



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board  
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, July 19, 2022  
Virtual Meeting**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 6:31 pm when a quorum was established with six members present: Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Maurice Roberts and Mr. Robijn van Giesen.

Members absent: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. Glenn Furnier, and Mr. Pat O'Brien.

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO.

Guests: Mr. Jonathan Walkup, property owner; Ms. Karen Bellamy, architect (4a); Mr. Ken Godat, property owner; Mr. Jerrick Tsosie and Mr. Cade Hayes, DUST architects (4b); Ms. Gabriella Barrillas-Longoria, COT-DTM; Ms. Emily Yetman, Living Streets Alliance (4c); Mr. Ken Taylor, IT; Mr. Fernando Chiquette, Mr. Marty Diamond, residents.

**2. Approval of Minutes— June 21, 2022**

The LAR/ Minutes were made available prior to the meeting. Mr. van Giesen made a motion to approve the LAR/ Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Mr. Beal due to absence).

**3. Call to the Audience**

None.

**4. Reviews**

**a. HPZ 22-032, 519 S Russell Avenue (T21CM09912)**

Construct rear addition.  
Full Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Walkup, the property owner, began the discussion. He noted he had purchased the property in March 2021 from the previous owner, including plans for a secondary unit that had not been completed. He has decided on a smaller secondary dwelling and to forgo plans for a pool that would have removed a large mesquite tree in the rear yard. He hoped the new plans had addressed concerns made about prior plans.

Ms. Bellamy showed the current single plans page and photographs of the site. She discussed how the proportions, details—corbels/ lintels, windows—clad wood— will

match the existing architecture of the 1890's Sonoran row house as it currently exists but will be differentiated by a smooth stucco finish. The proposed height is 14' which she believes is established with the existing structures.

The Board was generally pleased with the latest iteration of the plans as significantly better than all previous designs. However, the plans presented for the review were incomplete: lack details including window specifications, few dimensions, an incorrect cross-section of the garage (west elevation shown is reversed, actual has no lower parapet) or context especially actual height of the contributing structure on the site. Differences (height) in the two plan sets (Jan. & March) were discussed. The Board was aware (from earlier plans) that the contributing structure's height was actually 13'4" and requested the new construction be lowered to match that structure-not the noncontributing garage addition.

Ms. Bellamy was surprised that updated revised plans had not been received either City staff or the Board. She showed more complete revised plans during the meeting. A concern—the placement of an HVAC condenser unit adjacent to the north property line was discussed. A better location within a rooftop parapet was proposed. Other corrections to the plans—size/siting of the existing contributing structure; window size, design and function; revised cross-section of the existing garage, etc. were also discussed.

**Action Taken:** Mr. Burr made a motion to recommend approval of the project as presented with the following conditions: 1. the total height (not including chimney) of the new dwelling unit should be no higher than the contributing structure (13'4"); 2. that the mechanical units be placed on the roof so as not to impact adjacent neighbors; 3. that more fully developed, realized and corrected plans be submitted prior to permitting and that the applicant come back to the Board with any major changes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

Ms. Brown outlined next steps in the process for the applicant. It was noted that PRS would review the same materials as this Board but that some possible corrections and updates could be provided for review consideration. The Board again thanked the applicants for a significantly better designed project.

**b. HPZ 22-061, 803 S 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue (T22CM04841)**

Construct accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and demolition of detached rear yard structure.

Full Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Tsosie presented the design package from DUST. The essential plan—to construct a new +/- 600 ft. sq. ADU, construct new parking and storage structures to complement the 1890's transformed Sonoran contributing structure on the southeast corner of 18th Street and S 4th Avenue has not changed but has been significantly refined through the courtesy review process. A shed, currently listed as a contributing element on the site will need to be demolished to allow for the new construction. The design team and Ms. Brown have researched the outbuilding and concluded it was constructed (late 1940's-70's) after the period of significance for the HPZ (1860s to 1945) and is likely an error on the Historic Register inventory.

The new ADU will align with the north wall of the contributing structure and is indicated by a 36' x 16'6" rectangle on the site plan. The roof will match the existing rusted corrugated roofing of the contributing structure and will have a 11'2" midpoint roof height with a 13' ridge point that is lower than contributing structures' roof height. On the north facade, three pairs of double hung wood windows (inspired by a similar window on the contributing structure) will be complemented by three sets of French doors with transoms on the south elevation that also match those on the east elevation of the contributing structure. The new carport is now envisioned as a cantilevered slopped roof over the proposed storage/laundry structure, rather than attached to the new ADU. Questions about proposed items listed but not elaborated—a storage deck feature between the north wall of the ADU and existing north site wall, a fountain, a fire pit feature, new terraces, screening for a ground mechanical unit were not yet finalized. Drainage will be on site. The previously shown floor plan of the ADU remains the same. The current design plans were well received.

The question and discussion of the demolition of the existing, listed shed was more complex. Both Mr. Godat and Mr. Hayes noted that new construction could not proceed without the demolition of the structure. Ms. Brown provided an update on the process for demolition. She believes the structure is an error in the National Register listing because it is not apparent during the period of significance. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has verbally agreed but has formally referred it to the Historic Sites Review Committee (AZ) which cannot act until November. It will then have to be formally reviewed (45-day+ process) by the Keeper of the National Register to remove the listing. The only other process provided by the UDC is the M&C Demolition process which may be equally lengthy. Formal demolition permits may not be possible until January 2023. The timeline is unfortunate but beyond the Board's purview.

**Action Taken:** Mr. Beal made a motion to recommend approval of the plans as presented including the demolition of the existing shed per the advice of the HPO that it is apparently non-contributing but listed, however that process may proceed. Motion seconded by Mr. Burr. Motion approved by roll call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

**c. Public Art Project**

Traffic mitigation project on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue between 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets  
Courtesy Review

Ms. McClements noted she was to be a stakeholder in the public process for this next project. The first community outreach meeting will be Friday, July 22.

Ms. Barillas-Longoria (planner with the TDM) showed a presentation of the proposed project to the Board. She introduced Emily Yetman of Living Streets Alliance who is partnering with the city. Bloomberg provided a \$25K grant with \$10K matching funds for design and materials for the project. Local support includes Rio Nuevo, TEP, AARP, United Way, etc. The primary goal is enhanced safety and mobility for alternate (non-car) modes transportation and community enhancement. The previous asphalt art project—Corbett Porch in 2018 (at S 6th Avenue and 7th Street) was a success and lasted nearly two years before Downtown Links construction started.

This new project was presented to the Armory Park neighborhood the past week. Originally with 3 focus points (the 13th Street/ 6th Avenue intersection was ruled out due to limited space options), it has been refocused on a connection between the Children's Museum and Armory Park and the 12th Street/ 6th Avenue intersection portions. Paint will create new bump-outs on the asphalt at corners and a new crosswalk feature. The median lane is also planned for paint art. Other options include flexible posts and planters. No new concrete curbs are planned due to costs. The project is temporary but could be expanded in future.

The Board were universally supportive of the paint art project. The connectivity between the park and museum was useful, as were reduced distance pedestrian crossings. Some concerns were raised, however, about potential impacts to parking (possibly 4+ spaces retired), bus stops (no expected impacts) and about the flex posts and planters. It was generally hoped the flex posts could be removable so as to not impact the street during major downtown events that use the block— El Tour de Tucson, Holiday parade with bleachers etc. The design team were looking into technical options and compatibility with planned events. The team also asked for input on themes for the art. Suggestions were made that the site has many historic themes —original Ft. Lowell, City Beautiful Planning, the Armory, etc. that could be useful. The Board thanked the team for the presentation and looked forward to updates through the process before the temporary art project goes in probably this October.

**Action Taken:** none, courtesy review.

## **5. Design Guidelines Project**

Mr. Beal had no updates to provide. He will be meeting with Mr. Furnier to discuss edits soon.

## **6. Tucson Pima County Historical Commission Separation Update**

Ms. Brown provided the update. She gave an overview of why the separation was moving forward. In 2019 Eric Vondy from SHPO, after meeting with the National Park Service had directed staff to notify separate Certified Local Governments (CLG) that they should have separate individual historic commissions. Both the City of Tucson and Pima county are CLGs. A gap in process happened because of Covid. In 2021, Chris Cody (also SHPO) notified Mayor and Council of the directive. M&C then directed PDS to create a public process to separate the commissions. Michael Baker International was hired as a consultant. Pima County has been following a similar parallel process.

Recently, however, it has emerged that there are perhaps 10+ joint commissions functioning nationally out of 2081 CLGs. The Park Service is now conducting a study on whether to re-visit their guidance, but the timeline for that process is unknown.

She then reiterated where in the stakeholder meeting/ consultant process we are currently. The 4th group stakeholder meeting was held on June 16. Staff is still considering what came out of those meetings. Ms. Brown then indicated the process being considered now is not just a separation of the historic commissions but

also, some code revisions and a streamlining of the review process. She outlined what had consensus (specifically, among the stakeholder group and the consultants): a change in code to allow for deconstruction and materials reuse of demolished buildings, allowance for some public and landmark interiors to be listed, a need for increased staffing in PDSD, specifically in historic preservation and code enforcement, possible new fees for un-permitted work and more oversight/ authority from the HPO rather than the Planning Director.

However, the makeup and size of the future commission, how or if PRS will be recreated or continued or how the advisory boards and/or neighborhood input may function or continue all had considerable pushback. A distrust by neighborhood associations of creating new committees or appointing representatives had led to a lack of support.

Currently staff are expecting to provide an update to M&C in late August or likely September and ask for guidance. Staff are still planning to take recommendations to the full Historic Commission, then the Planning Commission and finally Mayor and Council. Input from the public can be made at those public meetings.

Mr. Burr asked how the recent vote (9 to 3 in favor) by the full Historic Commission to send a letter to M&C to request 1. pause or slow down the process, 2. create a local study to see how the current system does work but could be streamlined, 3. use a simple text amendment to split the commissions, and 4. not get rid of the Historic Zone Advisory Boards would now impact staff's recommendations and the update. Ms. Brown answered that it was M&C's discretion to give new direction to staff.

Ms. Brown noted that she had heard "through the grapevine" that some members of the public had been meeting privately to discuss other plans and she had notified the city Clerk's office to intervene to make sure no Open Meeting laws were being violated. She offered to host or post agendas for alternate meetings. Ms. McClements responded that those fears were unfounded and that no quorum of any commission had or would participate in private outside discussions.

Mr. Burr noted he was aware through DNaRC and discussions with other neighborhood leaders that all the advisory boards and their respective neighborhood associations, as well as many other historic neighborhoods were either sending letters or meeting with M&C members regarding community concerns. He then made a motion for the Board to direct the chair to send a letter to M&C outlining concerns, especially about the possible dissolution of the advisory boards. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts. After Board discussion the motion was refined to be specific to being against the dissolution of the advisory boards rather than also addressing concerns about the possible split in the commission.

**Action Taken:** Mr. Burr made the (revised) motion: for the Board to direct Martha McClement (Chair) to send a letter to Mayor and Council stating that APHZAB does not support any dissolution of the historic zone advisory boards because of their unique, 50 year contributions and responsibilities to both Mayor and Council and the historic preservation community at large and to ask M&C to direct staff to take that option off the table going forward. Motion seconded by Mr. Roberts. Motion approved by roll call vote, 5 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Mr. Beal due to a lack of knowledge about the process).

## **7. Call to the Board**

- Ms. Brown noted that Scott Clark has been reassigned to the City Manager's Office and is no longer the PDSD Director. The acting interim Planning Director is Tim Thomure, Assistant City Manager. Day to day oversight will revert to Lynne Birkinbine, Deputy Director. Mr. Thomure will fill the 14 "frontline" staff positions recently approved by M&C before possibly conducting a new national search for a director.
- Mr. Burr noted that the Infill Incentive District Design Review Committee (IID-DRC) had approved the Ugly But Honest Pizzeria plans, including the move of the historic sign, subject to the same conditions outlined by the Advisory Board. Ms. Brown is working on the "no change of status" finding.
- Mr. Roberts noted that market trends suggest a drop-off in the real estate market and that the time may be over for the overheated market in the area.
- Mr. van Giesen reminded everyone to vote in the upcoming elections.
- Mr. Beal will be back regularly after an extended vacation and a recent bout of Covid.
- Ms. Erickson noted that she had recently attended the National Alliance for Preservation Commissions conference in Cincinnati OH. There had been many fine presentations and she will soon share information with the HPO, etc.
- Ms. McClements noted that no minor reviews were currently scheduled. Ms. Brown concurred. Ms. McClements asked if the city might look into a recently installed, inappropriate, unreviewed and un-permitted fence she was aware of. Ms. Brown commented she would look into it. Ms. McClements then asked for any comments from the audience. No one spoke.

## **8. Future Agenda Items—Information Only**

Ms. Brown had nothing specific scheduled but expected monthly meetings to continue. She suggested the All Saints Project may be returning in the near future.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be August 16, 2022.