



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 21, 2023
Virtual Meeting**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm when a quorum was established with all six members present: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Mr. Pat O'Brien, and Mr. Maurice Roberts. Members absent: none.

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO.

Guests: Mr. Joseph Brinig & Ms. Barbara Brinig, property owners; Mr. Bob Lanning & Mr. Stephen Curti, architects, Lanning Architecture (item 4a); Ms. Jan Mulder, resident.

2. Approval of Minutes— February 21, 2023

The LAR/ Minutes were provided prior to the meeting. Mr. Beal made a motion to approve the LAR/Minutes as presented, seconded by Ms. Bachman-Williams. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Reviews

- a. **HPZ 21-068, 528 S Herbert-Continuation (T21CM06016/T21SA00353)**
Construct rear addition.
Full Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Burr, Chair, noted that the project had been previously reviewed and continued from the August 30, 2022 meeting. He invited the new architect for the project, Mr. Bob Lanning, to present the revised project.

Mr. Lanning introduced Mr. Curti as part of his design team. He then noted that the proposed addition and project had been revised to address concerns made by the board during the past review. The contributing structure is a 1898 adobe building with a hip roof that was expanded in the 1930's to the west with a partially open, parapet roof addition. An existing rear porch will be replaced by a new 10' x 25' library room addition and a new 6' x 24' porch will be added to the west of the new room. The addition will have a similar parapet and shed roof design as the existing rear portion of the contributing building, lowered by one foot and inset 3" on each side.

It will also have a weep-screed line to differentiate it from the historic structure. It will reuse the existing 10-light, wood rear door, on the new west elevation, along with two groups of 3 new wood, double-hung windows. Three of the existing rear wall openings will be filled in. The new porch will reuse some materials from the existing porch, with a corrugated S-curved metal roof.

The previous review had brought up the fact that a wrought iron fence had been installed, after approval, in 2018. It was replaced by a new steel 6' fence that featured patterned metal mesh screens, without design review.

The board was concerned that the visibility of the historic structure was now limited by the newer fence. In an effort to address the problem, replacing the mesh screen on the front gate with a more transparent screen is proposed, as well as inverting two panels so the upper area (rather than the lower area) is more transparent.

Generally, the Board was supportive of the new design for the rear addition. It was agreed that it was a more historically compatible design than the previous iteration. It was noted that the plans should be revised to note the total height of the hip roof, not the mid-slope height, per the definition of height in historic zones as defined in UDC 6.4.4.1 and TSM 9-02.3.2.

The Board, however, did have continuing concerns about the new front fence. Most agreed that it was a design not present in the development zone or larger HPZ, and likely would not have been recommended for approval if presented before installation. That said, the board appreciated the efforts of the owners and architects to correct the visibility problem. It was noted that the mesh was actually historic material familiar in mining communities, but that it had not been used in the neighborhood historically.

The question was raised as to what the visibility requirements actually are and who determines them. Ms. Brown clarified that Secretary of the Interior Standards did not have a requirement for visibility, but that SHPO has a policy on fence heights and makes the determination when reviewing for historic tax credits. She felt that replacing the front gate material may suffice but that general guidance is for visual transparency above 4 feet along street-scape fronts. Further discussion ensued. The Board agreed the mesh on the gate should be replaced. The question of the northern panels was debated. It was noted that the board cannot knowingly approve a design that could result in de-listing a contributing property.

Action Taken: Ms Erickson made a motion to recommend approval of the project as presented, with the condition that changes to the front fence will allow visual transparency above 48 inches in height. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Brien. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

The Board thanked the design team and owners (who joined the meeting during the presentation) for their thoughtful revisions and wished them well on the project.

5. Design Guidelines Project

- a. Update on the design guidelines

No new update was made.

6. Tucson Pima County Historical Commission Separation Update

Ms. Brown again noted that the process is still officially on hold. There is no date yet scheduled for a M&C Study Session. There may be updates made to the TPCHC. Ms. Brown will keep the board apprised of ongoing developments.

7. Minor Reviews

Mr. Burr noted that he had participated in three reviews since the last meeting, which were all issued approval letters with conditions:

- 749 S 4th Avenue (SD-0223-00025), replacement of a metal garage door with a new wood door with sidelight panels.
- 520 E 18th Street (SD-0223-00031), multiple items including door replacements, a new light fixture, changes to rafter tails and gable ends.
- 133 E 17th Street (SD-0223-00030), new solar panel installation.

8. Call to the Board

Specific Updates:

- Mr. Roberts noted that although interest rates have gone up, trends suggest a stabilization in property values in Tucson. He now expects neighborhood values to go up this year.
- Mr. Burr noted that M&C were holding the Public Hearing this evening for the UDC Update package. He also noted that after our last meeting and given the concerns that were expressed, that PRS had been given different advice, and had largely concurred with our recommendations. Ms. Brown clarified that PDSD staff are still working on how to address potentially needed process changes.

10. Future Agenda Items—Information Only

Ms. Brown noted that nothing is yet specifically scheduled for April. PRS will next meet on March 30, 2023, but nothing from Armory Park will be on that agenda.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:19 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting is April 18, 2023.