

2023

**Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**  
Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS)

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

**Thursday, May 25, 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: Teresita Majewski (Chair), Joel Ireland, Savannah McDonald

Commissioners Excused/Joined Late: Carol Griffith, Jan Mulder

Applicants/Public Present: Rick Brighton (Brighton Design Associates), Jim Glock (treasurer, West University Neighborhood Association [WUNA] and West University Historic Preservation Zone Advisory Board [WUHZAB), Rory Juneman and Robin Large (Lazarus and Silvyn), Sasha Kessler and Dan Maher (GLHN Architects and Engineering), Marco Schreier (potential buyer for 847 N. Stone Avenue), Paula Valencia (broker for M. Schreier)

Staff Present: Gabriel Sleighter and Michael Taku (both Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD])

**2. Approval of the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the Meeting of May 11, 2023**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Ireland to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of May 11, 2023, as submitted.

Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 3-0. (Commissioners Griffith and Mulder absent)

**3. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases**

**3a. TC-COM-0423-01043, 1000 N Stone Avenue**

Construction of two shade structures and installation of two benches  
Full Review/West University Historic Preservation Zone  
Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Taku provided background on the project, which had been heard by WUZHAB as a courtesy review on April 18, 2023. During the courtesy review, it was suggested that the applicant take the project to the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission Historic Landscapes Subcommittee (HLS), which was done on April 26, 2023. HLS recommended approval 4-0 of the project as proposed with color of the shade structures to be unobtrusive and that the color of the benches be compatible with playground equipment color(s). The case went to WUZHAB for full review on May 16, 2023. WUZHAB recommended approval 6-0 as presented, noting that the color of the shade umbrellas should be muted and chosen by the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department and WUNA together. WUZHAB also proposed some dividers on the benches to keep people from reclining on them. Jim Glock presented the case.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner McDonald to recommend approval of the project as presented, with the shade structure cloth to be muted in color and the benches to match the playground [equipment] colors as closely as possible, with color(s) ultimately chosen by the Parks and Recreation Department and the West University Neighborhood Association.

Commissioner Ireland seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 3-0. (Commissioners Griffith and Mulder absent)

**3b. SD-0423-00044/TC-COM-0223-000659, 33 S 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

Alteration to the existing façade.  
Full Review/Downtown National Register Historic District  
Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Taku provided background on this case and noted that the project is being managed by Maria Gayosso [PDSD], but she was unable to attend today's meeting. Project is located in Gibson Court in Downtown Tucson. He described the project. The existing corrugated metal screen that covers up existing glazing will be removed from the west face of the building, and the existing storefront will be replaced with double-pane glass with new colors proposed for the west façade. A new security gate will be installed on the west elevation, and the entrance door to the building will be updated/replaced.

Dan Maher presented the case with assistance from his colleague Sacha Kessler. The building will be converted into an event space. They previously did a courtesy review around the turn of the year. They hope to replace the existing entry doors to the building with compatible doors that will better receive the necessary panic hardware. The architect's goal is to keep the depth of the façade as represented. PRS members noted that they had no objections to using an updated door if it maintained lights as in the existing. Chair Majewski asked when DRB is meeting on this case, and the meeting date is June 16. If DRB proposes any changes from what PRS has said, the project will return to PRS.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Ireland to recommend approval of the project as presented.

Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 3-0. (Commissioners Griffith and Mulder absent)

**3c. TP-PRE-0523-00207, 847 N Stone Avenue**

Alteration to the existing façade.

Courtesy Review/Miracle Mile National Register Historic District  
Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Taku provided background on this case. The existing building is to be converted into offices/tenant spaces to be used during the gem show. A cafe will be placed at the front of the building. It is currently a contributor to the Miracle Mile National Register District, but some inappropriate changes have been made to the building recently. Rory Juneman with assistance from Robin Large presented the project. Currently the property is under contract, and the potential buyer Marco Schreier would like to close in several weeks. They would use the Infill Incentive District (IID) process for rehabilitation of the building and understand that a condition of the IID is to maintain the contributing status of contributing buildings. They met with City of Tucson Historic Preservation Officer Jodie Brown, and she noted that the changes made to the building recently may have compromised the building's contributing status (current owner made changes within the last year). The inventory form done for the building as part of the National Register nomination doesn't represent the 1940s building but something later, from the 1960s or 1970s. Latter building is very closed off. The period of significance was discussed, and although no one had the exact dates handy (they would be in the National Register nomination), 1940s to 1960s was mentioned.

The building opened circa 1940 as an auto service center and originally had an open-air front. The project proponents showed the only image of the building they have located to date, which is a 1941 newspaper ad from the *Tucson Citizen* shortly after the building opened. Their challenge is to represent, architecturally and historically, an open façade on that east side, but have it closed in – couldn't

have floor-to-ceiling windows in front. They noted that they obviously couldn't go back to an open-air front façade and showed an initial idea where some of the front façade would be closed in, and some would be glassed in. They want to have something more open and have a cafe. They are trying to put in as much glazing as possible to represent the openness of the original building. Their plan is to come back to PRS through the IID process.

Chair Majewski asked what Staff Brown said to them about what has happened to the building's character-defining features that would lead to delisting. Rory Juneman said that the entry and windows have been changed. It looks different that the changes made in the 1960s or 1970s. Staff Brown has not made a determination about the current contributing status. The proponents propose changes could bring it back closer to the 1940s look. Chair Majewski thought that more historic photos needed. Commissioner McDonald noted that they have the 1941 ad photo, but it is difficult to see all of the details. In that photo you do get the essence of the canopy structure, and that structure is still present on the building. Rory Juneman noted that the canopy would remain and that they plan to do more research. Chair Majewski suggested that they look through the nomination for Miracle Mile to see what character-defining features are listed. Staff Taku noted that when they come back for a full review they should include the nomination [and the inventory form] in their submission package. Chair Majewski added that they should include any other photographs they find during the research they indicated they will be doing. Commissioner McDonald said that it will really help to do that research. She is excited about this proposed adaptive reuse and that they are doing historical research to inform the design response for the important east façade.

Chair Majewski noted that they should be looking at the Arizona Historical Society (AHS) collections (Rory Juneman had mentioned the Arizona State Museum as the research location, but it is actually AHS). She also encouraged them to have a conversation with Staff Brown and have her comment on what has to be brought back to reflect character-defining features. What has happened to the building that can be reversed. How far to go back – to the 1940s or to the later appearance that was recently modified.

Rory Juneman commented that the recent look is not that attractive – they want to open the east façade back up. How can this openness be re-created? Commissioner McDonald said that they are seeking the correct outcomes if they want to achieve that openness – developing the transition between the interior and exterior and getting that connection as strong as possible. But as they've mentioned, there's the economics and energy consequences of using a ton of glass on the east side. How to balance connection, transparency, storytelling of original versus new – the economics of lots of glass and the performance of the building. She thinks they are on the right track. She pointed out that we are not here to design the building for them.

Mr. Juneman said that the key is to have a design with openness. Their architect is Rick Brighton, and he will work on the design once the sale closes. Commissioner McDonald said to tell the story of the connection between old and new. They are

not replicating what was once there. Mr. Juneman said that it is not a bad thing to differentiate the front façade from the rest of the building. Commissioner McDonald concurred that there should be a distinction, but Chair Majewski suggested it should not be wildly “new.” Commissioner McDonald had no more comments, and Commissioner Ireland said he agrees with Commissioner McDonald and Chair Majewski. He is glad to see someone interested in the building. He said it might be useful for the proponents to look at some of the glass versus brickwork open as in other motor-culture-related buildings in Tucson.

Chair Majewski asked if Staff Brown has given the proponents any indication that the building couldn't be brought back to contributing status? Mr. Juneman said that the purpose of the current meeting was to get PRS feedback on how to do that, particularly regarding the 1940s original design. He thanked PRS for the thoughtful feedback. Chair Majewski mentioned that if they wished, they could do a second courtesy review once the proponents have more information from research. Mr. Juneman was open to that. Chair Majewski commented that it's an exciting project for the Miracle Mile District. Staff Taku reminded the applicants that if they intend to use the IID, one of the conditions is that the design of the project would not lead to delisting and keep it as a contributor.

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

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

No report at this time, but Chair Majewski noted that she would like to complete this during the summer.

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

##### **5a. Minor Reviews**

Staff Taku reported that a number of minor reviews were completed on 5/24. Commissioner Ireland stopped by the properties but did not connect with Staff Taku for the actual reviews. There were three reviews in West University: 127 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Street for an already-installed wrought-iron fence (a zoning violation, and the owners are working with PDSD on this); 920 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue for a fence; and 538 N. Hoff for a window and French door (latter in vinyl and needs to be wood). Three reviews were held in Armory Park: 811 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue for a meter installation; 126 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street (roof change from last review – now doing like-for-like asphalt shingles); and 748 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue for a fence (inconclusive and will need to review again). Other minor reviews are upcoming, and he will be reaching out.

##### **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. Two cases will be brought to PRS soon (either as minor or full reviews): one at 205 E. University (fence without review), and the other at 207 E. University for a fence. There is also a zoning violation at 713 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street structure where they have changed windows and doors.

**5d. Review Process Issues**

Chair Majewski brought up the issue of the write-up for courtesy reviews and asked what PRS members and staff felt about the lengthy write-ups. General consensus was that they are helpful, but they take time to prepare, and full recordings are also available online. Attempt will be made to streamline write-ups.

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

No public comments were received by the posted deadline.

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

The next scheduled meeting is June 8, 2023, and Staff Taku felt that he likely wouldn't have any cases that he is working on, but Staff Brown (who is not on today's meeting), might have a case or cases to put on the agenda. All PRS members in attendance said they could attend the next meeting.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:31 P.M.