

ZONING MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Mazzocco, Zoning Examiner
John Beall, Planning & Development Services
Rick Guerra, City Recording Clerk

=====

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. We're all set. We're all ready to
2 go here. Everybody sit down. Let's keep quiet. Finish your
3 conversation. You're not listening to me. Okay. Okay. We're ready.
4 Okay. Staff, we're going on to the next case.

5 Okay. The next case is C9-16-13. I'm gonna ask for a
6 Staff report. John, go ahead, and everybody be quiet. Be quiet.
7 Enough, okay? We're done. John, speak. So, moving on.

8 MR. BEALL: This is a request by R+R Development (sic) on
9 behalf of the property owner, Trinity Presbyterian Church to rezone
10 approximately 2.79 acres from C-3 and R-3 to Planned Area Development
11 Historic, PAD-H zoning.

12 The rezoning site is located at southeast corner of
13 University Boulevard and 4th Avenue within the West University National
14 Register Historic District in the West University Historic
15 Preservation Zone.

16 This is a companion case to C9-16-12 West University HPZ
17 Boundary Amendment which proposes to remove the Trinity property from
18 the West University HPZ from HC-3 and HR-3 to C-3, R-3 and then
19 replace it with the rezoning to PAD-H zone.

20 The Planned Area Development overview, the PAD zoning
21 standards consist of a single zoning district based on a modified C-3
22 zone. The land uses listed are those permitted within the C-3 zone

1 with the following exceptions not permitted - restricted adult
2 activities, medical marijuana uses, gun shop, pawn shop, liquor store,
3 bar, automotive service and repair, check cashing, tattoo parlor,
4 correction use facility.

5 The PAD will require that group dwelling use and structured
6 parking only be allowed as a special exception land use permitted
7 through the Unified Development Code, Mayor and Council special
8 exception procedure, Section 3.4.4.

9 The PAD limits the maximum number of dwelling units to 111,
10 which is 40 dwelling units per acre, and a maximum building height of
11 50 feet. The Trinity PAD does not allow for - or does allow for
12 reduction in parking from UDC requirements, given this proximity to
13 the modern streetcar, and as a mixed use project having four separate
14 uses, residential, office, retail and religious, the PAD takes an
15 approach to parking for these land uses that have overlapping the
16 parking demand times, depending on work week hours versus weekend and
17 daytime work hours versus, again, evening hours.

18 The PAD is gonna provide 160 off-street parking spaces for
19 the development. The PAD also includes historic preservation
20 standards. The PAD includes the HPZ zone standards based on the UDC
21 Section 5.8, Historic Preservation Zone with only those modifications
22 to allow for the proposed project which includes increased height,
23 allows zero setback on 4th Street, modified surface texture standard to
24 allow materials appropriate to the desert climate, and modified detail
25 standards to omit requirements for specific historic details for new

1 construction. Modify HPZ sign standard to allow a larger signage,
2 maximum area sign of 20 square feet matching the size allowed in the
3 adjacent 4th Avenue standards.

4 The PAD document will allow through a minor amendment
5 process that any future historic landmark designation of the 1924
6 church sanctuary structure is to be considered a non-substantial
7 change to the PAD-H and subject to the historic preservation standards
8 as outlined in the PAD-H document subject to review and recommendation
9 by the City of Tucson, Historic Preservation Officer, and the Tucson-
10 Pima County Historic Commission, Plans Review Subcommittee to formally
11 consider the church nomination for eligibility.

12 The request to rezone the PAD site is consistent with Plan
13 Tucson, and University Area Plan, and West University Area Plan, and
14 for adaptive reuse of the Trinity Church site. Approval of the
15 requested Trinity Church PAD-H is appropriate only if C9-16-12 West
16 University HPZ Boundary Amendment is approved by Mayor and Council.

17 As of to date, 12/01/16, there have been 16 approvals, 11
18 protests. Seven are within the 150-foot protest area boundary.
19 Protest percentage to the north is zero percent. To the south is
20 12.3%. To the east is 26.6%, and to the west is 21%. And that's
21 important because if any percentage is greater than 20%, it requires a
22 super majority vote by Mayor and Council.

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you, John. So, if I
24 understand correctly, the protest and approval is the - exactly the
25 same as the other case, or slightly different?

1 MR. BEALL: Just slightly different.

2 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

3 MR. BEALL: There was - how that worked for (inaudible)

4 ZONING EXAMINER: But we still come out with a super
5 majority in both cases?

6 MR. BEALL: That's correct, -

7 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

8 MR. BEALL: - 'cause we, we sent out to separate mail-outs
9 for the cases.

10 ZONING EXAMINER: And, and there are, within the PAD
11 document, sets of historic preservation standards, is that correct?

12 MR. BEALL: That's correct.

13 ZONING EXAMINER: And any, any development coming forward
14 from this PAD document, if I understand correctly, the process would
15 be able to go to the West University Historic Advisory Board, and then
16 to the Plans Review Subcommittee of the Historic Commission, then on
17 to Planning & Development Services Staff.

18 MR. BEALL: That is correct.

19 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. John, the street, or the sidewalks
20 that adjoin this property, do they have any type of historic
21 designation?

22 MR. BEALL: No.

23 ZONING EXAMINATION: No. Okay. So, they're just generic
24 sidewalks at this point?

1 MR. BEALL: Yeah. They're, they're not regulated by the
2 HPZ overlay.

3 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

4 MR. BEALL: And they also are - do not have historic
5 designation as part of the West University National Register Historic
6 District.

7 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. The special exception, John,
8 that's talked about in here with regard to group dwelling, is that a
9 Mayor and Council special exception? Is that clarified?

10 MR. BEALL: Yes, it is. That's correct. It's Mayor and
11 Council special exception.

12 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. So, turn to the Applicant again,
13 Ms. Dorman. The microphone is yours and present as you think is
14 appropriate for this, understanding we've heard a lot of what you
15 said, but however you want to present is up to you.

16 MS. DORMAN: I will try not to present too much déjà vu.
17 Do I need to state my name and address again?

18 ZONING EXAMINER: Yes.

19 MS. DORMAN: Randi Dorman. I reside at 1001 East 17th
20 Street, Apartment 125, Tucson, 85719. Okay. So, I think we're all
21 clear on background, and even more background.

22 ZONING EXAMINER: So, what you're doing, because they can't
23 see this on the transcript, is you have a slide show. You've covered
24 several of these items in the previous case.

25 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

1 ZONING EXAMINER: And you're just saying these still apply
2 in, -

3 MS. DORMAN: These still apply.

4 ZONING EXAMINER: - in this case. And you're going to give
5 us a document of this power point, and we'll put that in the packet?

6 MS. DORMAN: Absolutely.

7 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

8 MS. DORMAN: I will refer to this slide one more time, -

9 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

10 MS. DORMAN: - which is the project site, 2.79 acres. The
11 two historic structures on the site are the 1924 church right there,
12 and the 1928 bungalow. The other additions in 1937, 1948, 1952, 1955
13 and 1959 are all outside the period of significance for the West
14 University Neighborhood.

15 And just again to review, current zoning is HC-3 on half of
16 the site, and HR-3 on the other half of the site which would allow for
17 high density residential. That's a picture of the original church
18 building which we will be bringing back. Do you need me to review
19 this again the heights, the -

20 ZONING EXAMINER: Mention - again, there's gonna be a
21 transcript, so you could just quickly explain what you're showing.

22 MS. DORMAN: The original church sanctuary is 36 feet tall.

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

24 MS. DORMAN: Prior - the plans that we had been presenting
25 over the past few years, we had used the 51.6-foot height of the

1 Donald Hitch Memorial structure as a height that we promised the
2 neighborhood we would not exceed.

3 At the time, we thought this was the allowable height.
4 Late last year or early this year, we were notified by Shippo that the
5 Donald Hitch Memorial structure at 51.6 feet was, in fact, not a
6 contributing historic structure. And that the only - the tallest
7 contributing historic structure on the site was the original church
8 sanctuary at 36 feet, which then became our allowable building height.

9 Again, I'll summarize why we're doing the boundary
10 amendment and PAD rezoning. Once we discovered that that was the
11 greatest height, we could not do a well-designed viable project at
12 that height.

13 And so, we requested - and we could not do a variance in an
14 HPZ. We designed a beautiful project at under 50 feet that would be
15 appropriate for the neighborhood and would allow market-rate housing
16 and an office project.

17 HPZ's cannot be amended, so our only option was to do the
18 HPZ boundary amendment paired with a PAD-H rezoning. In the rezoning,
19 all of the historic protections remain on the two historic structures,
20 but the rezoning enables consolidation of the HR-3 and HC-3 zoning,
21 height relief, some setback relief, definition of appropriate and
22 sustainable materials for new construction.

23 So, we're essentially asking for one more story of height
24 in exchange for reduced volume in footprint of building to create a
25 better design project.

1 The plan is to create two complementary buildings along 4th
2 Avenue, a mixed use residential building with ground floor retail,
3 about 60 market-rate residential units on site, paid parking for
4 residents, and along between Time Market and the church. A three-
5 story office building with ground floor retail and two floors of
6 office with surface parking for church, office, and retail users.

7 I'm clicking through the diagrams that show what is
8 existing and transitioning to what we are planning, but I won't go
9 into detail, and then the site plan, and what we could build without
10 the rezoning. Again, this is the footprint that is allowable in the
11 existing zoning.

12 Mass - it's broad coverage of the site. And our proposed
13 footprint that is in the PAD in the rezoning is a much reduced
14 building area. This is the allowable building area, but we're gonna
15 be building much less than that here, and the allowable building next
16 to Time - building area next to Time Market.

17 And again, in model form, this is what is allowed by code,
18 the view from 4th Avenue and 4th Street versus what we're proposing with
19 four stories and a stepped-back fourth floor. Much improved porosity
20 view sheds, much better site utilization. Again, on 4th Street and 3rd
21 Avenue what's allowed by code if we build three stories, and what
22 we're proposing. Much more open space, views pushed away from the
23 residential part of the neighborhood. We could build onto this
24 driveway. That's allowed. But within our PAD-H we are pushing back

1 to her. We could build part of the build- -- we could build driving
2 underneath it and build a building here.

3 Again, what's allowable by code, and three stories and then
4 what we are proposing at four stories. And, I mean, just look at the
5 difference in how the church gets surrounded or not. I think I
6 reviewed sufficiently the advantages of four stories versus three
7 stories, so I'll start here.

8 There is no boundary amendment without the corresponding
9 PAD-H. We have met with WUNA and its leadership 11 times since
10 February, and we've incorporated solutions to many of the issues that
11 they've raised into the PAD-H.

12 I want to make sure that everyone understands that a WUSAB
13 representative was on the PAD Review Committee. We work closely with
14 him to insure that WUSAB concerns were addressed. We made revisions
15 based on his recommendations. That was part of the PAD review
16 process.

17 We submitted our first draft to the PAD in July and now
18 we're in December. We made many changes based on feedback. And HPZ
19 design standards were written into the PAD-H verbatim. And any
20 variations are called out in red.

21 I mean you have the documents that you can see. We call it
22 out in red so that it is clearly marked where there is any deviation
23 from the verbatim HPZ standards.

24 So, I'd like to review the standards that we have - the
25 changes to the standards that we have requested. So, obviously, we

1 requested an increased building height from 36 feet to 50 feet. I
2 think I've spoken at length about why.

3 We've asked for zero setback, setbacks on 4th Street in lieu
4 of matching existing prevailing setbacks. This allows us to step back
5 on the fourth floor, and inset on the ground floor. On 4th Avenue as
6 well, if we inset on the bottom, then we can create shaded areas for
7 the retail. So, we've stepped in the ground floor and the fourth
8 floor.

9 I would like to say that on 4th Avenue across the street
10 there's zero setbacks. On 4th Avenue, at the church, there are zero
11 setbacks. The current structure that juts off of the awning is at a
12 zero setback.

13 We've asked to modify surface text- -- the surface texture
14 standard to allow materials appropriate to the desert climate for new
15 construction. So, we feel that in new construction, we should be
16 trying to design durable and sustainable buildings. I think we have
17 enough stick and stucco, low quality buildings in this town. And so
18 we wanted to use durable and desert-appropriate materials and not wood
19 windows which would be not sustainable.

20 We've asked to modify the detail standard to admit
21 requirements for specific historic details for new construction.
22 We have said from our very first meeting with WUNA, our very first
23 meeting. We said we do not do fake historic. We think that fake
24 historic does not honor historic properties. We've been clear about

1 that from day one. And so we like to do what is historically
2 compatible, but not fake historic.

3 We've asked to modify the HPZ sign standard to allow for
4 larger signage matching the size allowed in the adjacent 4th Avenue
5 standard, 20 square feet. And the reason we asked for this is we'd
6 like to call the residential building "The Trinity". And it's ten
7 letters. You can't fit that in eight square feet. And the WUSAB
8 representative was absolutely fine with that.

9 Any future historic landmark designation of the 1924 church
10 sanctuary structure will be considered a non-substantial change to the
11 PAD and subject to the Trinity Presbyterian Church PAD Part 3 Historic
12 Preservations Zone standards.

13 In addition, the applicable Historic Preservation Zone
14 technical standards and design guidelines compatibility for new
15 construction will be reviewed based on the Secretary of the Interior's
16 historic standards for rehabilitation.

17 The Arizona State Historic Preservation Office will be
18 consulted to make a final determination about compatibility if
19 necessary. And this came up in our discussions with WUSAB about what
20 determines new construction that was gonna be compatible with historic
21 construction.

22 And our solution was to go through the current process, but
23 then Shippo, if there is a discrepancy, Shippo will be consulted to
24 make a final determination on compatibility, which we think is highly
25 reasonable. I mean we're not trying to not be compatible. We're just

1 trying to make sure that it's not a moving target and that there is an
2 end determination.

3 Other PAD highlights that are not specifically in the HPZ
4 design standards, as I've mentioned many times tonight, we have
5 reduced building volume in exchange for height, improving view sheds
6 to historic buildings, creating porosity and walkability in the site.

7 We've allowed for porous pavers and stabilized DG because I
8 mean I think we all see when it rains, and the streets, there's no
9 place for the water to go, but we can put water back in the aquifer if
10 we're using porous pavers and stabilized EG in lieu of asphalt
11 everywhere.

12 We have extensive excluded uses. Mr. Beall recited them in
13 his opening summary, but including excluded bars, tattoo parlors and
14 marijuana dispensaries, and also as discussed thoroughly, we have
15 special exception status for both group dwelling and structured
16 parking.

17 I reviewed this before. We have been meeting with WUNA for
18 five years. I have the presentations, not on this plan. As I said
19 earlier, this plan we came to at the end of last year and presented
20 this plan starting in February. We did five formal presentations to
21 WUNA. We attended a meeting to answer questions. We met six other -
22 I mean it's just - it's a lot of meetings. I think you can see a lot
23 of meetings.

24 And so, how we've responded to WUNA feedback. I went
25 through this in the last part of the hearing, but I'm going to review

1 it quickly. We've responded to the desire for permeability,
2 walkability, bikeability, better options for restaurants and retail.
3 We've responded to those things in the design, but also specifically
4 in the PAD we have put many of their concerns right into the code.

5 Sensitive to height, I've talked extensively about stepping
6 back the ground floor and stepping back the fourth floor along 4th
7 Street and 4th Avenue. This was based on casual conversation. I mean
8 we've had meeting after meeting, meeting after meeting.

9 I have notes from meeting after meeting. We've asked for
10 official feedback from the West University Neighborhood Association.
11 We've asked several times, and the first time that we got official
12 feedback from WUNA as a group was yesterday.

13 So, everything that we've done to respond we've done based
14 on trying to listen really hard, and trying to be responsive, and
15 trying to be collaborative, quite frankly. Being collaborative was
16 very important to us in this process.

17 We've talked about being sensitive to additional cars in
18 the neighborhood. You know, there will additional cars. Regardless
19 of what's developed there, there will be additional cars. But we've
20 taken steps to try to mitigate the impact, and by doing a good
21 project, certainly the unwanted activity in the vacant parking lots
22 will be minimized.

23 We talked about no student housing, that we put into the
24 code no group dwelling. The durable materials making the church a
25 landmark. I've reviewed these misconceptions. We're not carving a

1 hole in the HPZ. The proposed PAD-H has no effect on the National
2 Register Historic District. We still have to go through very
3 stringent design review and design standards. And we even have Shippo
4 as a final determination on compatibility.

5 The height, we're asking for one more floor not ten. I
6 think we've talked about the church is not gonna leave their land as
7 is. The church is allowed to develop on their land. They've been
8 good neighbors, and they're allowed to create some financial stability
9 for themselves. I - we have not been threatening. We've been stating
10 factually.

11 I do not consider myself to be intimidating at all, and I
12 don't really know what to even say about that. But we have just been
13 stating what we could develop by current code which would have been so
14 much easier for us to do several years ago, if not a year ago.

15 There's a reason that we're here. We could have done those
16 things already. We want to do something better. We're not doing
17 student housing. Special exception is a onerous process. We do not
18 consider this to be a bad precedent, especially with all of the
19 layers.

20 And we really set out for this to be a positive precedent
21 for thoughtful new construction in a historic neighborhood. New
22 construction is allowed to happen in historic neighborhoods. And in
23 addition, we have informed people and worked with all the necessary
24 groups. I was gonna say ad nauseum, I'll just say a lot.

1 So, we submitted. We, we have - we did have our first
2 meeting with WUNA in 2011. We were clear about our objectives. We
3 expressed how much we wanted this to be a collaborative process. We
4 said, "We do not do fake historic." We were clear from the beginning.
5 But we really wanted this to be a project that everyone would be proud
6 of together.

7 We submitted our first draft of the PAD in July. We've had
8 the following meetings with WUNA since July. August 18th, we met with
9 WUNA leadership. August 20th, we presented to WUNA. September 15th, we
10 met with WUNA. And October 10th, we had our official neighborhood
11 meeting with WUNA.

12 We've given every opportunity for feedback. They have my
13 e-mail, they have my phone number. We've revised our PAD and our
14 design based on unofficial feedback to date, and despite asking, we
15 didn't get official feedback from WUNA until yesterday.

16 We - one request was sent to Mr. Beall a few weeks ago
17 stating that the development group would like structured parking as a
18 excluded use. And so we included the equivalent of that. But there
19 was no other official request to us until yesterday.

20 These are all the, the steps. We already talked about
21 tremendous benefits to the community. I mean the reactivation of an
22 underutilized property. Have you walked by there? Have you walked by
23 the building that completely blocks any access to the site from 4th
24 Avenue. At night, it's scary. I mean there's no windows, there's no
25 openings.

1 The parking lots are completely underutilized. The church
2 is trying to make some money off of their parking, and they're mostly
3 unused. We're trying to reactivate this site that is seriously under-
4 utilized right now. By doing that, the Trinity Church is gonna be a
5 partner with us, and that will help them stabilize financially.

6 We've had maximum porosity for pedestrian access through
7 this site. The reactivated streetscape, high-quality market-rate,
8 multi-generational housing, creative office space with new retail
9 offering. Not student housing.

10 The historic church being brought - façade being brought
11 back to life to the historic standard. All historic preservation
12 protections remain intact on historic buildings. We'd like to become
13 the greenest block in Tucson. That's a goal of ours. We're
14 definitely going to incorporate sustainable practices.

15 People want an opportunity for a live-work lifestyle. We
16 are an all-local design development construction and ownership team.
17 And all of this started because the church wanted to leverage and
18 embrace the City's investment in the modern streetcar.

19 So, again, in conclusion, this process exists within the
20 current code, wasn't modified for us in any way. We will not be the
21 tallest building on the block, let alone the neighborhood. The height
22 exists in and is consistent with the neighborhood. And the choice is
23 not between what's being proposed in the rezoning and the property
24 remaining as is.

1 The church will develop the land, so the choice is between
2 what could be designed within the current code and what we are
3 requesting. And we feel that this rezoning will allow for a far
4 superior project. We appreciate your time and your consideration.

5 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to
6 ask Staff a few questions. And these are directed at Carolyn. This
7 property, it's within the Infill Incentive District boundaries, is
8 that correct?

9 CAROLYN: Yes, Mr. Mazzocco, that's correct.

10 ZONING EXAMINER: And is - there's a subarea from the
11 Infill Incentive District that this particular proposal is within?

12 CAROLYN: Yes. The, the Infill Incentive District has a
13 series of subareas, and the greatest of those is the downtown links.
14 Within the downtown links subarea, there is the 4th Avenue area. And
15 within that area that calls out the historic piece and the commercial
16 retail piece (inaudible) of the street.

17 ZONING EXAMINER: So, so in that it's in the Infill
18 Incentive District, and the Infill Incentive District has a lot of
19 flexibility, why can't this proposal use the Infill Incentive District
20 provisions?

21 CAROLYN: Well, there are two pieces to it. On this site
22 is located within the 4th Avenue historic area which allows for some
23 modifications, some use of prevailing setbacks, parking relief. But
24 it also requires that they stay within the height restrictions of the
25 HPZ boundary.

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. So, that disqualified them from
2 using the Infill Incentive District provisions.

3 CAROLYN: That piece and the, the buildings themselves
4 which will be demolished, there's, there's language -

5 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

6 CAROLYN: - that protects.

7 ZONING EXAMINER: So, when you're in the Infill Incentive
8 District, it is kind of what you might call a special design area.
9 How does the design review process work in the Infill Incentive
10 District?

11 CAROLYN: Well, there are two different design review
12 categories. The first is a major review, which requires review by
13 PDS's Staff, a design professional which we have four of them that we
14 work with. And the Design Review Committee which is made up of five
15 members within the community.

16 They include an architect, a landscape architect, a local
17 developer, and a neighborhood representative for the entire 1200, or
18 1200 acres of Infill Incentive District. And then in this case,
19 there's also an additional member which is the head of the 4th Avenue
20 commercial zone.

21 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

22 CAROLYN: So, that would be a major review.

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

24 CAROLYN: A minor review would be a design professional
25 review, along with the PDS review.

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

2 CAROLYN: There's also a notice (inaudible) difference
3 between the two.

4 ZONING EXAMINER: What normally is looked at in a design
5 review in the Infill Incentive District?

6 CAROLYN: There are things such as lighting, materials,
7 facades, windows, the type of glazing that's used, landscape,
8 pedestrian circulation, environmental services concerns, traffic and
9 neighborhood issues that could come up.

10 ZONING EXAMINER: So, so, this case, when I asked John
11 earlier what design review it's going through, he mentioned that it
12 was the West University Advisory Board, then Historic Plans Review
13 Subcommittee, and then it goes directly to Staff. Is that particular
14 review, in your professional opinion, covering the exact same things
15 as the Infill Incentive District review?

16 CAROLYN: No, it is not.

17 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Okay. Well, okay. I just wanted
18 to compare what, what were the differences in that review versus if it
19 were a project that complied with the Infill Incentive District and
20 went through it.

21 One other question. They, they have a PAD document that
22 has a lot of information in it, and obviously goes into great detail
23 on historic preservation standards. Would you consider that the
24 design information in the PAD document is at the same level as an

1 application that would go to the Design Review Committee for the
2 Infill Incentive District?

3 CAROLYN: I would say not at this time.

4 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. So, that - it's not - it's setting
5 it up, but it's not quite where you would be if you were going through
6 the Infill Incentive District?

7 CAROLYN: That's correct.

8 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Okay. So, now I'm going to go
9 back to our public hearing process here. And I'm going to ask those
10 who are in favor of the case to speak first, and then those who are
11 opposed, and then those who are neutral.

12 So, first I'll call up those who are in favor. Could they
13 show their hands who want to speak in favor? Okay. I'll start with
14 the gentleman in the back, and then I'll go over on this side.

15 MR. HERMAN (ph.): My name is Mark Herman. Reside at 2648
16 East Drachman Street, Tucson, 85716. I'm the owner of Hermano's
17 Craft, Beer & Wine Bar on 4th Avenue, and I'm also the President of the
18 Board of the 4th Avenue Merchants Association.

19 FAMA, 4th Avenue Merchants Association, I'll abbreviate as
20 FAMA - FAMA's Governing Board voted unanimously to issue a letter of
21 support for this project, which I can briefly read it for the record,
22 if that's all right.

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Sure.

24 MR. HERMAN: "It is a pleasure - Dear Mayor and Council and
25 Zoning Examiner: It is a pleasure to express our enthusiastic support

1 for the proposed PAD rezoning of the Trinity Presbyterian Church at
2 400 East University Boulevard."

3 "As representatives of over a hundred merchants along a
4 century-old historic business district, we look forward to this
5 development, and believe that it will enhance the area through
6 creative and forward-thinking activation of an underutilized area of
7 our downtown community."

8 "The design is thoughtful, appropriate, and higher quality
9 than what currently exists. We certainly understand the importance of
10 maintaining the character of historic neighborhoods, well-thought-out
11 development which reflects our values will clearly benefit the
12 neighborhood."

13 "Both buildings will embrace sustainable building
14 techniques, both active and passive, employ smart growth and transit-
15 oriented design principals. In addition, a lush desert landscape plan
16 will transform barren parking lots into verdant landscape that the
17 neighborhood can access and enjoy."

18 "As a stewardship organiza- -- or association, we value
19 sustainable smart growth development, promoting environmental
20 responsible urban living and working. We encourage sensitive, high-
21 quality design, contemporary, compatible architecture which enhances
22 historic design."

23 "Regarding the height request, the difference between 36
24 and 50 feet as one experiences it from the street is minimal. It is
25 the street level that is most important, and street level building and

1 landscape plans enhances our community. Regards, Fred Ronstadt," our
2 Executive Director.

3 And additionally, speaking as a business owner, and I'll
4 preface that these remarks are my own and not, have not been endorsed
5 by the Board. But the merchants on the avenue are doing what they do
6 because they're passionate about their craft. You know, we're
7 passionate about serving the community. For example, many of the
8 businesses hold community meet-ups for non-profits and social groups
9 and many others.

10 However, business as it spreads thinner throughout the
11 greater downtown area, this live-workplace synergy can start to break
12 down when rents and business costs just creep up, as it normally does,
13 and the population, immediate population stays stagnant, which has,
14 which has been the case on the avenue.

15 And while we're passionate and, and we serve a community.
16 You know, we're not just here for convenience. This is our life and
17 our livelihoods. So, I understand the neighborhood and the sentiments
18 that they would like more, more shopping, better shopping, better
19 restaurants. But the vitality of any so-called better options is
20 dubious.

21 No one in their right mind is gonna want to spend hundreds
22 of thousands of dollars or more on a tasteful tenant improvement
23 project without the future growth potential and economy activity to
24 support it. So, I would kindly ask that the voice of the merchants be

1 afforded an appropriate weight in your decision-making. Thank you
2 very much.

3 ZONING EXAMINER: Thank you very much. Okay. There were
4 others in favor? Sir? Yeah, go ahead.

5 MR. LOVEJOY: Thank you. My name is Walter Lovejoy. I
6 live at sixty two oh - 6201 East 5th Street, get my numbers backwards.
7 Unit A-107, Tucson, 85711. I'm the Chairman of long-range development
8 team at Trinity Presbyterian Church.

9 As I said earlier, the church is very excited about this
10 project. We feel that this is gonna be a project that the church, the
11 neighborhood, and the City can be very proud of. It's gonna be a
12 place where people can live and can work. And the most important part
13 about this project is it's gonna be feasible, economically feasible
14 for both the developer and the church.

15 The church is in this for the economic benefit in order to
16 sustain itself so that we can continue to stay where we are at the
17 corner of University and 4th Avenue and bring all of the services that
18 we bring to the City of Tucson. Without the sustainability, who knows
19 what's gonna happen with the church?

20 Our congregation was 3500 in the mid-'50's, one of the
21 largest Presbyterian congregations in the country. Today, we're right
22 at 200. But we still offer many, many services to the City. And in
23 order to do that, to the people of the City. And in order to do that,
24 we need to be financially stable. And this is one way that we can do
25 that. Thank you very much.

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Ma'am?

2 MS. BOELTS: Again, Alison Boelts, 345 East University,
3 85705. Again, to reiterate my comments from before, I'm a third
4 generation native, and I've seen Tucson grow tremendously since I was
5 born and raised here.

6 And I understand the desire to preserve our historic
7 heritage, but I also believe strongly that as a society of people that
8 we need to understand the needs of, of human beings and that the
9 preservation of specific architectural structures is, is very
10 important, but must incorporate growth and change into our thinking
11 about our, our community and the people that live here.

12 And I, I have no desire whatsoever to harm anything that
13 makes us realize where our roots are from and where, where we started.
14 But, at the same time, we need to go into the future and come together
15 as a community by creating places where we can eat and walk and live
16 and go outside and, and see each other.

17 And so, being right there in that neighborhood, it would
18 mean a lot to me and to my neighbors to have this wonderful project
19 where we can all remember our past, but come together and go forward
20 in the future. Thank you.

21 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. See someone else in
22 favor? Okay. Those in opposition? Sir?

23 MR. LANGONE: Sorry about that. My name is Kenny Langone.
24 As I reiterated before, lived in the neighborhood 33 years, owned a
25 home for 29 years. To me the simple math is I've slept in the

1 neighborhood within two blocks of this project for about 10,000 nights
2 or more.

3 Tommy Brown, my friend, his wife Patty. Tommy has slept in
4 the neighborhood 20,000 nights or more. So, when we talk about
5 enhancement, I do feel it's been overlooked, those of us who reside
6 here. My wife, my two-year-old daughter. As I say, we have two homes
7 on 3rd Avenue right across the street, 722, 730 North 3rd Avenue.

8 Since we're talking historic, this home at 722 was built by
9 Mr. Henry Jostadt (ph.) in 1910, renowned architect that is featured
10 in one of the shuttle, excuse me, streetcar stops about the number of
11 structures he's built, including hotels, businesses, as well as many
12 historical residences in the neighborhood.

13 His house, quite obviously, when it was built in 1910 was
14 able to see the Tucson Mountains. So, when these various amendments
15 or additions to the church went up in '48, '59, all the things we've
16 heard, quite obviously, the City wasn't sensitive to things like that,
17 that a renowned person from Norway would go out of his way to build a
18 home - I have pictures of showing like it was built on the moon. But
19 quite obviously, he wasn't alive to see that kind of desecration.

20 As far as correcting the record about things, we've heard
21 how the church is good neighbors, that was said by a person who's not
22 neighbors of the church. We have heard they've been at it for five
23 years as though it's been some kind of burden when, in fact, the
24 questions I have listed, when you read them, you tell me if any of

1 them have been addressed as though you were a person sleeping within
2 the neighborhood.

3 No student aspect of it. We made clear in the meeting
4 where that was brought up. And, in fact, though they can't limit
5 students from being there, they said that they would price students
6 out of the range. And I made the point at that meeting, "Do you see
7 who's driving these \$50,000 cars?" So, economics would not limit
8 students from living there.

9 As far as the layout of the floor plan, they refer to these
10 group dwellings. I think that means a common room, as they used to be
11 called. We haven't seen floor plans, so I don't know about that. I
12 can tell you with the population density pushing the bow of the ship
13 of the entertainment district into the epicenter of West University,
14 which is 4th Avenue and University Boulevard, this will be the death
15 knell of our neighborhood.

16 Just like Penn Station being torn down in New York, Grand
17 Central being desecrated, that this neighborhood is too good, too
18 valuable to let this happen to. On a personal level, I can't
19 understand why anyone would question why I would absolutely opposed to
20 this. Thank you so much for your time, and I would, I would say as a
21 final thing.

22 Please look at the approvals and see how many of them stand
23 to make money off this. How many of them actually live in the
24 neighborhood commenting on our neighborhood? And then when you look
25 at the disapprovals, see how many of them don't stand to make money,

1 and sleep here and vote here and live here and raise children here.

2 Thank you very much.

3 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Okay.

4 MR. GANS: This straddles the line between neutral and
5 opposed. So, I don't - you said there were some (inaudible) and
6 feedback of PDSO today on some of the conditions. Shall I read them
7 out what we are presented?

8 ZONING EXAMINER: I think if you state the date of your
9 letter and how many items, and if you want to just summarize a few of
10 them, 'cause it is in the documentation that I have.

11 MR. GANS: Okay. Before I do that, what I would like -

12 ZONING EXAMINER: Could you say your name and everything
13 for the record.

14 MR. GANS: Oh, yes. Chris Gans.

15 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

16 MR. GANS: 130 East University Boulevard in Tucson.
17 Current President of the Neighborhood Association, West University
18 Neighborhood Association.

19 And just to address something Randi said. Our feedback -
20 our neighborhood is kind of like molasses on a cold night. Everything
21 moves slow and it gets kind of sticky. So, we, we actually got our
22 final document done Tuesday night, sent in to Mr. Beall early
23 Wednesday morning. So, that's the process (inaudible)

24 The other part I just wanted to say because there seems to
25 be some confusion amongst some people is that while this process

1 removes, does remove the property from the HPZ, it does permanently.
2 It does put some (inaudible) some of the conditions of Historic
3 Preservation Zone back into the PAD-H, but is not an HPZ any longer at
4 that point.

5 So, I just - that's - some people hear that, and hear an
6 interpretation, or hear their own interpretation, so it does remove
7 that. And maybe at some point in the future we need to explore a
8 different process for amending or the variance or whatever, HPZ's that
9 don't remove properties from historic - from HPZ.

10 It does create holes, and it does create an issue at some
11 point where it may be just a patchwork of holes in a neighborhood.
12 This was submitted early morning, November 30th, I believe, to Mr.
13 Beall, is that correct?

14 ZONING EXAMINER: Correct.

15 MR. GANS: And there are a couple of things I'd like to add
16 to that, that are not in that. One would be number 24, the final
17 total cubic yards of volume shall not exceed 53,000 cubic yards of
18 volume as stated by the developers.

19 And there should be additional design review. Maybe the
20 IID design review process which tends to be a little more rigorous
21 than the historic review process (inaudible) if it gets to that point.
22 And I realize they're tied together, so one follows the other, and so
23 whatever happens on that.

24 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

1 MR. GANS: Oh. One last thing. I noticed in the traffic
2 study under expended trips. I don't know if it's a typo or what. But
3 on the first paragraph on page four, it said the first building,
4 building one will be located on 4th Avenue where the current education
5 annex building is located, and will be a mixed use residential and
6 retail building.

7 There'll be 9100 square feet of special retail use, which
8 includes approximately 1946 square feet of outdoor space on the ground
9 level. Above retail and dining space will be two stories of
10 apartments. And I thought it was actually three. What this, what
11 this states as two stories it should be corrected.

12 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay.

13 MR. GANS: Okay.

14 ZONING EXAMINER: Anybody else? Okay.

15 MR. BURR: John Burr, 424 South 4th - 5th Avenue, 85701. I
16 was looking over the, the WUNA comments, and I've kind of followed
17 along this process. And I'm glad you brought up the IID standards a
18 little better because that got my mind thinking.

19 I don't think this PAD as presented is yet finalized. I
20 see a lot of little like problems. I've seen actual development plans
21 that have been floated to the neighborhood. They're not a part of the
22 PAD. You only get the floor plan. They talk about this giant mass
23 reduction, and no structured parking, no student housing. And yet,
24 the PAD asks for structured parking, student housing and only

1 guarantees a minimum footprint reduction of 10%. Not - it opens the
2 door.

3 I also don't think what's - if you're going to remove the
4 Trinity property and only protect the historic church by WUNA
5 standards, but you take it away from the WUSAB area, then why wouldn't
6 you mandate that it become a landmark and preserve the Arthur Brown
7 pieces intact as well? It will have new standards and keep Trinity
8 intact.

9 The problem with this whole thing, by putting this PAD in
10 and doing the rezoning, it changes what goes - the zoning rules that
11 go with this lot imperpetuity (sic). If a different designer is
12 proposed after the PAD is approved, if Trinity decides to sell the
13 church and go, move down the street to a little building because
14 their, you know, their membership has shrunk, there's still all these
15 things. And there, and there aren't enough design standards.

16 So, I hope that you would continue this until a better PAD
17 is developed that would provide more standards of what really happens
18 to the actual Trinity church site that's carved out, not the 1936 -
19 24, 36-foot high building, but the Arthur Brown buildings which could
20 be arguably of local significance. Almost all of the Arthur Brown's
21 buildings have been torn down in Tucson.

22 I don't think also this PAD sets out things. I understand
23 and respect the current developers' position that they don't want to
24 do Disney-like detailings and fake historic. But they're not saying

1 what they will do. And that does beg the question, what are the
2 actual design standards?

3 We've already moved some of the things that are HP- -- or
4 WUNA HPZ standards, or West University standards. But we haven't
5 defined the good design that is part of this PAD that goes back in.
6 And so, I would like you to see - to add in as a condition that it
7 goes through a modified design review process similar to what goes on
8 in the IID for this particular area to insure a better design, no
9 matter who builds this project, no matter who owns it once you change
10 the zoning on the ground permanently. Thank you.

11 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Anybody
12 want to say anything on a neutral level? Okay. First Richard then -

13 MR. MAYERS (ph.): Richard Mayers. I live at 624 North 3rd
14 Avenue. I'm in sight of this (inaudible) from my porch. I think I'll
15 be able to see it quite well.

16 So, the height is, is, is frightening me 'cause it's
17 something that isn't there now. And I think there's just a lot of
18 fear that comes from, from the neighborhood. And it's exasperating
19 for the developer. I understand Randi's exasperated. I can hear it
20 in her voice. Sometimes we just have to flip out a little bit.

21 What can I say? I'll say some things that I like about the
22 development. First of all, I think I'm the person who introduced the
23 concept of an open site plan and permeability. That's what I asked
24 for in that first meeting that we met with them. And I appreciate the
25 developers listened to me and honored my request.

1 I'm also the person who really pushed the no structured
2 parking. And again, the developers listened to me and honored my
3 request and I appreciate that. I also don't have any problems with
4 the exception process for adding the two precluded uses of group
5 dwellings and structured parking because I understand from
6 conversation, from conversations with John Beall that there's
7 absolutely no difference between doing it that way and doing it the
8 other way where you'd do a major amendment to the PAD.

9 Both, both times you end up in front of the Zoning Examiner
10 with a vote up or down by Mayor and Council. So, however you want to
11 do it is fine. I appreciate that those uses are not readily available
12 for someone who's developing the property.

13 The process thing with neighborhoods is fraught. The, the
14 whole thing that, that you have to - that the minimum unit that the
15 City of Tucson recognizes is a neighborhood association makes all the
16 stuff around development and, and neighbors really, really difficult
17 'cause people invariably are gonna come out of the woodwork because a
18 neighborhood association is not a neighbor. They're not the
19 residents. They're, they're - it's just this thing that the City
20 recognizes, and that's why we have them. And, and participation wanes
21 and waxes, and you're never gonna reach anybody.

22 It's frustrating for me. I mean I went door-to-door to get
23 someone - and posting notices that get people to show up at a meeting
24 that Randi and her team graciously attended, you know, just start get
25 the word to people that were not hearing this.

1 But personally, I don't, I don't - I do really neither
2 support nor, nor oppose this development. It's, it's, it's - I just
3 don't know. And as the Vice-President of WUNA, I don't want to play
4 God, so I'm out of it. Anyway, thank you for your time.

5 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. And this gentleman
6 here.

7 MR. HENDERSON: Thank you. Scott Henderson, 529 East 4th
8 Street. And I chose neutral because I really want to emphasize that
9 this is, as Richard said, a very difficult thing. I'm, I'm somewhat
10 on the line on it except with respect to a couple of points.

11 I listened carefully to those who spoke in favor of it.
12 And I agreed with almost every single word they said. I really did.
13 But what I'm not convinced of is that this project can't go forward
14 without doing this rezoning, that a successful project couldn't be
15 pulled off very similar without doing this process. And this is a,
16 this is a hell of a process to really set up and go through. We
17 better make sure that we know that we're doing it.

18 I had a conversation with our, with our two R's, Randi -
19 and I'm sorry. Rob. I'm sorry, Rob. And, and I said, "Couldn't we
20 get some third parties or some objective people that wouldn't reveal
21 financial numbers, but could, could support this claim that you have
22 to do it this way? And that would put everybody at ease, and kind of
23 set this - the big, one of the biggest sticking points to rest.

24 And I don't know why we couldn't have something like that.
25 But what was thrown back to me was, "Well, why don't you get a

1 developer to come, you know, talk about this and evaluate this?" And
2 I have, and that developer did not agree that this four-story was
3 necessary to, to develop a profitable - that this process was not
4 necessary to develop this and pull this off in a beautiful and
5 profitable way.

6 So, perhaps if there would be some way that we might have a
7 little bit more discussion around this. I think a lot of members of
8 the neighborhood really did kind of come on late. People haven't been
9 able to understand and think about this.

10 I don't want to delay this, nobody does, but if there were
11 a way to have more productive conversations about it, it might be the
12 greater consensus could be reached which would be good for everyone.

13 So, I just leave as a, as a suggestion to - with that, I
14 would be able to perhaps be convinced that we would need to go this
15 way or we could find another path. At this point, it's very hard for
16 me to know. So, I have - that's why I've, you know, stated my case
17 against the rezoning. Thank you.

18 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Dorman, I take it
19 nobody has - wants to say anything, that that was the person I saw.
20 Okay. Let's you and I talk a little bit here.

21 You know, my role in this is to look at documentation, take
22 testimony, and eventually make a recommendation to the Mayor and
23 Council. You know, I've heard a lot now and I, and I have a letter
24 here that, that you referred to, that you only had a day to kind of
25 look at it. And even Staff had a day to look at it. And they did

1 their best for me to try to say, "I don't think that's enforceable.
2 That seems okay," you know, etc., etc.

3 I, I also took note of a statement that you said. Is that,
4 you know, you've been trying to work in a collaborative way with West
5 University. And I've worked with West University, and I find them to
6 be tough, but I also find them to be fair. And -

7 MS. DORMAN: We, we don't mind the tough part.

8 ZONING EXAMINER: Yeah. So, what I'd like to do is I want
9 to ask if we can continue this to December 15th, that's two weeks from
10 now, not a long time. And if we can have a meeting with you, and your
11 team, and I would like Chris, if he would agree, to put together, not,
12 not ten or fifteen, but, you know, a couple of people, to represent
13 West University and, and discuss this letter.

14 And I'd like Staff to be involved with this, too, because I
15 think Staff is saying, "Some of this we can't enforce." And it can't,
16 you know, it can be a gentleman's agreement or however you want to do
17 it, but it can't be enforced through Staff. I think there may be
18 still some points of consensus that you can reach, and I think there's
19 other points you're not gonna agree on. And I'm okay with that.

20 MS. DORMAN: May I say something -

21 ZONING EXAMINER: Sure.

22 MS. DORMAN: - for the record?

23 ZONING EXAMINER: Sure.

24 MS. DORMAN: So, in addition to meeting with WUNA and their
25 representatives 11 times in the last nine months, -

1 ZONING EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

2 MS. DORMAN: - on September 15th, WUNA initiated a
3 neighborhood meeting where they had a note-taker, -

4 ZONING EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

5 MS. DORMAN: - and we were happy to attend and participate
6 in that meeting. And I have the notes right here. They were not part
7 of the PAD 'cause they were really for reference. And then, of
8 course, we have our official neighborhood meeting. That was well
9 attended and well recorded.

10 And since our official neighborhood meeting, the
11 neighborhood has had meetings where we specifically were not allowed
12 to attend, even to correct - not to present, but to correct
13 misinformation to help prevent things from spinning out of control, to
14 keep things focused, and also to hear more feedback, because we've,
15 we've - I mean, Mr. Beall knows we've taken every opportunity to
16 revise this document.

17 It struck me as highly curious that in the letter that we
18 rece- -- that Mr. Beall received, we didn't even receive it,
19 yesterday, of the 23 items - maybe six or seven were mentioned in any
20 of these meetings that we attended. It's - we've worked really hard
21 and we want this to be a great process and a great project.

22 I appreciated Richard's comments. I don't mind being
23 exasperated when I'm playing against - when I'm playing on a level
24 playing field. So, when I'm not, then it's challenging. It's bad
25 business.

1 I think that we have operated in a very honorable way with
2 this neighborhood, and I'm happy to discuss more. But I would like to
3 emphasize to you and to the Planning & Development Services
4 Department, I would like you to recognize the changes that we have
5 already made in this PAD.

6 I do not want the document that was received yesterday to
7 be a starting point. We started, we started a long time ago in
8 earnest. And so, I just don't want us to start with this as some kind
9 of compromise. We started compromising a long time ago, and we were
10 not met, not even close to halfway. And I'd like to be on the record.

11 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. And it's on the record. So, let
12 me continue my comments.

13 MS. DORMAN: Okay.

14 ZONING EXAMINER: And, and my directions because now you're
15 in front of me.

16 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

17 ZONING EXAMINER: And I'm not them.

18 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

19 ZONING EXAMINER: Okay. So, what I'm asking is you go
20 through this letter again and, and see if there are any consensus
21 points. I'd like to know that, and I don't know that. And there are
22 probably things that Staff's gonna tell you that they're - they can't
23 enforce that. So, I'd like that to go through.

24 The only thing I'd like to go, you to go through, and I'm
25 just throwing this out there, and I'm asking what you're going to come

1 back with, is the current design review process is pretty good for
2 historic review, considering it's in the Infill Incentive District.
3 I'd like that to be explored if that is something that could be added
4 to this process. I'm not - just asking a question.

5 And this is in no way intended to disparage Rob Paulus
6 because I think he's a great architect. It's just, it's a, it's a
7 process that's - this is happening in a special design area. This is
8 setting a precedent in that area. And I think I'd like to set a
9 precedent that we always go for the best in design. And I think Rob
10 reflects that as a person and a, and an architect.

11 MS. DOEMAN: Thank you.

12 ZONING EXAMINER: The group dwelling thing, I'd like you to
13 tell me what you think about that, and just a reflection on that.
14 Right now, it's set up to go through Mayor and Council special
15 exception.

16 I, I would just say to you, do you really want to go
17 through that brain damage? Is it worth having that in the document?
18 And if your answer is "yes", then so be it. But, I, I think that's
19 something that you should - I, I just want to - I'm asking a question.
20 You don't have to answer it. I'm just saying -

21 MS. DORMAN: Actually, can I ask you for clarification?
22 I'm confused.

23 ZONING EXAMINER: What I'm saying is right now you're
24 recommending in your document that group dwellings be a special
25 exception, and go through Mayor and Council process.

1 MS. DORMAN: Right. We're trying to make it difficult to
2 do group dwelling at the request of the neighborhood.

3 ZONING EXAMINER: Right. Right. And I'm wondering why not
4 just take it out? And, and I'm just saying, I'm posing that as a
5 question. And if you come back and say, "We thought about it. Thank
6 you for your input. We'd prefer to have it in." I'm just asking
7 that, okay?

8 I'd like Staff to just confirm to me that the HL process
9 that you have here is, is again, the appropriate process. That's a
10 small point. But, and the other thing I'd like to look at a little
11 bit more deeply, and if the design review process takes this into
12 consideration, and it's not a historic issue, is the streetscape.

13 While I would expect that to be well done by you, the thing
14 that, I don't want to say it concerns me, but it's - well, I guess it
15 does concern me - is that whatever you do is setting the precedent for
16 the rest of 4th Avenue.

17 And I would like people to go into this with their eyes
18 open, that what you're doing is you're kind of telling the rest of 4th
19 Avenue, and other developments what a best practice streetscape should
20 be. So, I would like more emphasis on that as to kind of -

21 MS. DORMAN: Okay.

22 ZONING EXAMINER: - either more detail or it has a process
23 where there's a broader input into it. And those are my points, and I
24 hope it's clear enough for you, and I hope it's clear enough for
25 Staff, and I hope it's clear enough for you. And when you come back

1 on December 15th, we can have that discussion. I'm keeping both items
2 open.

3 I'll, I'll limit the amount of time that we'll discuss
4 them, but I'm hoping that that's all we do. And we're, we're moving
5 on from there.

6 MS. DORMAN: Can I please ask a clarification?

7 ZONING EXAMINER: Uh-huh.

8 MS. DORMAN: Who initiates the meeting that happens between
9 now and December 15th with WUNA?

10 ZONING EXAMINER: I would ask you to work with John because
11 I'm asking Staff to kind of help with that letter that they
12 participated in. And hopefully we have a room, or Planning &
13 Development Services has a room they could use in the interim between
14 now and then to accommodate everyone. Okay?

15 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

16 ZONING EXAMINER: And with that, the two items are
17 continued, but tonight's hearing is closed for now. So, thank you all
18 for coming.

19 MS. DORMAN: Thank you.

20 (The hearing was closed and two items continued to December
21 15, 2016.)

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the original tape recorded conversation in the case reference on page 1 above.

Transcription Completed: 12/14/16

/s/ Kathleen R. Krassow
KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner
M&M Typing Service