



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 15, 2021
Virtual Meeting**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 6:32 pm when a quorum was established with seven members present: Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Mr. Glenn Furnier, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Maurice Roberts, Mr. Robijn van Giesen.

Members absent: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. Pat O'Brien

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO

Guests: Mr. Scott Neeley and Mr. Jim Sauer, architects; Mr. Michael Shiner, property owner; Mr. Ken Taylor, IT

2. Approval of Minutes – December 14, 2021

The LAR/ Minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. It was noted that the meeting had occurred on 14 December, not 12-21, and that Mr. Furnier's name had been misspelled. Mr. Beal made a motion to approve the LAR/ Minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Erickson. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 7 in favor; 0 opposed, (2 members absent).

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Reviews

North Side of 18th Street Between Herbert Avenue and 4th Avenue

Flexible lot development to construct six (6) single family house
Courtesy Review/Vacant Property

Mr. Sauer began the presentation by introducing the team. The property owner is Michael Shiner. He is a Tucson native and UA/ Eller School MBA graduate, owner of CXT Realty (in the Barrio) and Armory Park (del Sol) neighborhood resident (since 2015), along with his wife Melissa and their 2 children. He was selected by the Elias family to purchase the properties in 2021.

Scott Neeley Architecture is the architectural firm and includes both Mr. Sauer and Scott Neeley, who presented the overview of the project. Essentially it is a Flexible Lot Development (FLD) project of six new residences (including one ADU unit) on approximately .4 acres (two parcels). The goal was to create a positive streetscape that was pedestrian friendly. A large southern ROW along 18th Street is envisioned as a garden buffer.

The homes are designed with a hierarchy of their placement on the lots and reflect a diversity of sizes and designs as seen in the larger neighborhood. The development zone is large as the lots encompass 2 corners and face both a major and minor avenue, as well as a cross-street. The lots will range from c. 2400 to 5000 ft. sq. and the structures will range from c. 1500 to 2400 ft. sq. with a lot coverage range of 62-70%.

The heights were determined by structures in the development zone and range from 15' 0" ADU, 16'3" parapeted structures, 24'2" gabled roof structure roof peak.

The largest lot /structure is on the corner of 4th Avenue and 18th Street. It is intended to face both frontages, is a one and a half story structure with a gabled roof and large dormer to accommodate a second-floor master suite. A 2-car garage slightly set back from the facade and an ADU unit will be on this new parcel. The mid-block house on 18th St. is the next largest dwelling, with a single garage, covered entry and parapet roof, with a central courtyard. The four smaller residences will face Herbert Avenue in series, with two types of floor plans (two with interior courtyards), a single garage each, and awning style window covers.

Design- wise, all will be stuccoed, with double hung windows, and with metal awnings and fences. The single gabled roof design appears to feature a metal roof. Window materials may include either clad wood or fiberglass proposals. The team then asked for feedback.

The Board thanked the team for coming early in the process. Items of discussion/ guidance were:

- *Lot sizing and setbacks:* The street facing setbacks are currently at 6' with 3' separating the buildings and along the northern property lines. The Board request the team to consider 5' rather than 3' distances to allow for ADA access around the structures. A potential re-envisioning might include duplex structures with more space around structures but could complicate SFR sales.
- *ADU unit:* It was noted that there were no small ADU type units on major Avenue frontages generally in the district at large. The ADU ordinance suggests rear or side yard placement to reduce impacts to principal streetscapes. It was requested that the unit be set back from 4th Avenue, behind primary facade planes and possibly be reoriented with its entrance into a shared access to maintain streetscape patterns, even if the lot may eventually legally face 18th Street. It was also noted the 4th Avenue facade of the largest structure should be better developed to appear as the primary facade, including window size and placement.
- *Garages and Parking:* Armory Park design guidance is that garages face minor Avenues or Streets but not major Avenues. Several board members suggested lowering the height of garage parapets or setting back garage facades to be

more compatible with development zone and area standards for compatibility of volumes and massing.

- *Design details and materials:* Alternative materials may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Fiberglass windows of an historically compatible design could be considered.
- Fences can be metal; open on major facades, solid on secondary facades but should be the 6' zoning standard not 7' or 8' as is apparently shown on the proposal. Designs for the awnings and other details may be considered for new construction but should be compatible. Smooth finish stucco and flush mounted skylights are area standards. If roof decks are planned, streetscape visible external staircases are generally discouraged.
- *Other considerations:* It was suggested that underground structures/piping for a former large water tower on the site are likely still on the southwest quadrant. The tower was approximately 75' H, 40' D and was likely in place from the 19-teens to early 1950's. Another major concern from prior reviews of FLD plans would be utility easements and setbacks requirements (usually 10') that may affect the plans and structure siting. It was suggested these issues should be addressed before a major design phase is undertaken. Several Board members suggested that 5 rather than 6 structures might make site utilization more compatible.

Action Taken: None- courtesy review.

5. Board Elections

The Chair noted that three positions were up for renewal for calendar 2022: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary.

- Martha McClements was nominated for Chair by Mr. Burr, seconded by Ms. Erickson.
Ms. McClements was elected Chair 2022 by acclamation.
- Mr. van Giesen was nominated for Vice- Chair by Mr. Beal, seconded by Ms. McClements.
Mr. van Giesen was elected Vice- Chair 2022 by acclamation.
- Mr. Burr offered to serve again as Secretary. Ms. McClements seconded, noting that Ms. Bachman Williams might serve as an alternate later.
Mr. Burr was elected Secretary 2022 by acclamation.

6. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Ms. McClements asked Mr. Beal if he would make a renewed attempt at an edit for the Board to review. Mr. Furnier also offered to also try. It was noted that Ms. Bachman Williams had also previously volunteered to make an edit. Mr. Ken Taylor, IT, noted that he had made a streamlined draft revision of version 5.3 and would make that draft available for all board members. It is hoped that a new revised draft may be considered by the Board in the coming few months.

7. Call to the Board

Specific Updates:

- Ms. Erickson noted that the Historic Landscape Sub-Committee was working on revised guidance, especially for historically appropriate plant replacements in historic landscapes with drought tolerant species and would include established precedents.
- Mr. Burr noted that Mayor & Council had initiated a revisiting/ review of the Infill Incentive District (IID) ordinance in advance of its sunset date in early 2023. It will include stakeholder meetings, possible code revisions and boundary changes/ expansions. Updates will be made on the process as it comes.
- Mr. Roberts reported that Zillow was predicting an 18.1% rise in values in 85701 by 2023.
- Mr. van Giesen asked about a state legislature push for eliminating single family zoning statewide. Ms. Brown noted some of the concerns about HB 2674 and that COT, Phoenix, and AZ League of Cities (among others) have opposed the problematic bill. It was also noted that the bill appears to have died in committee but could be revisited later in the session.
- Ms. McClements noted that there was still no update on the Peach proposal to respond to. Apparently, a revision of zoning request for 375 S. Stone Ave. has been made but not yet approved for review by the COT.
- The bulk of the item discussion was an update on the separation of the TPCHC. Ms. McClements and Ms. Erickson are on the stakeholder committee. Ms. Brown provided the update:
 - The 2-9-22 TPCHC meeting had a major update and discussion (audio available).
 - The COT had Michael Baker Jr. Inc. do a status report and comparison of best practices in Phoenix AZ, Pasadena CA, and Salt Lake City UT. Staff had requested specific reviews of 1) Historic interiors; 2) Work Without Permits policies, including the potential for fines; 3) De-listings and a process that might include “findings”; 4) Deconstruction including possible reuse guidelines for historic materials; and others.
 - The initial Stakeholder group was 15 but has now been extended to 35 members. The first meeting will be on 2-17-2022. Members include Commission Chair and Vice Chair; Chairs of Advisory Boards; Executive Director of the Tucson Preservation Foundation; architects, developers, property lawyers, Sunshine Mile owners, some homeowners who have gone through the process, and others.
 - Ms. Brown noted that TPCHC meetings will have the major updates. She is willing to provide updates to us, also, and that the COT was committed to maintaining neighborhood/ advisory board input into the process. The County will follow the City’s lead.
 - Ms. Brown also noted that review problems vs. final build of projects is still through the process of Code Enforcement, but that Permit Reviews are also helping ensure projects are built as approved.

8. Future Agenda Items Information Only

Ms. Brown noted that no major projects were likely to come for review in March but would keep the board posted.

Ms. McClements noted a minor review (437 S. 5th Ave., for window replacements) was in process but not yet scheduled. Another potential minor review may be for gutters.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be March 22, 2022.