



POSTER
MIRTO
McDONALD

ARCHITECTURE
PLANNING
PRESERVATION

DATE: January 2, 2020, *Revised February 7, 2020, Revised February 26, 2020*

TO: IID Design Review Committee
c/o Nicholas Ross, Lead Planner
c/o Maria Gayosso, Lead Planner
Planning & Development Services
City of Tucson
201 N Stone Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85701

FROM: Corky Poster, Architect/Planner (AICP), City of Tucson On-Call Design Professional

RE: 902 South 6th Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701

OWNER: Flash TV LLC

ARCHITECT: Lanning Architecture with Cypress Civil Development

PHASE OF REVIEW:

Comment:

I have reviewed the Special District Application for the Flash TV South, dated November 20, 2019, for compliance with the UDC Infill Incentive District (IID), UDC Section 5.12.2, 5.12.8, and 5.12.9.

I have not met with the applicant prior their Pre-Application meeting, I have not reviewed the applicants submittal for the purpose of determining its conformance with the Submittal Requirements of the IID. I have not checked the submittal against the Submittal Requirements 1-14, included in the application and the Checklist for Design Profession Reviewer. I did not attend a pre-submittal conference.

This review is the first time I have reviewed elements of this proposal and the first formal review of a package prior to its review by the Design Review Committee of the IID.

*I reviewed this application on two subsequent occasions: **February 7, 2020 & February 26, 2020***

MATERIAL REVIEWED:

INFILL INCENTIVE DISTRICT DESIGN PACKAGE FOR The Flash TV South, submittal from applicant, dated November 20, 2019. Materials as noted, following (8.5 x 11 Format):

- Infill Incentive District Application (1 page)
- Letter authorizing Chris Leighton to be authorized agent (1 page)
- The Flash II Project Introduction (2 pages)
- Development Package Drawings (3 sheets)
 - Site Plan
 - Elevations
 - Rendering looking Southwest at 6th and 19th
 - Rendering looking Southeast at Russell Ave and 19th
 - Accent siding samples
- Existing Photo Study (6 pages)
 - Aerial and photo key
 - Site photos (6 sheets)

- Precedent Examples (1 sheet)
- Neighborhood Meeting (November 12, 2019) Documentation
 - Invitation
 - Meeting Summary
 - Meeting Slide Presentation (14 slides)
 - Certification of mailing
 - Mailing Labels (5 sheets)
- Permit Review Details (COT PRO)
- Pima County Assessor's Record Parcel Detail & Map (5 pages)
- *Revised floor plans and east elevation*
- *Shade Study*
- *Revised Shade Study*

*The submittal did not provide a narrative or calculations as to how they were meeting the requirements of 5.12.2, 5.12.8, and 5.12.6.E. In some cases, I was able to identify the issues without that narrative and calculations. In other cases (e.g. Shade calculation), I was unable to offer an assessment. **The Architect provided a more detailed Shade Study dated 2-12-20 that showed in excess of 50% shade over sidewalk on the prescribed date. This standard has been met.***

IID STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO PROJECT:

- UDC Section **5.12.2. Establishment**
- UDC Section **5.12.8 General IID Zoning Option Design Standards**
- UDC Section **5.12.6.E Plan Review and Approval Procedures under the IID Zoning Option.**

STANDARDS AND REVIEWER COMMENTS:

UDC Section 5.12.8. GENERAL IID ZONING OPTION DESIGN STANDARDS

An IID Plan under the IID zoning option design standards must demonstrate compliance with the following:

A. Streetscape Design- Streetscape design must comply with the street design standards in the Technical Manual and the Streetscape Design Policy.

1. Pedestrian-orientation: Projects shall be pedestrian-oriented and comply with all of the following standards:

a. New construction shall have architectural elements/details at the first two floor levels;

The project is entirely residential, which leaves little room for the pedestrian-oriented detail envisioned with the IID. That said, there has been a reasonable effort to provided changes in material, expansion joints, windows and doors, etc.

b. Buildings shall provide windows, window displays, or visible activity on the ground floor for at least 50 percent of frontage;

This standard appears to be met. There are 6 triple sets of glass doors and 6 windows over the entire length of the north elevation. The south elevation has a comparable number of windows and doors, but this elevation is entirely on private property, where presumably no street-frontage pedestrians would be located. The 6th Avenue Street frontage and the Russell Avenue street frontage has a comparable pedestrian interest.

c. A single plane of façade shall be no longer than fifty feet without architectural detail;

This standard is met.

d. Front doors shall be visible or identifiable from the street and visually highlighted by graphics, lighting, or similar features;

This standard is not met but, given the residential use of the entire building and given the fact that the entry is not on the street but rather on the parking lot, this requirement is impossible to meet.

e. Uses, such as Commercial Services or Retail Trade uses that encourage street level pedestrian activity are preferred on the first floor of a structure of a multistory building;

*This is a preferred standard and not a required standard. The owners have decided to develop and entirely residential development. This is less problematic on the 19th Street frontage, which already has a residential character, but it would interesting, and in the spirit of the IID, to explore Commercial Services or Retail Trade use on the first floor of the east end of the building along 6th Avenue. The tightness of the eastern sidewalk with no building setback and the immediate adjacency of residential living space on 6th Avenue, as shown on the rendering looking south, demonstrates the difficulty of this decision. In the case submitted, the only street level pedestrian activity offered is peering into the apartment window. **The modification to the east elevation shows storefront doors and window on 6th instead of the windows. The 1st floor plan shows one large room in the residential unit instead of two bedrooms. But there is no indication that these units are intended to be live-work spaces or commercial spaces with access from 6th Avenue. While the effort is appreciated, in order for it to have an impact on my comment, I would need to understand how it is intended to be used. The Architect provided an email dated 2-17-20 that clarified that: "The client will market these two units as "live-work" type units." This preferred standard has been addressed satisfactorily.***



f. Construction and maintenance of sidewalks must be done in compliance with the City's Streetscape Design Policy. Existing sidewalk widths shall be maintained so as to provide effective, accessible, connectivity to adjoining properties. Sidewalks may be widened to accommodate a project's design characteristics. Where no sidewalks exist, sidewalks shall be provided. Outdoor seating and dining areas and landscaping may be located in the sidewalk area where safe and effective sidewalk width around the design feature can be provided;

See comments in e. above.

g. To the extent practicable, bus pull-outs shall be provided where bus stops are currently located;
Not applicable.

h. If drive-through service is proposed, it shall not interfere with pedestrian access to the site from the right-of-way.
Not applicable.

2. Shade

a. Except as provided below, shade shall be provided for at least 50% of all sidewalks and pedestrian access paths as measured at 2:00 p.m. on June 21 when the sun is 82 degrees above the horizon. Shade may be provided by trees, arcades, canopies, or shade structures provided their location and design characteristics are compatible with the historic and design context of the street and the architectural integrity of the building. The use of plantings and shade structures in the City right-of-way is permitted to meet this standard with the approval of the Transportation Department. The shade provided by a building may serve to meet this standard.

No information was provided with regard to this standard and compliance could not be evaluated. A shade study has now been provided. While the 832 SF of shade on the east sidewalk appears accurate, I don't see how you get to 632 SF of shade cast by trees on the sidewalk. If the big tree on the north-east corner provides roughly 50 SF on the sidewalk, I estimate that the fragments of the partial shade by all the other trees may equal another 50-80 SF on the sidewalk. Please help me with your calcs.

b. Exception- The PDS Director may approve an IID Plan providing less than 50% shade where compliance is not feasible due to a project site's location and/or building orientation and the applicant has made a reasonable attempt to comply with this standard.

B. Development Transition Standards

The purpose of the Development Transition Standards is to mitigate excessive visual, noise, odor, vibration intrusion, and other similar public health and safety concerns that may be created by the proposed project.

1. Applicability - Developing sites that abut an affected single family or duplex dwelling shall comply with this section. For purposes of the IID, the following terms and examples describe elements of applicable transitional areas:

a. "Affected residential property" refers to an existing detached single-family or duplex dwelling that is adjacent to a developing site;

b. "High density residential" refers to residential development that is neither existing single-family detached nor attached dwellings;

c. Examples of applicable transitional areas include a nonresidential developing site adjacent to existing single-family detached or attached dwellings within a subdivision, or a developing high-density residential site adjacent to existing single-family detached or attached dwellings within a subdivision; and,

d. For projects within the DCS, the Development Transition Standards apply only to those projects adjacent to affected residential properties outside the DCS boundaries.

Not applicable.



2. Mitigation of Taller Structures: Compliance with the following standards is required where the developing site has taller buildings than adjacent affected residential properties:

a. Within the GIS and DCS, the maximum building height is 25 feet within 30 feet of the property line adjacent to an affected residential property. Proposed buildings may be developed to the maximum height permitted by the underlying zone or as permitted by the IID Subdistrict, whichever is applicable, when the building is 30 feet or more from the property line adjacent to an affected residential property;

The single-family residential structure is located immediately west of the proposed project across Russell Avenue. Russell Avenue is 25' wide. The proposed project at its west end is 36' tall, but the building is set back 14' from the Russell Avenue property line. 14' + 25' of Russell Avenue makes the 36' height set back 39' from the single-story, single-family detached structure. In my view, this is compliant with the Mitigation of Taller Structures standard.

b. Building Bulk Reduction

c. If a building façade faces a property line adjacent to a single-family detached or duplex residential property, the PDSO Director may require bulk reduction. The Design Professional shall make a finding and recommendation, after consulting with the DRC and/or Historic Commission if applicable, that the proposed design provides an effective way of breaking up the mass, so the building mass of the façade is less imposing.

In my view, no Bulk Reduction should be required.

d. Windows at or above the second story of a structure shall be located or treated to reduce views into adjacent affected residential property's buildings and yard areas;

The new development faces one single-family home to the west, which itself is built on the property line. There are windows on the west elevation of the new construction, but they offer a view only of the roof of the adjacent single-family structure and not to any private yards or patios of the structure.

e. Balconies shall be oriented away from affected residential property or use a screening device to reduce views into the rear or side yards of the affected residential property.

There are no balconies.

f. The developing site's buildings shall be oriented so as to reduce views onto an affected residential property; and

g. Buffers and/or screening consistent with the purpose of this section shall be provided between a developing site and affected residential properties and shall include features such as, but not limited to, landscaping, walls, and architecturally decorative features.

There is a proposed plastered masonry screen wall on the west property line. The height is not indicated. It is recommended that this wall be 6' tall to maximize the screening of the property to the west.

3. Mitigation of Service Areas- Potential nuisance or noisy areas shall be oriented away from affected residential property, such as by placing service areas for loading and garbage disposal between the developing site's buildings, behind opaque barriers, or by using architectural or landscaping treatments that effectively reduce nuisance impacts from service areas. The service area shall be mitigated to reduce the noise and view of the service features, reduce the emission of offensive odors to owners or occupants of adjacent properties or create a nuisance or hazard beyond the property lines of the project site, and prevent vibrations that are discernible beyond the property lines of the project site.

Aerial photos indicate that Russell Avenue is a Trash service street and so the location of screened trash pick-up for the new development is appropriate on Russell Avenue.

4. Mitigation of Parking Facilities and Other Areas- Where the site has parking areas or an area with noise and outdoor lighting features, the areas shall be screened from affected residential property by a combination of a wall or opaque non-chain link fence with a vegetative hedge or a row of trees that shall be dense enough to screen views onto the development site. An alternative treatment may be used, such as using architectural or landscaping treatments that effectively reduce nuisance impacts from parking facilities and other areas. Where there is a finding that the vegetative screen will be opaque, the requirement of a masonry wall may be waived by the PDSO Director.

There is a proposed plastered masonry screen wall on the west property line. The height is not indicated. It is recommended that this wall be 6' tall to maximize the screening of the property to the west.

C. Alternative Compliance

1. The PDSO Director may approve an urban design best practice option for compliance with Section 5.12.8.A, Streetscape Design, and Section 5.12.8.B, Development Transition Standards.

2. For purposes of this section, urban design best practices may include urban design studies approved for the City of Tucson, adopted urban design standards for a downtown area in an Arizona city of comparable size or a city in the Southwest of comparable size, books written by urban design experts or endorsed by a professional organization, such as the American Institute of Architects, addressing downtown development, or any comparable report, study, or standards recommended by the City's Design Professional and approved by the PDSO Director.

N/A.

D. Utilities- Plans shall include information on the layout and demonstrate availability of utilities such as water, wastewater, natural gas, electric, and telecommunication utilities.

Beyond the scope of this reviewer.

E. Parking

1. Parking spaces may be located as follows:

a. On site; or

b. Off-site within ¼ of a mile of the project site under a shared parking agreement that is approved by the City.

2. Required vehicle and bicycle parking may be reduced pursuant to an IID Parking Plan in accordance with Section 7.4.5.A, except as modified as follows:

a. Section 7.4.5.A.3 in Permitted Uses and Types of Development does not apply. An IID Parking Plan may be used to reduce required residential parking.

The submission references a to-be-submitted Individual Parking Plan. The reviewer has not seen or reviewed this plan. It is unfortunate from a time and resources perspective that the applicant did not combine the IID Community Meeting with the required IPP Community Meeting, as is common practice.

b. Bike parking shall be provided when motor vehicle parking is provided. The PDSO Director may reduce the required number of bike parking spaces depending on the use, setting, and intensity of the proposal.

Will be provided as per UDC 7.4 requirements.

c. The neighborhood meeting that is required for under Section 7.4.5.A.6.a may be held concurrently with the neighborhood meeting required by Section 5.12.6.B.

See 2.a. comment above.

d. Section 7.4.5.B, Downtown Parking District, does not apply.

3. Where Parking is provided, the parking area must comply with the standards of Section 7.4.6.C and D.

4. Parking must be in a parking structure with the ground floor of the parking structure screened from view.

It is recommended that a surface parking lot is acceptable in this development. A parking structure is highly impractical.

a. Exception

b. Parking may be located on a surface parking lot if it is determined by the PDSO Director to be impracticable to be located elsewhere and other options are not available.

c. Parking may be located on a surface parking lot if it is determined by the PDSO Director to be impracticable to be located elsewhere and other options are not available. If located onsite, parking areas must be located at the rear or side of the building.

d. Changes of use and expansion of existing structures may use the site's current parking configuration.

e. Parking structures shall be designed so that parked vehicles are screened from view at street level through incorporation of design elements including, but not limited to, landscaping, pedestrian arcades, occupied space, or display space.

5. Special IID Parking Agreement- Where a developer can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the PSDS that the parking options provided for in this Section are not feasible, and the City makes a specific finding that the project will have significant economic development value for the IID Sub-District in which it will be located, the following parking options are allowed as follows:

a. A percentage of long-term residential parking may be located in a City public parking garage by an agreement with Park Tucson if the project is of significant economic benefit to the City to allow this option.

b. The agreement must be reviewed by PSDS, the Design Professional, Park Tucson and approved by the City Manager.

The submission references a to-be-submitted Individual Parking Plan. The reviewer has not seen or reviewed this plan.

F. Multi-zone Parcels- Where a development parcel contains more than one zoning district, uses and building massing may be distributed across the zoning districts on the parcel, provided that the development complies with the design standards in Section 5.12.8.B to mitigate the impact of the new development on existing, less intensely developed adjacent parcels.

N/A.

Section 5.12.6.E – IID Historic Preservation Review



2. Projects not in an HPZ

a. The Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission (TPCHC) Plans Review Subcommittee reviews all projects listed below:

(2) Projects proposing new development using IID zoning option that are either adjacent to the boundaries of an HPZ or adjacent to a structure meeting any one or more of the following characteristics:

(a) Listed or eligible to be listed in the National or Arizona Register of Historic Places, individually or as a contributing property.

The proposed development is adjacent to two "Contributing Structures" (C) to the Barrio Santa Rosa National Historic District to the west and across 6th Avenue from two "Contributing Structures" (C) in the Armory Park National Historic District. As such, the project is required to meet the standards below.

d. The TPCHC Plans Review Subcommittee reviews for compliance with the design requirements of the applicable sub-district and for design compatibility of a proposed development project.

(1) New development must be designed to complement and be compatible with the architecture of adjacent historic structures.

(2) Compatibility with adjacent historic structures is to be achieved through architectural elements such as building setbacks, building step-backs, textures, materials, forms, and landscaping.



Ultimately, the Tucson Pima County Plans Review Sub-Committee will tender their own opinion regarding items (1) and (2) above, but this reviewer has concluded, based on the submitted materials, that compliance with this adequate. The proposed development is a three story contemporary structure. The form of this buildings is so substantially different from the adjacent plastered masonry building that any imitative efforts would be pandering to a false historic imagery. The new development has made substantial efforts to provide texture, building setback, window detailing, a masonry screen wall, landscaping, etc. that additional efforts are not required. It would be possible to match the coral paint color of the adjacent structure by painting the screen wall a similar color, but what a happens if the adjacent structure repaints its wall to another color, as is their right in a non HPZ. .

Submitted by:

Handwritten signature of Corky Poster in blue ink.

Corky Poster, Architect/Planner, Poster Mirto McDonald
City of Tucson Design Professional