

2023

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

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

**Thursday, April 13, 2023**

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.

Note: A recording of the entire meeting (audio/video) can be accessed at <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLUfRGd7RxAUv6rMbrNEurjg1iY8N4ZALR>

1. **Call to Order and 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, Savannah McDonald (left meeting at 2:19 P.M.), Jan Mulder, Rikki Riojas

Commissioners Excused/Joined Late: Joel Ireland

Applicants/Public Present: John Burr (Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board [APHZAB]); Andy Pongratz (Property Owner); Drew Cook and Corky Poster (Poster Mirto McDonald [PMM]); Sara Fontaine (Pima County Facilities Management); Bob Lanning and Stephen Curti (Lanning Architecture); Bill Mackey (Worker Incorporated); Linda Mayro, Ian Milliken, and Scott O'Mack (Pima County Office of Sustainability and Conservation)

Staff Present: Jodie Brown and Michael Taku (Planning and Development Services Department)

2. **Approval of the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the Meeting of March 30, 2023**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Griffith to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of March 30, 2023, as submitted.

Commissioner Mulder seconded the motion.

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

3. **Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases**

*UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*

**3a. HPZ 21-068, 528 S Herbert (T21CM06016/T21SA00353)**

Construct rear addition.

Full Review/ Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone

Contributing Resource/ Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Brown provided background on this case, which was heard at the APHZAB meeting of March 21, 2023. The advisory board recommended approval unanimously with changes to the front fence to make it more transparent over 48 inches. Bob Lanning and Stehen Curti (Lanning Architecture) presented the project on behalf of the owners.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner McDonald to recommend approval of the project as submitted, with the following comments: the front yard fence panels should be transparent above 48”, including the far right panel, but maintain full transparency where presented as such in the drawings; that the addition to the rear has a stucco finish that is distinguished from the existing; and that the 10-light French door that is existing is to be reused, if possible, and if not, to provide a new door to match the existing.

Commissioner Mulder seconded the motion.

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

**3b. SD-0323-00033, 903 N 5th Avenue**

Revisions to previously approved plan, detached green house

Full Review/ West University Historic Preservation Zone

Contributing Resource/ Rehabilitation Standards

*[Commissioner Riojas stepped away from the meeting at 2:37 P.M. and returned at 2:39 P.M.]*

Staff Brown provided background on this case, which was heard at the West University Historic Preservation Zone Advisory Board meeting of March 21, 2023. The advisory board approved 6-0 noting that the 2 by 4’ window on the south side needed to be called out on the plans and that the proposed rock wall extension should be removed from the plans. Bill Mackey (Worker Incorporated) presented the project.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Riojas to recommend approval of the project as presented, with the following modifications: that the window on the south side elevation is corrected to appear as 2 by 4’ [on the plans, sheet G-2] and that the rock wall is taken out of the proposal entirely.

Commissioner Griffith seconded the motion.

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

**3c. TP-PRE-0323-00154, 130 E Congress**

Reconstruct storefront.

Courtesy Review/ Downtown National Register Historic District Individually Listed-J.C. Penney/ Chicago Store/ Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Brown provided background on the project. She recently met on-site with the property owners who wish to reconstruct the storefront (right now it is a recessed storefront) to bring out the building face to the street. Bill Mackey (Worker Incorporated) has done research on this to justify that a lot of storefronts change over the years. The owners are looking for more space, she assumes, and are wanting to reconstruct the storefront to how it appeared earlier. Chair Majewski noted that this is a courtesy review to provide feedback and asked if it would come back to the Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS) for full review, and Staff Brown said yes, as it is in the Rio Nuevo area.

Mr. Mackey presented the project. He noted that the Period of Significance for the building is 1903–1957 per the property inventory form. He showed a photograph dating to 1919 (or earlier) when it was the Chicago Store. The storefront glazing and openings are visible in the photograph. It is a typical downtown Tucson property where there is a storefront, some sort of horizontal beam, and then some sort of glazing above that. The next photo shown was from 1957, when it was the J. C. Penney Company. The columns were clad into bases with the mirror and then the recessed storefront façade. The recesses allowed people to come into the space to look at furniture within those display areas. He then showed a photograph of the building when it was occupied by Aaronson Brothers Department Store 1957–1967; there was little change from the J. C. Penney photograph. Mr. Mackey also showed a series of Sanborn maps to illustrate the changes over time.

He then showed the existing façade and noted that they did the west door a couple of years ago when the Loop, the co-working space, moved up into the second floor. They are proposing to remove all the recessed façade and put in a new, minimal storefront, looking back at the 1919 photograph. The façade would have a low profile in keeping with a lot of the downtown. There would be three doors, equally spaced between the existing columns. They will do investigative demolition of the columns to see what they actually look like and how the storefront would interface with that. There are details that are not yet worked out, such as what the base would look like and the actual profile of the storefront system. He would like to know if they can move ahead as proposed, and noted how storefronts change over time and are thought of as being flexible spaces within the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He would like to confirm the approach before they get much further along in design.

Chair Majewski asked for comments and questions.

Commissioner Riojas asked why that one door would remain recessed. Mr. Mackey responded that floor slope is an issue. One the east side it is pretty much the same height as the finished floor of the building, and as you move west, the finished floor is up a few inches from the sidewalk. So keeping that recess in place is mostly a safety and feasibility issue. The other doors can recess enough where it's not an issue – the slope isn't too great to make it a problem to be able to negotiate that door. Commissioner Riojas said she understands that he's not too far along in the design and asked if the owners are hoping to get a full glass storefront as in the 1919 photograph. Mr. Mackey said yes, everything below the beam cornice, the prismatic glass – all that stays. What would change is more than likely the covering of the columns and the whole storefront system. A new storefront system and base would be brought out to the edge of that ledge. Commissioner Riojas said she likes the original picture but would be sad to see the existing recesses go. She doesn't have other comments and is glad this building is getting the love it needs.

Commissioner McDonald noted that the base she sees in the 1919 photograph isn't shown in his elevation. She feels she would want to see a base, even if it's at a different height than it is now. She and Mr. Mackey discussed the base height. He noted it would be a 12" base. He thinks that some of the sidewalk has changed over time. Ultimately, there will be some sort of base, minimal like 12" or 8". There is a greater grade difference as you go west. He asked if moving the storefront is a big issue for her. She responded that he has the 1919 photo, and it's within the period of significance, so it seems like he has a good case, a good argument. She feels like Commissioner Riojas in that she likes having that recessed space. Commissioner McDonald's other question was about the rhythm of the clerestory portion. In the 1919 photograph, there is patterning consistent with the above and below. And if you're doing something different and now the clerestory is changed, how do you respond to that? How do you find a way to be compatible with the 1919 look? But now you're dealing with a different clerestory condition that has a different pattern. Mr. Mackey responded that they would pick up the rhythm that's created at the clerestory right now, because that rhythm is mildly based on the column placement, and so their storefront would be associated to that anyway. Commissioner McDonald said she was glad to hear that.

Commissioner Griffith said that Commissioners Riojas and McDonald already addressed a couple of her issues. Going back to the original historic photograph, she asked if there was actually a bay at the far right end, or is that just a reflection in the window? Mr. Mackey pointed out (in the 1919 photograph) two bays more to the left, and that would translate to before 1919. She asked if he would be putting that back in, and he said yes. They want to put in as many doors as they can. They are treating it as a rehabilitation instead of a reconstruction since proper documentation is not available. Commissioner Griffith was just going to ask about documentation. If there is only the 1919 photograph, he's really in some ways turning the façade back to that or using the image as his jumping-off point. He noted that all that is available is that photograph. He reiterated that the Secretary of the Interior says storefronts are malleable. This always seems to be the discussion when he brings in storefront projects, and it has certainly been

proven in downtown Tucson over the years. Commission Griffith asked if the reason behind his approach is to add square footage to the interior, and he responded yes.

Commissioner Mulder noted that her questions have been covered. She will also be sad to see the large insets disappear. She understands about the lack of documentation. Mr. Mackey thinks that what appears in the 1919 photo happened before 1919, but that's based on the Sanborn maps. She was referring to the change to the J. C. Penney frontage with the larger insets in the front. He said he wasn't sure when that happened, but he suggested it maybe happened when the building expanded to the west, sometime before 1947 and after 1919.

Chair Majewski noted that apparently we have a consensus that he should move ahead with developing his ideas. He asked if there is any serious opposition to bringing the glass out to the property line. There was no disagreement.

No action was taken.

*[Commissioner McDonald recused from the next case at 2:19 P.M., left the meeting, and did not return.]*

**3d. TP-PRE-0323-00155, N Kinney Road**

Restoration and reconstruction of historic 1930s CCC ramadas and stone picnic structures.

Courtesy Review (County)/ National Park  
Restoration Standards

Present from the Pima County Office of Sustainability and Conservation for this case include Linda Mayro, Ian Milliken, and Scott O'Mack; Drew Cook and Corky Poster from PMM); and Sara Fontaine (Pima County Facilities Management, project administrator).

Mr. Milliken provided context. This project, the Juan Santa Cruz Rehabilitation Project, began in 2019 with pursuit of a National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Tucson Mountain Park Historic District, which was listed in July 2021 for its significance related to the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Mr. O'Mack prepared the nomination. A lot of the work he did on the nomination was a tribute to Ron Beckwith, an archaeologist with the National Park (NPS) Service who inventoried a range of resources in Saguaro National Park West but also in Tucson Mountain Park. Following that, the county had PMM prepare a master plan to understand the picnic area and its current condition. He noted that the CCC was a 1930s effort. All recreational elements in the county's two flagship parks, Colossal Cave Mountain Park and Tucson Mountain Park, are really attributable to the CCC and were built in NPS rustic architectural style. The focus was on scenery and not construction, so what was built was minimalist so as not to obstruct the vistas and places where things were built. There were aesthetic choices in terms of color and materials, all being locally sourced. Rock work was extensive in CCC construction, and rock was chosen not only for its look but scale. It was meant to blend in and look like natural rock outcrops that were

coming out of the setting – built to last. These things were relatively untouched since the 1920s, and they used a lot of masonry features that did what they were supposed to do. They lasted, but now need some work. The inventory of Juan Santa Cruz picnic area really was that original document. The county moved on after they received the documentation and had PMM do a construction plan for the rehabilitation.

The rehabilitation project is funded by an Arizona Heritage Fund Grant awarded to the county in Spring 2022. Mr. Milliken believes that Staff Brown was able to upload both the master plan and construction documentation for PRS review. If there are technical questions, he will defer to PMM, and he and Mr. O'Mack can help on history questions.

Drew Cook presented the construction documents, which he prepared for the project. PMM was contracted to do an analysis of the site and what was existing to determine what repair work was needed. They identified contributing and noncontributing works as well as other important things at the site. He discussed the main things they will be doing and the methods for rehabilitating three ramadas using some compatible rather than like-for-like materials. Each ramada has a corresponding fire pit, and these will also be rehabilitated. One of the ramadas, the iconic shelter house, is in pretty good shape. For this structure, like-for-like will mostly be replaced. They will replace the roof with metal but will keep the elegant crisscross pattern underneath. They will probably not use saguaro ribs for it (for the sake of environmentalism) but will use dowls instead to create the same pattern as the existing.

For most of the work on the site other than these three structures, it will all be repair work, and no new materials will be used. There are three tables; some have fireplaces and free-standing NPS-style BBQs.

Corky Poster summarized. There are three principal ramadas they will be dealing with. One is completely intact and iconic, and all the information needed for a preservation approach is in place. On two of the ramadas, the roofs and details are gone. No drawings for the latter two are available. In these two ramadas PMM decided to take a clearly contemporary rehabilitation approach. They will install a new roof that has the spirit of the old, using materials that will be durable. They will be taking a preservation approach toward the tables and fireplaces and all the ancillary elements, which one by one are in fact contributing structures. For these, they will essentially be doing a preservation maintenance upgrade. So, they'll be using a mixed approach to the different structures depending on their current condition and the amount of documentation available.

Chair Majewski asked for questions and comments.

Commissioner Griffith noted that she liked the approach and the fact that PMM is going to try and replace in kind as much as possible on the iconic structure but using something a little more durable. She asked if PMM will be doing documentation on this as you go or have they already done it. Mr. Poster responded that they have already done the documentation – simultaneous

rehabilitation and restoration. Commissioner Griffith thanked him and noted that she liked the approach.

Commissioner Riojas said she really liked and is excited for this thoughtful project. She is thankful PMM is keeping like materials where possible. She thanked them for keeping the very beautiful design beneath the roof of the iconic structure.

Commissioner Mulder said she didn't have anything to add. She likes the approach and appreciates the care and thought that's gone into it. It will be exciting to see.

Chair Majewski noted that she was fortunate to see this project when it was proposed as a Heritage Fund project. She especially likes the fact that the use of more ecologically sound materials is being explored and that documentation has been done.

Mr. Milliken noted that the camp picnic area will be open during construction, per the Heritage Fund requirement. This is meant to bring the public out there to engage and see the construction being done. They are looking forward to serving this back to the public. The area is right next to the Desert Museum and is one of the two picnic areas that remain in Tucson Mountain Park. The remaining picnic areas are within Saguaro National Park West. The Juan Santa Cruz area is one of the most heavily used. Finally, he noted that PPM's work is incredible and very complimentary to the work being done in Saguaro West on very similar features. So there's a lot of cohesion between the work the county is doing and what the NPS is doing. They have been in contact with the NPS throughout, both for Colossal Cave Mountain Park and Tucson Mountain Park.

Chair Majewski hoped that the county will be able to let visitors that stop by during construction know about the importance of preservation, about the attention to detail on the materials and why it's important, and about your collaboration with the NPS, etc. It's a great opportunity to let the public know about the challenges you face when working with in-use historic properties. The courtesy review ended by wishing them good luck with the project.

No action was taken.

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

**4a. Discussion on Best Practices for Naming of City- and County-Owned Physical Assets**

Chair Majewski is still working on revisions to the current draft.

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

**5a. Minor Reviews**

Staff Taku reported that he has been out of the country and that there are no minor reviews to report on at this time. He will reach out to schedule minor reviews as they are ready.

**5b. Appeals**

Staff Taku noted that there are no current appeals.

**5c. Zoning Violations**

Staff Taku noted that there are ongoing and pending cases being worked on for compliance and/or in the review process, and that staff are working with their zoning violation code enforcement liaison. As soon as they are ready, they will be brought to PRS.

**5d. Review Process Issues**

Commissioner Riojas commented on the directive at the recent Tucson–Pima County Historical Commission meeting for commissioners to always leave their cameras on (unless they had joined by phone) (the chat function is also disabled). This was done to ensure that people were actually attending a meeting rather than just being signed on and actually not being there. This could affect a meeting’s quorum. Staff Brown noted that the City Clerk has always been touchy about virtual meetings. Commissioner Riojas also asked about the chat function being turned off on full commission meetings, and Chair Majewski verified that this was the case. Staff Brown also noted that there haven’t been issues with this for PRS, and Staff Taku will check with supervisors in his department about this and report back.

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

No public comments were received by the deadline.

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

The next scheduled meeting is April 27, 2023, and Staff Brown expects a case from Fort Lowell, potentially one from West University, and a courtesy review for the Ajo Curley School Gymnasium (latter a county project). Of the commissioners remaining at this time in the meeting, all four said they could attend the next meeting (Griffith, Majewski, Mulder, and Riojas).

**8. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 2:49 P.M.