



West University Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, September 20, 2022, at 6:00PM
Virtual Meeting
Meeting Minutes/Legal Action Report

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting Opened 6:03 pm

Meeting Secretary: Hazelbaker

Board Members Attending: Sarah Fajardo, Darci Hazelbaker, Rick McDonnell (chair), Rachel Serra and Betsy Besenick-Larson. Damon Turner joined at 6:06

Guests: John Ash, Roger Brevoort, Jodie Brown (COT PDSD), Mark Buckingham, Jayme Fabe, Maria Gayosso (COT PDSD), Noel Griemsmann, William Hubbard, Joel Ireland, Samuel Ireland, Jason Jones, Bert Kempfert, Bill Mackey, Davis Maxwell, Chris Mooney, Barbara Quade, Doug Rohe, Marcellus Rusk, Ken Scoville, Scott Soelter, Ty Utton

2. Approval of Minutes – August 16, 2022

Serra motioned to approve, Seconded by McDonnell. Motion approved 4-1 by roll call. Hazelbaker abstained.

3. Call to Audience

Brown read letter from Ken Scoville regarding item 5a.

4. Tucson Pima County Historical Commission Separation Update

Brown stated that it is still on hold and there is no date proposed for Mayor and Council

5. Reviews

a. Capstone Project

HPZ 22-053, 812 E Speedway (T21BU00511)

HPZ 22-054, 814 E Speedway (T21BU00512)

HPZ 22-055, 818 E Speedway (T21BU00513)

HPZ 22-056, 1052 N Euclid (T21BU00510)

HPZ 22-057, 1040-1050 N Euclid (T21BU00509)

HPZ 22-058, 1036 N Euclid (T21BU00508)

Relocation/demolition of 6 houses for proposed new construction.

Full Review/Contributing Resources

Noel Griemsmann, on behalf of Capstone, started the conversation regarding the relocation plan and economic viability.

Griemsmann asked Mark Buckingham from Wolfe House and Building Movers to present the process and experience of moving homes. Buckingham stated that the houses to be relocated will be a cakewalk – they have moved houses in worse condition previously. Buckingham explained the process of moving the homes with accompanying slides of homes Wolfe has previously relocated – using lifts and dollies to move them down the road, in a slow walk. Questions were opened to the Board members.

Serra enquired about the route and if one has been determined to move the houses. Buckingham stated he has not mapped the route but has walked it. McDonnell asked about the steps and order of operations that need to have in place to move the homes. Buckingham stated that it would be drawn up by an engineer. Porches would be rebuilt, some fireplaces would need to be removed and rebuilt. Serra asked if the foundation needed to be in place prior to moving and Buckingham stated that the footers need to be in place prior to being moved. The houses will be resting on steel structure until the stem wall is in place. That ensures the foundation will fit like a glove. Then the framework will be lowered, and the steel removed.

Hazelbaker asked who is responsible if the homes have issues making it to the new site. Samuel Ireland stated that until the houses make it to the site, they are the responsibility of Capstone. Once they land, they will be the responsibility of the property owner.

Hazelbaker asked about soils engineering for site, Rusk stated that they will be engineered as part of a plan to engineer the footings and foundations.

McDonnell asked if the packet we have received is the current plan for the scope of the work. Rusk stated that it is. McDonnell asked if the scope of work is what we are being asked to approve, Griemsmann stated that it is.

Are there any additional questions for the Buckingham? Board stated None.

According to McDonnell 818 ½ E Speedway is on the City of Tucson's Inventory as a contributing property. Rusk stated that he was also not aware of this information either. McDonnell asked Jody Brown to clarify that it is on the GIS as a contributing property. Scott Soetler stated that it was an automotive building and then turned into an apartment.

Regarding the Adobe at 1052 N. Euclid Griemsmann stated that the structural engineer looked at the building and found significant fire damage. The engineer felt that the lack of integrity with the roof would require a significant amount of work and effort to relocate it. Brevoort stated that is also will be significant. McDonnell stated the question is not only about moving it, what about preserving it and protecting it. Griemsmann stated that in trying to plan around the structures, it unfortunately sits right in the middle of it and it's impractical to work around it. Griemsmann feels that the effort to rehab it and renovate it would be too significant. Sam Ireland asked about the 2 that are not going to be moved, they are favorable to stay in place due to their location. Rusk stated that the

adobe is cost prohibitive to renovate it – no systems in place to continue to update.

Hazelbaker stated that the relocation of these structures is not complying with the MGUOP and that additional opportunities exist for these homes rather than relocating them – they could be moved farther back from Speedway and Euclid, used for commercial purposes and are a gateway to the zone.

Griemsmann stated that he feels that they have done the most that they can to meet the goal.

Samuel Ireland stated that student housing has a market need.

Turner commented that in the end that rules and regulations are in place for reasonable economic use, and properties should not be allowed to be demolished and neglected – Turner is concerned about Demolition by neglect and setting a precedent in the neighborhood.

Jayne Fabe would like to speak on behalf of the sellers, and the existing conditions and put together as a whole they have more value. The current owners that own them don't have the funds to renovate them.

Serra doesn't feel that they are site specific, and that putting them into the fabric of the neighborhood so that they can be used and part of the community and have the historic integrity. Betsy Besenick-Larson asked about the two that will remain and how will those fit in? Serra stated that they fit in better due to their proximity to the additional houses around them.

Ireland asked if the houses that remain will become community spaces or what will happen to them. Griemsmann stated that they are still in process to be determined how they will fit into the project.

Serra stated that we should be recognize that there is currently a team in place that is willing to invest in relocating them.

Besenick – Larson asked if we need to be thinking about the precedent we are setting. Her house was unlivable at one point, would we have demolished it? Do we need to be concerned about the message that it sends – letting properties become run down so they can be demolished? Serra stated that we are keeping the inventory, and the issue is more about the inventory and the message it sends.

Turner stated that it is fair to be concerned about the future viability of the precedent. He is most concerned of the demolition of the Adobe structure – demolition by neglect.

McDonnell stated that the items the board has to consider compared to the totality of the project. We need to make a motion. Fajardo stated that her concern is that we allow the homes to be moved and demolished and then there is a vacant lot. McDonnell stated that nothing will move until all phases are approved.

In the interest of time, McDonnell stated that we need to make some motions on the individual homes. Brown stated that we need to vote on them separately - include the address and the HPZ number and if you are approving relocation.

Soelter stated that he wanted to direct everyone to the West University plan, Soelter was dropped from the call. Fabe stated that there hasn't been an analysis of the deferred maintenance, once tower went up it became impossible to lease.

Turner stated that the maintenance is included in the document, we are not being asked to evaluate financial hardship.

HPZ 22-055, 818 E Speedway (T21BU00513) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

HPZ 22-053, 812 E Speedway (T21BU00511) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

HPZ 22-054, 814 E Speedway (T21BU00512) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

HPZ 22-056, 1052 N Euclid (T21BU00510) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

HPZ 22-057, 1040-1050 N Euclid (T21BU00509) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

HPZ 22-058, 1036 N Euclid (T21BU00508) Turner motioned to deny what is being proposed due to that evidence is not being shown that it's an economic financial hardship and setting a precedent of demolition by neglect. Hazelbaker seconded. Motion approved 5-1.

b. HPZ 22-069, 612 E 1st Street (T22SA00209)

Construction of two porches.

Full Review/Contributing Resource

Rusk presented the proposal of 612 E. 1st Street - proposed replacement of a back porch and side porch. Light grey shingles to match existing, columns to match existing. Rusk showed precedents in the neighborhood. The proposed side porch will have similar wood painted columns. Site context and property inventory was also presented. McDonnell asked about the location of the side porch – Rusk stated that it will be on the east side. Turner asked about the

choice of metal material selection, Rusk stated that the simplest solution is a flat roof. Serra stated it will appear as a flat roof; Rusk stated that it will be painted to match the shingle color. Serra asked about the roof plan. Rusk stated it's a complicated roof plan, so the metal makes the most sense.

Turner made a motion to approve as presented. Serra seconded. unanimous approval 6-0.

c. HPZ 22-071, 626 N 6th Avenue (T22SA00419.T21DV00835)

Replacement of 8 windows and garage door.
Full Review/Contributing Resource

McDonnell stated that work has been done, and it did not go thru review. The Board is now looking at what Mackey is presenting as work to be done for approval. Mackey stated that Mooney did not know that this was a violation, and he has put together a set of documents to walk us thru the work. The owner replaced 10 or so deteriorating windows, turned a window into a door on the East façade, and infilled a garage door opening. The windows that were replaced were a vinyl material.

Turner asked Mackey to clarify the property. The Bungalow was built in 1925. The new building was built and is also contributing. The development zone is eclectic. Mackey walked us thru the windows and doors that were replaced. The West façade you can see that a window was extended down to the ground to make a door. The garage door on the West side was enclosed with wood and painted, the outline is still visible.

Mooney stated that he is very sorry that he had replaced the windows and he had no idea that he violated the guidelines.

Turner asked about how we should be voting. Brown stated that we are to be voting on as if its proposed. The violations on the addition, that might potentially be non-contributing feel less of an issue. McDonnell agreed.

Mackey asked about the process – it's a tough one to make a decision on when the work has been done. Hazelbaker stated that there have been violations in the past that the board has rejected in the past for vinyl windows.

Mackey wants to understand the procedure, what happens if everyone denies it. Brown stated that if everyone denies it then it will be a code violation, and it could end up in court. Brown added that once you are issued a decision letter, Owner has a 14-day appeal period once the letter comes from the planning director.

Discussion among the Board and what the precedent would be set if we allow this to happen. There is a reason that we are asked to look at this as if the work hasn't been done.

Turner motions to approve with the following exceptions – the vinyl windows are to be replaced with an acceptable material allowed in the guidelines, as well as the windows that have been altered to be brought back to their original size and proportion.

Turner made a motion to approve as presented. Serra seconded. unanimous approval 6-0.

6. Staff Updates - Information Only

Brown stated that the city's new permitting system will be going live on October 31, 2022. The week prior the city of Tucson will not be accepting any new permits unless they are an emergency issue

7. Future Agenda Items

None.

8. Adjournment

Turner motioned to adjourn. Hazelbaker seconded.
Motion approved unanimously by roll call, 6-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:19 pm.

Rick McDonnell, Chair / Darci Hazelbaker, Secretary