

2022

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

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

**Thursday, February 24, 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 1:00 P.M., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Terry Majewski (Chair), Carol Griffith (arrived 1:48), Joel Ireland, Savannah McDonald, Jan Mulder (departed 2:43), and Rikki Riojas

Commissioners Absent/Excused: Carol Griffith

Applicants/Public Present: Dustin Miller, Cathy Rex, Chuck Meyer, Richard Fifer, Jim Sauer, Michael Shiner, Scott Neeley, John Burr, and Martha McClements

Staff Present: Michael Taku and Jodie Brown, PDSD

2. **Approval of the Legal Action Report (LAR)/[Minutes] from Meeting of February 10, 2022**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Mulder to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of February 10, 2022, as submitted.

Commissioner Ireland seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Commissioner Griffith absent)

3. **Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases**

- 3a. **HPZ 22-004, 708 E. University**  
**West University Historic Preservation Zone**  
Construction of two wood-framed pergolas  
Full Review/West University Historic Preservation Zone  
Contributing Property/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Taku provided a summary of the project and read into the record the recommendations and actions of the West University Historic Zone Advisory Board (WUHZAB) from the meeting of 2/15/2022.

Presenters Dustin Miller and Cathy Rex as agents of the owner.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Mulder to recommend approval of the plans as submitted, with the change in roofing material to corrugated metal.

Commissioner Ireland seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Commissioner Griffith absent)

- 3b. HPZ 22-007/MGD 22-01, 865 E. University  
West University Historic Preservation Zone  
Construction of patio improvements  
Full Review/West University Historic Preservation Zone  
Non-Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards**

Staff Taku provided a summary of the project and read into the record the recommendations and actions of the West University Historic Zone Advisory Board (WUHZAB) from the meeting of 2/15/2022.

Chuck Meyer and Richard Fifer presented the project.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner McDonald to recommend approval of the revised plans as submitted, with the agreement that staff will conduct a review of the new support columns once they are finalized and designed.

Commissioner Riojas seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 5-0. (Commissioner Griffith absent)

- 3c. North Side of 18<sup>th</sup> Street between Herbert Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone  
Flexible lot development to construct six (6) single-family houses  
Courtesy Review/Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone  
Vacant Property/Rehabilitation Standards**

Staff Brown provided background to the project and summarized discussions at the Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board meeting on 2/15/22.

Presenters Jim Sauer and Scott Neeley, Scott Neeley Architecture, LLC, and Michael Shiner (owner)

PRS members had questions, concerns, and comments regarding the proposed project. Mr. Sauer, Mr. Neeley, and Mr. Shiner responded to these during and following the presentation.

Discussion was held. No action was taken.

1. Property owner Michael Shiner gave a brief introduction, and then Scott Neeley introduced the project, noting that the property is one of the most important infill lots in the core area. He and Jim Sauer want to make a positive contribution to the streetscape and create a pleasant pedestrian experience. They have designed a group of houses that reflect the architectural diversity of the Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone (APHPZ), echoing the basic building block patterns that are found in Armory Park. The houses are a variety of sizes to provide a range of options, with a hierarchy along street edges. The houses are diverse but linked. For landscaping, they are working with the City and looking at water management, irrigation, and rainwater catch basins. They studied the development zone, as they wanted to put appropriate buildings in appropriate locations. They discussed the differing setbacks and height comparisons.
2. Commissioner McDonald asked if this had been a vacant lot for a long time. Mr. Sauer displayed a historic photograph that showed a 75-foot water tower on the lot. It was not on the 1901 Sanborn Map but is on the 1909 and 1919 maps. It no longer appears on the 1947 map, and by that time the lot was back to being vacant. He knows of no development that has occurred on this lot. He also brought up that the Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board (APHZAB) expressed concerns that there may be cisterns and other features underground left from when the water tower was in use. It may be a difficult site to develop because of this. When they do a subsurface evaluation, they may discover some development challenges. Chair Majewski asked about archaeology on the site, and Staff Brown noted that no archaeology is required, as it is privately owned. Mr. Neeley noted that the water department has no record of the water tower and no information on it. Mr. Sauer asked commissioners to let him know if anyone has ideas on where to find more information on this to inform their project. Commissioner Ireland wanted to follow up on the water tower. He asked: "What is the neighborhood's concern?" He noted that we're reviewing for consistency with the neighborhood, and he doesn't understand what the presence of cisterns, etc., underground has to do with that issue. Mr. Sauer responded that Armory Park is generally excited about the development of this vacant land. He said that they were providing friendly advice. They had a wide-ranging discussion when they did a courtesy review with the APHZAB, including topics such as utility easements and ADA accessibility. They discussed more than just HPZ rules. Mr. Shiner said that the discussion about possible underground features was a friendly "heads up." He will talk to a Geotech company to get a preliminary due diligence study to see if they can determine what's underground. Mr. Sauer noted that a 12" pipe coming off the water tower is shown on the 1919 Sanborn Map.

3. Mr. Shiner invited the subcommittee's ideas on general design at this preliminary design phase for the houses, including layout, concept, orientation, and roofs. Commissioner Ireland is interested to hear if Armory Park had any concerns with the materials, and Mr. Sauer said they had none. He also noted that he had no concerns about the heights of the houses, as Mr. Sauer has always been very diligent about this. Finally, he asked about windows, and Mr. Neeley said they are a mix of different types found in the area (1 over 1, 2 over 2, etc.). This would work with double-hung windows as singles or ganged as doubles or triples. Mr. Neeley and Mr. Sauer are interested, because of weather, to use fiberglass windows with appropriate profiles. APHZAB said they would evaluate on a case-by-case basis. Chair Majewski said that APHZAB and PRS have approved metal-clad wood windows in Armory Park. Mr. Neeley asked if aluminum clad would be a go on a non-contributing building, and PRS said yes. Chair Majewski asked them to be sensitive about this. She then asked about the size variation of the houses, and the architects noted that they range from 400 sq ft to 1620/1630/1700 sq ft to 2,300 sq ft. Chair Majewski asked about the materials. Mr. Neeley said all were stucco. Some have wood casings around the windows and others have crisp edges on the stucco.
4. Chair Majewski asked if APHZAB had concerns regarding parking and garages. Mr. Sauer said that a member of the APHZAB asked about garages on 18<sup>th</sup> Street, but in that meeting they looked at a Google Street View and saw that a nearby contributor in the development zone has a garage. Another contributor outside of the development zone also has a garage. Mr. Sauer and Mr. Neeley are trying to strike a balance between old and new where garages are concerned, while keeping the houses compatible with the HPZ. Mr. Neeley said they are garages and curb cuts all along 18<sup>th</sup>. When they met with APHZAB, John Burr suggested lowering (on the houses on Herbert) the parapet over the garages so that the garages look more like an addition. The architects have not yet had the chance to evaluate this suggestion yet.
5. Commissioner McDonald noted that she appreciates the considerations and the responsiveness of the elevations, roof lines, and the patterns for 4<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and Herbert, especially Herbert, where awnings over entryways and porches are used. She also brought up that spacing between houses (and APHZAB brought this up as well) seems really right. She asked if they could find a way to have more spacing. Mr. Sauer said that they need to strike the right balance there to create a viable project. He noted that there are duplexes and triplexes along Herbert, and on 18<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> there is more spacing. They want the interiors to be modern, functional, and livable. Commissioner Riojas also commented on the close spacing. She noted she was fine with it, as it reminded her of many historic neighborhoods, and she liked the courtyard spaces.
6. Commissioner Mulder thanked the team for being so proactive and for the informative submission package. She commented that APHZAB was thorough in their review. She seconded their suggestion that the architects see if there are other ~~thing~~things, they can do to reduce the impact of the

garages (additional setback, lowering of the parapet, etc.). She asked about the possibility of having a couple of the small houses attached. Why is it problematic to do this? Mr. Sauer noted that it was a matter of egress and noted that it was a goal to create fully detached houses.

[Commissioner Griffith joined at 1:48 P.M.]

7. Commissioner Griffith noted that any questions she may have asked have been answered.
8. Chair Majewski asked when they would be back to PRS with more detailed plans. The architects replied that they didn't have a schedule yet. They are working with Tucson Electric Power to understand those requirements.

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

##### **4a. Discussion on incorporation of the Task Force on Inclusivity report recommendations.**

Commissioner Riojas, Commissioner Griffith, and Chair Majewski shared the latest outline of a best practices for naming document that had been prepared with PRS members as guidance for City and County departments and entities. It has been reformatted and edited. Further edits were made "live" during the meeting, and these edits are documented below.

Place names can convey important information related to the significance and history of a property or place. The naming and renaming of City- and County-owned buildings, roads, and properties should reflect the rich history, culture, and ethnic diversity of Tucson and Pima County. The Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission (TPCHC) created the Task Force on Inclusivity Regarding the Naming of City- and County-Owned Buildings and Properties to investigate current practices and make recommendations. Based on the findings of this Task Force, the following are "Best Practices" recommended by the TPCHC.

1. Meaning or significance of the proposed name
  - a. Appropriateness to (acceptance by) the surrounding area and the local (or impacted/referenced) community.
2. If renaming, why the new name is more relevant than the previous one.
3. Historical research to support proposed name
  - a. Information must be authenticated/cited
  - b. If proposed name is that of a living person, research into their background is required, and the significance of their contribution must be established.
  - c. Is the name one already being used by residents in the area?
  - d. Are there any archaeological ties?
  - e. Was or is the property/landscape used by Native Americans?
  - f. Who has the property previously belonged to?
4. Impact on the community
  - a. If approved, will there be a need for address changes?
    - i. List of affected properties/businesses

- a. Does it bring representation of an underrepresented population whose contribution has been inadequately recognized?
  - b. Cost involved (any sign changes)
5. Letters of support from surrounding community – e.g., neighbors in a neighborhood, nearby businesses if a commercial building
6. Public opinion meetings
  - a. Letter(s)/notice(s) given to the community regarding the meetings and the proposed change
  - b. Meeting minutes & community comments
  - c. Multiple meetings, at differing times, must be held in the vicinity of the proposed renamed building, structure, object, landscape, etc.
  - d. If affecting address changes, then resources on how to do so must be provided
7. Full commission presentation
  - a. Letter of support generated if a majority of commission members support the name
  - b. Recommendation of other possible names by the commission
  - c. Distribute letter to ? Who sends the commission the naming request in the first place? At what point in the process? What has to change to make this happen? The City directive would have to be modified. What about in the County? [these questions still need to be fleshed out in next draft]

**Possible resources for information concerning the history of the property and the community**

- State Historic Preservation Office/City Historic Preservation Office- Context studies, National and State Registers of Historic Properties
- Tribal Historic Preservation Offices
- City and County Historic Preservation Offices
- Parking & Transportation
- Universities/special collections, Arizona State Museum
- Arizona Historical Society and local historical societies
- Federal land managing agencies such as National Park Service, US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management
- National Register of Historic Places
- State land managing agencies such as Arizona State Land Department, Arizona State Parks
- State Library & Archives, including the Board on Geographic and Historic Names
- “Arizona Place Names” by Will C. Barnes
- Historical Maps - Sanborn maps, USGS maps
- *Historical Archaeology Research Guide* – This guide provides information on how to conduct historical research as well as a comprehensive source of records and where they are available. <https://www.arizonastateparks.com/SHPO>

PRS discussed the topics on the outline, and noted other things to consider:

1. Consensus is to leave best practices document in outline format.

2. Donations – the best practice document will not go into depth on donations but will include a statement about using best practices for naming/renaming where donations are involved, urge that best practices be followed when evaluating naming requests. Commissioner Griffith will follow up with to see if the U.S. Board on Geographic Names has something to say about naming when donations are involved.
3. Discussed adding a statement that the governing body (i.e., the City or County) should reserve the right to change a name at any time should the name end up being disreputable or not follow their guiding principles. Related concept to include – should be a waiting period to provide for historical perspective when proposing a naming/renaming for a recently deceased person.
4. Confirmed that the best practices should be in a policy document rather than in code.
5. Need language on the jurisdiction of the Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names, particularly in how it intersects with the naming of roads. This board will be asked to review the document. State Board has jurisdiction over the naming of geographic features and federal, state, and county roads, but not city roads or buildings and structures.
6. Include a section on what is not covered by the best practices document. In addition to what the State Board is responsible for, include process that architects go through for naming of subdivisions/streets in subdivisions (ask Linda Mayro for more information)
7. Chair Majewski suggested that when PRS has a draft ready for next steps that it goes to TPCHC Subcommittees for review and feedback before going to the full commission. Commissioners Riojas and Griffith will draft a proposed review schedule.
8. Will include resource links and reference other best practice documents. Make note on need to periodically check links, etc.
9. Tribal feedback on the naming policy will be sought through Commissioners Sadongei and Steere during review of the draft document (see below).
10. Need to address process and City and County historical commissions' involvement. Review City of Tucson Administrative Directive and make suggestions for amending it, referring to best practice document, etc.
11. Proposed review schedule: mention at 3/9 full commission meeting, PRS finalize draft at 3/10 meeting, send finalized draft to commission subcommittees, Commissioners Steere and Sadongei, other commissioners; PRS incorporates feedback and creates final draft at 3/24

PRS meeting and brings back to full commission at 4/13 full commission meeting for in-depth review, discussion, and approval.

No action was taken.

**5. Current Issues for Information/Discussion**

**5a. Minor Reviews**

Recent minor reviews included: in the West University HPZ, one at 800 E. University of a change of copy for a sign (chair of WUHZAB was present) and one at 415 E. University for change of copy on a monument sign (Commissioner Ireland assisted in the latter, which was approved); in the Armory Park HPZ, one at 437 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. for in-kind window replacement and one at 135 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. for a sign that extends over the sidewalk (Commissioner Riojas assisted with both of these). For the latter, noted that screws securing the sign should only go through the mortar, not the brick, and may only do a change of copy so as not to place screws in the brick. Upcoming minor reviews include solar panels in the West University HPZ.

**5b. Appeals**

Staff Taku noted that there are no current appeals.

**5c. Zoning Violations**

Staff 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.

**5d. Review Process Issues**

No review process issues were raised.

**6. Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)**

No comments were received by the deadline.

**7. Future Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

Staff mentioned that there will be an IID update (Maria Gayosso) for transit-oriented development (TOD), and possibly some HPZ cases if they are ready for PRS. The best practices for naming document will also be discussed.

The next scheduled meeting is March 10, 2022. PRS meetings to be conducted virtually until further notice.



8. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:52 P.M.