

2022

**Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**  
Plans Review Subcommittee

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

**Thursday, January 13, 2022**

Pursuant to safe practices during the COVID-19 pandemic, all in-person meetings are cancelled until further notice. This meeting was held virtually to allow for healthy practices and social distancing. The meeting was accessible at provided link to allow for participating virtually and/or calling in.

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Meeting called to order at 1:03 P.M., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Terry Majewski (Chair), Carol Griffith, Joel Ireland, Savannah McDonald, Jan Mulder, and Rikki Riojas (lost audio between 1:26 and 1:30)

Commissioners Absent/Excused: None

Applicants/Public Present: Lias Gallardo, Adelina Gallardo, Demion Clinco, Linda Mayro and Courtney Rose, John Burr, and Martha McClements

Staff Present: Michael Taku and Jodie Brown

**2. Approval of the Legal Action Report (LAR)/[Minutes] from Meeting of 12-16-2021**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner McDonald to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of 12-16-2021 as submitted.

Commissioner Griffith seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 6-0.

**3. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases**

*UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*

**3a. HPZ 20-060, 847–849 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone**

Restucco exterior, replace windows, new perimeter fence, replace awnings  
Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone  
Non-Contributing Property /Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Brown provided a summary of the project and read into the record the recommendations and actions of the Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board (APHZAB) from the meeting of 12/21/2021.

Presentation by Lias Gallardo on behalf of his parents/owners, Adelina and Rene Gallardo.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner McDonald to recommend approval of the project as presented, including:

- the addition of the wrought-iron fence around the front yard;
- replacement of the wood and asphalt awnings (awnings must be new wood to match configuration of the existing; proposed corrugated metal roof awning material approved as presented); and
- restuccoing of exterior walls (as long as the material of the stucco and finish exactly matches the existing material and finish).

For the proposed window replacement, we would approve the north and east [windows] to be completely removed and replaced as proposed with fiberglass windows, but for the west and the south [windows], the fiberglass would replace just the openings, and the [center] post[s] would be maintained [or replaced with matching].

Commissioner Griffith seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 6-0.

#### 4. **National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Nominations**

##### 4a. **Jacobson House**

5645 N. Campbell Avenue  
National Register Criterion C and Criteria Consideration G  
Period of Significance: 1977

Linda Mayro introduced the nomination and the presenter. She noted that the County supported the nomination of this extraordinary property.

Demion Clinco presented the nomination.

Discussion was held. Discussion points included the following.

Presenter noted that County Landmark status will also be sought for this property. It is an extraordinary example of architect Judith Chaffee's work, and he pointed out the unique relationship of the house to the site and the ways the views were integrated into the design. It is one of the more remarkable modern properties in the region. The property's exceptional significance and applicability of Criterion Consideration G is supported by the support letters in the nomination. Commissioner Griffith, other PRS members, and the presenter discussed the local level of significance proposed in the nomination, and PRS supported it while encouraging pursuit of a higher level of significance as appropriate and feasible in the future. The presenter noted that when the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) did a Determination of Eligibility, a local level of significance was indicated. Also, much of the work that comes after is derivative. Can always get it

listed as local and retool later at a higher level. Chair Majewski asked about integrity. The presenter noted that the original carport was enclosed as a garage shortly after it was built and is called out as an alteration in the nomination. There is a solar array water-heating system that never functioned fully, and additional HVAC systems were added, but there is a clarity of design. The owners of the property have worked on restoring the viewshed as altered by the HVAC installations. All changes are reversible. Chair Majewski asked PRS to comment on Criterion Consideration G. Commissioner Riojas stated that she felt the Criterion Consideration G discussion was strong and that the property warranted this consideration. Commissioners McDonald and Mulder commended the applicant for an excellent nomination, and the entire PRS was supportive of the nomination. The presenter noted that he will schedule a visit to the property if PRS members were interested, and they were. Linda Mayro requested a copy of the LAR and Minutes of this meeting once they are prepared, so that she can integrate PRS comments and action into the County's Certified Local Government support letter for the nomination that will be sent to SHPO for integration into the Historic Sites Review Committee (HSRC) packet. The nomination is scheduled for review by the HSRC in 2022.

Any planned visits to the Jacobson House will be noticed appropriately through Boards and Commissions.

Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Griffith that in the matter of the Jacobson House National Register Nomination, the Plans Review Subcommittee found the nomination prepared by the applicant to be strong and makes a case for the house being nominated under Criterion C and [Criterion Consideration] G at the local level of significance.

Commissioner Riojas seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 6-0.

## **5. Task Force on Inclusivity Recommendations**

### **5a. Discussion on incorporation of the Task Force on Inclusivity report recommendations.**

PRS reviewed the 11/18/21 PRS minutes regarding discussion of the task force report recommendations [also need to consider 7/8/21 PRS minutes]. General consensus is that a policy prepared by PRS would outline best practices for naming and would consider relevant points in the Phoenix and San Diego policies that Staff Brown had previously provided as well as the City of Tucson Administrative Directive on this topic. Commissioner Griffith reported that she had contacted SHPO to ask about what guidance they use for naming of properties. They use National Register Bulletin 16A (page 8) regarding the naming of historic buildings and archaeological sites. Commissioner Griffith is also researching what guidance might be offered by the Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names (housed under Arizona State Library, Archives, & Public Records). This board is responsible for determining the most

appropriate names for geographic features in Arizona. Commissioner Griffith will contact the board to see if they have more information on their process. They like the names of features to reflect the state's colorful history, culture, and diversity. PRS will focus on creating best practices as a first step, considering recommendations from the Task Force on Inclusivity report with a focus on naming buildings after groups and individuals who had not been considered before. Chair Majewski asked for another volunteer in addition to Commissioner Griffith to help with the best practices, and Commissioner Riojas volunteered. This subgroup will pull together best practices that can be expanded upon, and a draft list of topics would be ready in approximately one month (by the 2/10/22 PRS meeting). All the materials assembled to date for this topic will be considered as well as any new information that is obtained. Points to consider include but are not limited to:

- Process for naming (look at process used by Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names for ideas)?
- How should naming requests be investigated? What are the methods?
- How Phoenix, San Diego, and other cities have done this?
- Consider a cooling-off period before naming a building after someone who has passed away.
- Which city entities need to be informed of these best practices?

A motion was recently passed by the full commission to request renaming of the Tucson Convention Center historic landscape after Alva Torres, and preparation of documentation is underway. Commissioner Riojas had offered to help the TPCHC Historic Landscapes Subcommittee (HLS) with the Alva Torres naming request, but has not yet been contacted by HLS Chair Commissioner Steve Grede. Staff Brown suggested that we think about how you would write a justification for the Alva Torres renaming, as it could inform a best practices document. Commissioner Mulder reminded PRS that Lydia Otero was going to work with Commissioner Grede because she recently published the book on Alva Torres' [newspaper] columns. That was the plan as the first step moving ahead. Commissioner Mulder volunteered to circle back with Commissioner Grede about where this stands. Chair Majewski noted that she hopes that the request for renaming could go in at about the same time as the Task Force on Inclusivity final report, and the cover letter for that transmittal would also say that PRS was working on best practices.

Chair Majewski noted as she had previously that naming concerns rarely come up within the context of an HPZ case. More things are coming up outside of the HPZ process, such as park naming, fountain naming at TCC [actually in the plaza outside the old Pima County Courthouse], statues, etc. Naming is an issue that impacts a lot of city departments. It is difficult for Staff Brown to interface with all city departments about this. Commissioner McDonald asked how creating best practices is related to PRS and whether we're going to be proactive in seeking out projects, or is it just a standard of practice that comes through our group. Chair Majewski thinks it is more a standard of practice/best practices for things that come to us or could come through PRS. It's a purview question. Staff Brown agreed that it would be a policy for things that come through PRS. Commissioner Riojas asked if this could be shared with focus groups working on the commission separation. PRS is putting a lot of work into this, and we don't

want our efforts to be lost. Staff Brown noted that both she and Staff Taku will still be a contributing element to carry policies forward, and the new commission will still have many of the same members. Chair Majewski mentioned that the task force report specifically mentioned the importance of carrying the inclusivity recommendations forward with both of the new commissions. This topic needs to be broached with the County, as they will also need to carry it through. Linda Mayro and her staff from the County need to be present when PRS begins discussing the best practices in earnest. We need to understand what the County is doing regarding the separation of the commissions.

No action was taken.

## **6. Current Issues for Information/Discussion**

### **6a. Minor Reviews**

Staff Taku noted that two minor reviews are scheduled for 1/14/22 in West University: 621 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue for exterior modifications, including doors, windows, stucco, and painting; and 207 E. University Boulevard for solar panel installation (Commissioner Riojas will attend these minor reviews for PRS). Other minor reviews are pending.

### **6b. Appeals**

There are no current appeals.

### **6c. Zoning Violations**

Staff Taku noted that there are ongoing and pending cases being worked on for compliance and/or in the review process, and that staff is working with their zoning violation code enforcement liaison.

### **6d. Review Process Issues**

None at this time.

## **7. Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)**

No comments were received by the deadline.

## **8. Future Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

Staff mentioned two cases as possibilities for the next agenda – a potential courtesy review for the Westerner, and an IID case at 30 S. Arizona Avenue for windows and doors.

The next scheduled meeting is January 27, 2022. PRS meetings to be conducted virtually until further notice.

9. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:46 P.M.