. Burr asked about the black and white color version of the shadow boxes and stated that it was not clear on the color renditions. Mr. Goodman stated that they were the same shadow boxes on the west side. Mr. Burr wondered if the applicant had explored any attempts to put in stub-outs for potential future retail use. Mr. Hisey informed Mr. Burr there was a 6 inch stub-out on the west side of the building. Mr. Burr informed the applicant that he was specifically speaking about the new now separate building which was the community room that faces Broadway Boulevard. The applicant informed Mr. Burr that it could easily be repurposed.

Mr. Keith wondered if the applicant had considered doing some spandrel on the shadow boxes and mentioned it might help give connectivity to the west and east elevation. Mr. Goodman responded that the east elevation was the fire wall and they were not able to do that.

Ms. Woods had a question about the steel shadow boxes. Mr. Goodman informed Ms. Woods that the steel boxes mounted onto the wall provided shadowing throughout the day.

Mr. Gonzalez brought up the concern about clarifying that they had created two separate property's and were not addressing all the requirements for each one of those; stating this could be an issue in terms of somebody else taking the property at a later date. He mentioned and informed the applicant that they take a look at the criteria in the IID in order to make sure they were covering all the issues in each specific property. Mr. Hisey mentioned that the uses have not changed within the building and that the only issue was the tax credit piece of the building. He also stated that there had to be a separate legal description for the investors to take a position against, and that they have to create a separate ownership interest that the investors take or the City of Tucson who has a home agreement. Copes commitment for office, ground floor, commercial and a residential piece has not changed and they are working with the city to meet all the issues in terms of having two separate ownership entities. Mr. Gonzales informed Mr. Hisey that he still had concerns and that he meet the conditions for each specific property in regards to the design he also mentioned that he would like to see some relief on some of the building elevations.

4. **Future Agenda Items**

Staff explained upcoming cases.

5. **Call to the Audience**

No audience present.

6. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.