



Infill Incentive District – Design Review Committee

Thursday, February 23, 2017 – 3:30 p.m.

Public Works Building – 3rd Floor Large Conference Room

201 North Stone Avenue – Tucson, AZ 85701

Legal Action Report

1. Roll Call

Those present and absent were:

Present:

William Viner
Chris Gans
John Burr
Lori Woods
Robin Shambach

Absent:

Design Professional:

Richard Tom Fe

Staff Members Present:

Carolyn Laurie, Planning & Development Services
Michael Moreno, Planning & Development Services

2. Approval of Legal Action Report - November 28th, 2016

The committee voted 6 to 0 to approve the legal action report.

3. IID 16-10 Downtown Clifton

Architects and Presenters Matt Stuart, Planner and Rick McClain, Design Team

Mr. Stuart proposed the project which would include a partial demolition and expansion of the Clifton Hotel. The construction would take place on the existing site, demolishing three rental units and adding to the eastern portion of the hotel, planning for it to be congruent with the current hotel. The project would consist of 29 total units with a max building height of 20 feet. The new Clifton would have 2800 square feet of common area space for restaurants and offices. The project will have a pool in the center of the courtyard with tables and lounge chairs for the residents. The building is located within the downtown core and is within the National Register District for Armory Park, although it is not part of the preservation zone. The existing downtown Clifton is a non-contributing structure. They will be providing 26 parking spaces on-site as well as five (5) parking spaces along 16th Street, they will not be providing on street loading. The applicant stated they want to restrict and direct as much pedestrian access as possible onto Stone Avenue. Matt also informed the committee that they would be open to holding events and having food trucks on different occasions on their parking lot.

Mr. McClain stated that he wanted to utilize a lot of the existing context that was around Armory Park with an urban sensibility in order to create a pedestrian friendly design. The applicant stated that the concept for the design was not to create one large building mass, but to break it up into smaller buildings making it more in line with the context of the neighborhoods as well as the residential uses that were there.

Mr. Viner was wondering if the units would be two (2) stories. The applicant informed Mr. Viner that they were stacked guest rooms with a guest room on the first floor and a guest room on the 2nd floor. Mr. Viner asked if there was retention requirement on that particular site and the applicant informed him there was not because it was less than one acre. Mr. Viner informed the applicant that it would be a good idea to save some of the entryways on the adobe walls.

Mr. Burr stated the he would like to see the monitoring of the 1858 Velasco adobe home adjacent to the north of the construction site while the construction was taking place. He also informed the applicant that he would like to see the incorporation of the 90 year old concrete wall in the project. Mr. Burr informed the applicant if it was not possible to keep the concrete wall, it would be a good idea to record and take pictures of it, as well as presenting it as a past feature of the original site. Mr. Burr also stated that the neighbors around the surrounding property were pleased with the project.

Ms. Laurie stated that in this area of the IID allowed for modifications that were by-right as they opted into the IID. She also mentioned that one of the main things that stood out on her review was the shading, stating it was pretty substantial. Ms. Laurie also mentioned that then 2nd floor had some overhang throughout the property. Ms. Laurie informed the committee that the applicant was utilizing some of the wood screening features to help with the shading towards the west for the afternoon sun. Ms. Laurie informed the committee that the modifications to the perimeter side yards were very minor and that they had provided additional landscape in order to buffer the transition within the area. Ms. Laurie asked the applicant what it was they were planning to do with the mural on-site. Mr. McClain informed the committee that they wanted to preserve it by having it redone in the same spirit from the existing building and were proposing to maintain and carry the continuity and feel of the current Clifton into the new design. The new mural would face the north side of the public building, which would make it highly visible from Stone.

Ms. Shambach asked a question about the curb rating and mentioned that those were some of the more technical items. Ms. Laurie stated that with the MS&R it was something that was allowed to be reviewed within the IID and because of the timing and the new ordinance that had come through they wanted to make sure TDOT and PDSO were in alignment on how to review it. It was with her understanding that TDOT preferred they run it through the DRC instead of another formal piece of review.

Ms. Woods asked the applicant if they would be able to keep the 90 year concrete wall and the applicant informed her that they would not be able to because it would interfere with trying to create a positive flow on the site. She also asked the applicant what type of paving material they would be using for the parking lot. The applicant informed her they would be using a type of drivable grass with a hex pattern and that the idea was to create a strong pedestrian connection between the existing Clifton and the new design. She said that the opening between 6th street could potentially give pedestrians walking down the street a way to get in and mentioned to the applicant that they should consider a wrought iron fence instead of a wooden fence. She also asked if they would consider using a native mesquite instead of using the thorn less mesquite. She finally stated that it was a good project

Mr. Tom stated that in the downtown area you tend to want the front doors on the street which induce more pedestrian traffic although in this case the main entrance was into the parking lot and stated that perhaps there was no choice but to have it there. He then went onto say they he wants to expose the historic building as much they possibly could.

Ms. Shambach moved to recommend approval of the Downtown Clifton project with the following conditions

- Vibration study while construction was taking place
- Retain any portion of the historic wall or at least document it (encouraged)
- Come back for DRC if there was substantial conditions

Discussion:

Amendment: Motion to amend in order to replace Honey Mesquite with Native Mesquite.

4. Future Agenda Items

Staff explained upcoming cases.

5. Call to the Audience

No audience present.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 pm.