



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 15, 2022
Virtual Meeting**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm when a quorum was established with eight Members present: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Mr. Glenn Furnier, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Pat O'Brien, Mr. Maurice Roberts, Mr. Robijn van Giesen.

Members absent: Mr. Tom Beal.

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO, moderator. Ms. Brown recorded the meeting for COT.

Guests: Mr. Cade Hayes & Mr. Jerrick Tsosie, architects with DUST (4a, 4b); Mr. Bill Mackey, Worker Architecture PLC, Mr. Chris Leighton, Peach Properties & Ms. Robin Large, Lazarus & Silyvn PC (4c); Mr. Ken Taylor, IT; Mr. Daniel Fleury, resident; Ms. Natalia Hayes; Mr. Ben Johnson & Ms. Lori Van Buggenum, residents; Ms. Susan Knight, resident; Ms. Mia Madrid; Ms. Kristin Olsen-Garewal, resident; Mr. Patrick Rooney, resident; Ms. Etoile Wichnevetski, resident; and two unknown callers.

2. Approval of Minutes— February 15, 2022

The LAR/ Minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. Mr. van Giesen made a motion to approve the LAR/ Minutes as presented, seconded by Ms. Erickson. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 8 in favor; 0 opposed, (Mr. Beal, absent).

3. Call to the Audience

Ms. Brown noted that about 15 comments had been received prior to the meeting (3 after the cutoff time). Ms. Brown forwarded all comments to the Board prior to the meeting. All were related to item 4c.

At the request of the Board, the comments were read into the record of the meeting and will be attached to the LAR by Ms. Brown. Three of the comments

were in favor of the proposal, 11 against. Of note, six of the comments were from adjacent residents/owners who were all generally opposed. The primary issues noted were **parking** (lack of/impacts); **traffic** (increase); **height** (3rd story); **density** (number of units (85)/ compatibility to area uses (SFR); **building form** (size, scale, and mass); **setbacks** (0' vs. prevailing); **precedents** (lack of in HPZ).

The comments were read into the record in the following order (not as received/ sent), with those in support first, opposed following. Comments were made by: Kristin Olsen-Garewal; Amy Jorgenson; Daniel Fleury; Jim Woloshin; Barrie Wolf; Patrick Rooney; Mark Losleben; Susan Knight; Ben Johnson; Betty Fulcomer; Etoile Wichnevetski; Patricia Engle; Danielle Beadry; Steve Grede; Alexandra Pearce (not read). ***Please see attached comments at the end of the LAR.***

4. Reviews

a. 807 (803) S 4th Avenue

Construction of an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and carport structure. Courtesy Review/ Contributing Resource.

Mr. Hayes and Mr. Tsosie, architects with DUST, presented the design concept to the Board. The property is at the southeast corner of S. 4th Avenue and 18th Street. It is an (estimated) 1870's Sonoran Transformed contributing structure facing 4th Avenue, on a 6098 ft. sq. lot. The current owner, Mr. Ken Godat, would like to build a +/-600 ft. sq. ADU unit and a carport (over existing parking area) along the 18th Street frontage, about 3.6' from the north property line, just inside (2.9') of an existing masonry wall. The footprints shown are for an approximately 16' x 36' ADU and a 10' x 20' carport. Mr. Hayes showed a perspective drawing of a potential simple box building form (wall height 12') with either a shed or hipped roof form, both of which are elements of the contributing structure. Mr. Godat would like to align the new structures with the north facade of the contributing structure to allow for retention of established trees and landscaping in the rear yard. The proposal also requests the demolition of an existing shed in the rear yard. The applicant suggested waivers of street setbacks may require a DDO process in addition to HPZ reviews.

The Board thanked Mr. Hayes for coming to a courtesy review early in the design phase and suggested the HPZ review process may not require a separate DDO. As this is the first ADU on a contributing property proposed in the HPZ, consultation with COT will be needed. The proposal appears to conform with the recent ADU amendment to the UDC. Consultation with the adjoining property owner to the east should be encouraged because of the proposed reduced setback of the carport structure to the east property line.

Generally, the Board was supportive of aligning the north facades of the new structures with the contributing structure to allow for retention of existing trees and general/ prevailing development standards within the development zone. The Board did note that carport should not project northwards more than that line. The Board also noted that the ADU should be lower in height than the contributing structure whichever roof form is eventually proposed. The Board was also pleased that the general building form appears to be compatible with contributing structure.

The Board did have significant concerns over the demolition proposal for the existing shed. Both the 1994 National Register map and the current COT HPZ map show 2 contributing accessory structures in the rear yard. Mr. Hayes was unaware of a second structure and believed the existing shed was a non-contributing, newer structure. Ms. Brown noted that a determination of non-contributing status should be made by her office, after further review.

The Board again thanked the design team for coming in before a formal proposal is made, suggesting another courtesy review with more information about the shed structure and a fleshed-out design with elevations may help to ease the formal review process.

Action Taken: None- courtesy review.

b. 414 S 3rd Avenue

Remove and replace existing exterior stairs and decking. Install awnings. Courtesy Review/ Non-Contributing Structure.

Mr. Hayes and Mr. Tsosie, DUST, presented the design proposal on behalf of the owner of the property, Mr. Philip Lipman. Mr. Hayes gave an overview of the property's history. Originally constructed as a one-story Queen Anne residence, it was remodeled into an apartment structure with a simplified second story with a stylized central pediment between 1939 and 1948. Further modifications over time have placed it in non-contributing status within the HPZ. An older photo showed awnings on the structure. The second story apartments are currently served by three balconies, each with a separate staircase toward the front yard. All are of wood, non-historic, and in poor condition.

The owner would like to recondition the building, remove all (3) existing exterior stairs and balconies to be replaced by a new 3-sided wrap-around balcony around the front and two sides with two new staircases oriented to the rear of the structure. Because of costs and maintenance, the owner would like to replace the wood structures with steel construction and teak decking materials, with a yet to be determined railing design. The owner would also like to construct awnings over second story openings for shading/ weather protection. Fifteen new post columns symmetrically placed along each elevation would support the new 6' wide porch,

the stairs about 3' in width. These dimensions roughly mimic the existing dimensions so the setbacks would be the same.

The Board was generally fine with the project conceptually— a single wrap-around porch with two staircases moved toward the rear. Generally, considering the large front setback, and the non-contributing status of the building, the shift to steel seems an appropriately compatible concept. Awning, yet to be designed, would be possible, providing they enhance the design of the building. The design of the railings was discussed at length, since those shown on the proposal are “placeholder” railings. It was generally determined that the existing railings are not historic. The Board suggested looking at railing designs in the area that are more historically compatible, noting that the development zone is limited.

The Board again thanked the team for coming early in the process and again suggested another courtesy review with a more detailed design may help before the formal review process.

Action Taken: None- courtesy review

c. All Saints Project

Construction of a multi-family building and parking, rezoning of multiple parcels along Stone Avenue, 14th Street and 6th Avenue. Courtesy Review/ Contributing Resources.

(Note: Mr. Roberts recused himself as an adjacent property owner and left the meeting.

After some unresolved discussion, Mr. Burr abstained from participating in the review or discussion of the item at Ms. Brown's request.)

Mr. Mackey, architect for the project, noted that he understood there were neighborhood concerns about the project and noted that the comments focused largely on parking and density which were not the purview of the Board. He noted the ongoing meetings that had already happened: APNA meeting; 375 S. Stone Avenue rezoning neighborhood meeting; previous APHZAB and PRS courtesy reviews and others. He has attempted to reduce the overall mass and increase the parking in the overall (eleven parcel) project, most notably at 415 and 435 S. 6th Ave, here for review. He noted that he had reduced the height generally along Arizona Avenue from 3 to 2 stories, moved the at-grade parking to a new underground facility at 375 (thereby getting rid of a parking entrance on 14th St.) but had then needed to add units to this proposal, mainly on the southern ground floor portion of the All-Saints School Building. He had also drastically redesigned the 6 unit building at 435 S. 6th Ave. to a single two-story building with surface parking. The previous totals for the overall development project were: 182 units, 1 restaurant, 1 event space and 120 parking places. The new totals are 188 units, 1 (smaller) restaurant, 1 event space and 137 parking spaces: 92 at 375,

37 dedicated spaces at 415 and 8 surface spaces at 435. Per Mr. Mackey, this creates a .73 ratio of spaces to units which is well in statutory and general practice.

Mr. Mackey then proceeded through the various Previous and Revision streetscape elevations studies that included the revisions and now have context provided by existing building masses. They were from 6th Avenue and the courtyard facing east; from 14th Street facing south; from 15th Street and the courtyard facing north, and along Arizona Avenue facing west. Major revisions include a reduction in height to 2 stories on 410, 414 and 418 S. Arizona Avenue which created a breaking up of massing elements; removal of the parking entrance on 14th Street; a substantial revision for the 435 new apartment building, including a reduction of height; shrinking of the balconies along Arizona from full balconies to "Juliette" balconies; removal of all parking openings except toward the inner courtyard; new enclosed yard spaces at the lot line along Arizona Avenue and 14th Street with street entrances directly into units.

Mr. Mackey showed 1st, 2nd and third floor plans for the project. The footprint of the new construction is slightly smaller, reflecting the new volume massing. Residential trash will now be in smaller rooms with a compactor with wheeled out barrels on trash days. (The restaurant trash will be in the garage.) The first floor of the school now has 3 apartments and a substantially smaller restaurant space. The 3rd floor plan shows how the 405 S 6th Avenue building is largely unchanged, but the other portions show the roof plan where it was reduced. He also showed a new height massing slide of various buildings in the development zone.

The Board were generally pleased that many of their initial concerns had been addressed including reduction of overall height, variation in massing, changes to the apartment building at 435 and its height and parking, removal of the surface parking structure and entrance on 14th Street and more compatibility on Arizona Avenue. All were please that a substantial portion of the parking had been moved to 375.

The Board did have concerns about the balconies on Arizona Avenue, especially those that overlooked adjoining yards. Some felt that "eyes on the street" could improve safety but others had privacy concerns especially with "engagement". This led to a discussion on new fences with increased heights for adjoining neighbors and what could apply contextually under the historic code. There was a difference of opinion between the architect, various board members and the adjoining residents who were allowed to speak.

Several Board members were still concerned over the 0' setback of the three apartments facing 14th Street. Discussion was made about the tradeoff between covering the garage and residential units resulting in that setback proposal. A

break-up of those units into various setbacks was discussed. Again, there was no consensus of the ideal balance.

There was a discussion of the historic character of the area, and how the scale and lot utilization of the project may affect it. The materials were brought up and clarified. The new construction will essentially be "Stucco boxes with details at openings". These include iron railings in some pattern, and mullioned windows. The roof will be clay tile, similar to the school and rectory buildings. Mr. Mackey's inspirations are buildings in the Historic Downtown District and with Bauhaus and Deco detailing.

Audience members who spoke were Mia Madrid, Etoile Wichnevetski, and Lori van Buggenum.

The Board thanked Mr. Mackey for his revisions and encouraged further engagement with area residents.

Action Taken: None- courtesy review

Note: Mr. Roberts and Mr. Burr rejoined the meeting at 8:10 pm.)

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Mr. Furnier said he had made an effort at editing a draft and had ended up with little more than the current 9-02 TSM guidelines. He had issues with the streetscape portions and removed them entirely. He had not yet correlated with Mr. Beal.

Ms. Erickson countered that the new standards were very important because national guidance on the Historic Preservation Act has moved from largely looking at buildings and structures exclusively to now consider settings and context. She noted that the current draft does not apply to property owners landscaping but rather continuity of the historic streetscape in relationship to street trees, and bike and pedestrian contexts. Mr. Furnier agreed to revisit them and consult with Mr. Beal. Further updates and drafts will come in the future.

6. Call to the Board

Specific Updates:

-Mr. Roberts noted his concerns regarding the recusal. He also was pleased an ADU proposal had now come to the Board.

-Mr. van Giesen requested further guidance on recusal standards since Ms. Brown had now suggested "approximate to" and "tenancy" may be a factor.

-Mr. Burr noted that he and Martha had attended a neighborhood meeting about the new Ugly But Honest Pizzeria at Five Points, which includes possibly moving the historic sign. The general documents are available on the PRO site for 733 Stone Ave. The project will be coming back to the Board for review.

There will be a neighborhood meeting for a revised IID project on the Corbett Block on 3-17. There will be an IID-DRC meeting for a west-side complex on 3-22.

There will be a COT meeting at Armory Park on 3-18 that will preview potential changes coming for the IID code and an introduction to the new eTOD corridor overlay which will affect us.

-Ms. McClements noted that she had found a new home for all the APNA and APHZAB document files that Bill Duffy has stored for several years. There is a new need to digitize those additional documents and costs will be provided by APNA. Mr. Burr suggested that the item needs to be on the next agenda so we can formally request funds for the digitization.

Mr. Furnier asked for further news about the split of the TPCHC. He had viewed the PowerPoint and recommendations and had concerns. Ms. Brown provided an update:

The COT had Michael Baker Jr. Inc. do a current status report and comparison of best practices in Phoenix AZ, Pasadena CA, and Salt Lake City UT. Mr. Baker's report now has recommendations. The initial Stakeholder group was 15 but has now been extended to 35 members. The first meeting was on 2-17-2022. The next one is 3-23. Members include Commission Chair and Vice Chair; Chairs of Advisory Boards; Chair of the Tucson Preservation Foundation; architects, developers, property lawyers, Sunshine Mile committee members and some homeowners who have gone through the process, and others. Ms. Brown again noted that TPCHC meetings will have the major updates.

Mr. Furnier understood the need to streamline the process but was concerned that reducing oversight to COT and one small committee with limited neighborhood input was potentially a problem.

7. Future Agenda Items Information Only

Ms. Brown noted that she was not sure any major projects were likely to come for review in April but would keep the board posted.

Ms. McClements noted a minor review (437 S. 5th Ave.), for window replacements) was approved. Two others are in process but not yet scheduled. She will update the Board at the next meeting.

The agenda item for requesting funds from APNA for APHZAB record digitization will be on the next agenda.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be April 19, 2022.