



Infill Incentive District – Design Review Committee
Friday, May 11th, 2018 – 11:30 a.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:

Present:

- Chris Gans
- John Burr
- Lori Woods
- Robin Shambach
- Kathleen Eriksen

Absent:

- Bill Vainer

Design Professional:

- Scott Neeley (Not present)

Staff Members Present:

- Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services
- Andrew Connor, Planning & Development Services
- Maria Gayosso, Planning & Development Services
- Elisa Hamblin, Planning & Development Services

2. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair

Motion made by Robin Shambach, second by John Burr for Chris Gans and John Burr, to remain as chair and co-chair, respectively.
The committee unanimously agreed to approve.

3. Approval of Legal Action Report -

The committee unanimously agreed to approve the legal action report.

4. IID-17-01 The Flin – Courtesy Review (T17SA00465, DP17-0038)

Introduction by Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services

a. Project Presentation by Applicant

Design architects and presenters: Tatyana L. Bresler, & Evan S. Eglin, of Elgin & Bresler Architects, and Matt Stuart of Cypress Civil Engineering

Applicant explained the scope of work and that the project would consist of 243 Multi-family units incorporated into historic structures.

Applicant presented the 4 challenges of the project design:

- 1) Odd shape of property and most of the site being land locked;
- 2) Presence of historic buildings;
- 3) The commercial viability of the land use; and
- 4) Architectural precedence of building design downtown.

Applicant also presented design team reaction to challenges:

- 1) Enhance historic buildings as commercial use, stand on their own;
- 2) Multifamily use for new buildings oversized windows, recessed balconies and completely permeable with Eckbo plaza;
- 3) Complexity of shape, towers placed to profile views from inside and outside;
- 4) Strong breakage on the top level to enhance skyline;
- 5) Two main entrances from Church Ave & Eckbo pathway;
- 6) Open deck facing Church Ave and lobby complementing Eckbo landscape; and
- 7) Exterior surface materials selected to avoid randomness.

b. Staff Preliminary Remarks

- 1) The Flin chose to go through IID process asking for several modifications that are reasonable and in harmony with IID;
- 2) Staff is working with applicant to refine design;
- 3) HLS has created website to keep inform public;
- 4) Positive Historic Plans Review Subcommittee recommendations; and
- 5) Would like to clarify design options before official review

c. Applicants response to Design Professional Findings / Recommendations (No legal action taken the following items were discussed by applicant and committee).

Streetscapes:

- 1) Applicant: Church is the only access possible for loading and parking, access from Broadway is not viable because of grade changes;
- 2) Site at this time not economically feasible for commercial use on first floor along Eckbo;
- 3) Private courtyard will open quarterly to general public;

- 4) Residence will access from Church and Eckbo;
- 5) Historic buildings will include space;
- 6) Amenities for residence will be placed on the upper stories along Church Ave; and
- 7) Facade facing Broadway now includes balconies & windows.

Committee's Discussion on Architectural Design:

- 1) Not convinced that there are no commercial opportunities along Eckbo side of property;
- 2) What is the final color palette? Accent colors are in narrative, but in the elevations;
- 3) Prefer to see first floor amenities, no dead corridors and access to La Mesilla Park and Samaniego House; and
- 4) No public access between stables and Eckbo landscape.

Committee's Recommended items to include on IID application:

- 1) Engagement with TCC and Eckbo;
- 2) Water use (Harvesting);
- 3) Landscape in general;
- 4) Energy efficiency, use of roof gardens and solar; and
- 5) Scaling with relationship to historic buildings.

5. Future Agenda Items

Staff explained upcoming cases.

6. Call to the Audience

No audience present.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.