

2022

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission
Plans Review Subcommittee

LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes

Thursday, February 10, 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 / Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 1:01 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

Commissioners Absent/Excused: None

Applicants/Public Present: Linda Mayro and Courtney Rose from Pima County, and Demion Clinco

Staff Present: Michael Taku and Jodie Brown, PDSD

2. Approval of the Legal Action Report (LAR)/[Minutes] from Meeting of 1-27-2022

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Griffith to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of 1-27-2022 as submitted.

Commissioner Riojas seconded the motion.

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

3. Historic Landmark Review Cases

Pima County Code Section 18.63

3a. Jacobson House

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

Staff Rose and Staff Mayro (Pima County Office of Sustainability and Conservation, Cultural Resources & Historic Preservation Division) introduced the application for the Jacobson House. Staff Rose noted that the Office of Sustainability and Conservation has reviewed the application and recommends

approval of the Pima County Historic Landmark Zone Designation for the Jacobson House designed by master architect Judith Chafee, with a period of significance of 1977. The property has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and a formal National Register nomination has been submitted and is pending review by the [Arizona] Historic Sites Review Committee. [At its meeting of 1-13-20022, the Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS) reviewed the latter nomination and expressed support for it.] The building has retained its integrity of location, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and its ability to convey significance, and there have been virtually no changes to the residence. Linda Mayro noted that the County provided a letter in support of the application, reiterated County support of the designation.

Chair Majewski introduced the applicant/owner, Demion Clinco, and asked him if he would like to present. Mr. Clinco noted that PRS recently reviewed the National Register nomination for this property. The latter was the basis for the Pima County application. Since PRS just recently heard his presentation on the National Register nomination for the property, and a number of commissioners visited the property recently, he said rather than make a presentation, he would be available for questions.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Griffith that [the Plans Review Subcommittee] support the nomination of the Jacobson House as a County Historic Landmark under Criterion C and Criterion Consideration G for [the] unique relationship of the house to its natural foothills setting and its wholly integrated design. It is one of the more remarkable modern properties in the region with important local significance. It contributes information of historical, cultural, and social importance related to the heritage of the community. Due to the age of the building, Criterion Consideration G is applied, as an example of architecture that has achieved significance within the last 50 years and is an outstanding residential example of the work of Judith Chafee and the Modern Movement in Tucson.

Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion. The motion was modified by Commissioner Mulder with the approval of the original mover (Griffith) and the seconder (McDonald).

Modified Motion: In the matter of the Jacobson House at 5645 N. Campbell, it was moved by Commissioner Mulder to recommend approval of the designation [of the property] as a Pima County Historic Landmark Zone based on the finding that the application is complete and includes all the submittal requirements sufficient to justify the Historic Landmark Zone Designation, and that it meets the Pima County Historic Landmark Zone (Ch. 18.63) Application Criteria for this outstanding property.

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

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 outline of a best practices for naming document that they had prepared with PRS members as guidance for City and County departments and entities.

Introduction: 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 recommended “best practices.”

1. Meaning or significance of the proposed name
 - a. Appropriateness to the surrounding area
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. Who did the property belong to originally?
 - d. Is the name one already being used by residents in the area?
 - e. Are there any archaeological ties?
 - f. Was or is the property/landscape used by Native Americans?
4. Impact on the community
 - a. Will people have to change their addresses? [idea for transportation to be involved]
 - i. List of affected properties/businesses
 - b. Does it bring representation of an underrepresented population whose contribution has been inadequately recognized? [JM mentioned that naming should always be for the appropriate naming for that area; SM thinks it's a good question to ask]
 - c. Cost involved (any sign changes required?)
5. Letters of support from surrounding community – e.g., neighbors in a neighborhood, nearby businesses if a commercial building
6. Public opinion meetings
 - a. Meeting minutes & community input
 - b. Multiple meetings must be held in the vicinity of the proposed renamed object, site, building, or structure, etc.
 - c. If affecting address changes, then example of how to navigate this system
7. Letter(s)/notice(s) given to the community regarding the meetings and the proposed change
8. Full commission presentation
 - a. Letter of support generated if a majority of commission members support the name change

- b. Recommendation of other possible names
- c. Possible resources for the information
 - i. State Historic Preservation Office/City Historic Preservation Office - Context studies, National and State Registers of Historic Properties
 - ii. Tribal Historic Preservation Offices
 - iii. Parking & Transportation
 - iv. Universities/special collections
 - v. Arizona Historical Society and local historical societies
 - vi. National Park Service
 - vii. State Library & Archives, including the Board on Geographic and Historic Names
 - viii. "Arizona Place Names" by Will C. Barnes
 - ix. Historical Maps - Sanborn maps
 - x. Bureau Land Management/ Forest Service
 - xi. "Historical Archaeology Research Guide" - A 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. Donations – need to consider language in the City’s Administrative Directive; Commissioner Ireland wishes to explore in more depth; group would like to consider language from other jurisdictions. What groups get what kind of input when?
2. Need input from Staff Brown and Staff Mayro on jurisdictional overlap.
3. Consider City of San Diego’s policy that the city reserves the right to change a name at any time, should the name end up being disreputable or not follow their Guiding Principles.
4. 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 and Chair Majewski will draft a proposed review schedule.
5. Discussed that best practices be in a policy document rather than in code.
6. Desire to include resource links, other best practice documents.
7. Commissioner Griffith feels we should ask for input from the Arizona State Board on Geographic and Historic Names. They may have some jurisdictional overlap.
8. Commissioners Sadongei and Steere should be asked to solicit Tribal feedback.

9. Discussed how developers name subdivisions/streets in subdivisions? Might have some interesting information/ideas. Linda said there are addressing rules, vetting by architect or consultant to see if no name duplication.

No action was taken.

5. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

5a. Minor Reviews

Recent minor reviews included one at 3488 E. Via Golondrina. Commissioner Griffith volunteered from PRS. Window work and stucco patching were discussed. It was agreed that the original windows were not salvageable. In-kind replacement would be appropriate, but the applicant was asked to do further research. Applicant asked to keep the window center divider between the metal-clad wood windows and that a window-replacement plan be developed in conjunction with staff. Staff Taku noted upcoming reviews and asked for volunteers from PRS to assist in the Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone (HPZ), at 437 S. 5th for window replacement, and at 135 S. 6th for restaurant Projecting Delta Sign. (Commissioner Riojas volunteered for first two); and in the West University HPZ, at 800 E. University for wall signs (Commissioner Ireland volunteered).

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 may be a few cases for the next agenda, as a number are going to the historic zone advisory boards. If the agenda is not too full, we will continue to discuss the best practices for naming document.

The next scheduled meeting is February 24, 2022. PRS meetings to be conducted virtually until further notice.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:31 P.M.