

2024

**Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission**

Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS)

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

**Thursday, April 25, 2024**

**This was a hybrid meeting. The meeting was accessible at the provided link to allow for participating in-person, 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**

The meeting was called to order at 1:01 P.M., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Jan Mulder (Acting Chair) and Rikki Riojas (in-person); Joel Ireland, Andrew Christopher, and Savannah McDonald (virtual),

Commissioners Absent: Teresita Majewski (Chair). Applicants/Public Present: Bret West, Corky Poster, Drew Cook, Zoe Sadorf, Greg Vega-Diddle, Elaine Hill, Gerrald Adams, Athba Alradaan, and Shashank Marade

Staff Present: Michael Taku, Jodie Brown, and Dan Bursuck (City of Tucson, Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD]), Johanna Hernandez, Sarah Meggison, (Housing and Community Department), Terry Gilliland (City Manager's Office), and Jasmine Chan (Parks & Recreational Department).

**2. Approval of the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the Meeting of April 11, 2024**

**Motion:** Commissioner Riojas moved to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of April 11, 2024, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDonald.

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

**3. Historic Preservation 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. TD-DEV-1023-00435, 1135 W Miracle Mile**

Rehabilitation of existing motel for a multi-family development  
Full Review/Miracle Mile National Register Historic District  
Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

[Note: Commissioner McDonald recused at 1:24 P.M.]

Staff Meggison presented background on the 31-unit multi-family project.

Architect Zoe Sadorf from PMM provided an overview of the project, clarified points, and answered questions during the presentation. Corky Poster stated that the long-term plan for the site was to build an additional 43 units of affordable housing on the west side of the property. The Amazon Motel sign was requested to be presented separately to PRS.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** Commissioner Riojas moved to recommend approval of the project as presented with the condition that Amazon Motel sign be returned to PRS for review.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Christopher.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0. (Commissioner McDonald recused and did not vote; Chair Majewski absent)

**3b. TP-PRE-0324-00055, 5479 East Fort Lowell Road**  
Commissary Building Rehabilitation.  
Courtesy Review/ Fort Lowell Historic Preservation Zone  
Individually Listed

Staff Brown presented background on the project, noting that project was presented as a courtesy to the Fort Lowell Historic Zone Advisory Board (FLHZAB) on 3/25/24 and to the TPCHC Historic Landscapes Subcommittee on 3/28/24.

Jasmine Chan from the Parks and Recreation Department introduced the project and the role of City Parks. Corky Poster, from Poster, Mirto, McDonald Architects (PMM) noted that it is a city-owned property and managed in partnership with Pima County. All work will follow the existing Fort Lowell Master Plan approved by Mayor and Council.

Andrew Cook from PMM- provided an overview of the site, scope of work, and clarified and answered questions during the presentation. The rehabilitation presentation was on the Adkin's parking lot, Commissary, and Donaldson house.

Discussion was held. A summary of the discussion is included below. Responses from "PPM" are either by Drew Cook or Corky Poster or both.

*Commissioner Ireland asked whether there is a plan for lighting in the courtyard for evening purposes?*

*PMM:* The exterior part of this project has been behind the rest of the project. The next phase of the project is to choose the lighting and decide how the lighting is going to be done. We intend to have low lights, maybe strong lighting, but we must be very thoughtful to our neighbors. We don't want to disrupt them or the neighborhood.

*Commissioner Ireland also asked if lighting could be used that is directed more toward the ground.*

*PMM:* We would do that in compliance with the dark sky ordinance anyway. Everything needs to be directed downward. We might do some lighting from the building, and we might have some Ballard path lighting.

*Commissioner Riojas asked about using lights that auto brighten and dim near the proposed crosswalk so that cars are aware of pedestrians crossing there.*

*PMM.* The area you're talking about is public right-of-way, but we can suggest that to the COT Department of Transportation and Mobility.

*Commissioner Riojas noted that she likes the way they are proposing to incorporate the cellar into the project design and asked about the tree shown inside the cellar in the concept drawing.*

*PMM:* The tree is in the cellar; there are 9 trees in the cellar, and some will have to be removed. For the cellar, they are proposing to either put a chain-link fence around it to mitigate safety hazards or putting a deck within the walls so that people could stand on it and see what's beneath it. If the deck option is not feasible due to cost, then they will need to put a fence around the cellar.

*Commissioner Christopher asked about parking. Given Fort Lowell's design guidelines, what was their reaction to parking?*

*PMM:* We were influenced by the Neighborhood Association to bring more parking along the street and less interior parking. They also needed to look at parking for deliveries and ways to improve ADA access. Later in the discussion, Elaine Hill (member of the public) noted that she didn't believe that the Neighborhood Association found more street parking desirable but that they wanted to compromise on parking.

*Commissioner Riojas asked about the north parking lot. Is the reason that the parking lot is not being extended because there are artifacts in that area?*

*PMM:* That north parking lot is expected to be used by employees. That area is not developed for high traffic, and there is no ADA pathway. PMM has been directed to follow the Fort Lowell Master Plan, which had been approved by

Mayor and Council many years ago, to the extent possible. Many of the things they are doing are “preordained” by the master plan.

No action was taken.

- 3c. **TC-DMO-0424-00085, 24 N Norris Avenue**  
Demolition of primary and detached building.  
Full Review/Sunshine Mile National Register Historic District  
Contributing Resource

[Note: Commissioner McDonald returned at 2:47 P.M. and left the meeting at 3:00P.M.]

Staff Brown informed commissioners that the project was being reviewed consistent with the City’s Administrative Directive.

Terry Gilliland from the City Manager’s Office summarized all the actions undertaken to build the new Fire Station No. 3.

Gerrald Adams, from Perlman Architects of Arizona (Perlman) provided an overview of the design and clarified and answered questions during the presentation.

Discussion was held. Action was taken.

**Motion:** Commissioner Riojas moved to support the good architectural documentation and recommended an interpretative display of the iteration of the demolished fire station No. 3.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Christopher.

The motion passed unanimously by a roll call vote of 4-0. (Commissioner McDonald and Chair Majewski absent)

#### 4. Public and Institutional Use in a Development Zone Discussion

- 4a. **Discussion on the use of Public and Institutional buildings as comparative properties in Development Zones**

*[Note: This item was taken out of sequence; reviewed as first case]*

Staff Brown presented background on the discussion. At issue is the definition of the Development Zone (DZ) that includes the use of eligible or designated Public and Institutional Buildings as comparative properties in the review process. This will be relevant for the review of an upcoming 3-Story project in the Barrio.

Discussion was held.

Acting Chair Mulder pondered whether an exception in DZ [with inclusion of public and institutional buildings] was to facilitate Rio Nuevo and Downtown development or intended for both RNA and HPZ reviews.

Staff Bursuck did research on the history of how it got into the definitions. Staff found that there were discussions at two Planning Commission meetings (one study session and one public hearing) on the changes related to the Rio Nuevo and the Downtown Zone. In addition to the Planning Commission review, the Mayor and Council also held a public hearing to review and adopt the changes. The conclusion of the review was that it appears the insertion was intentional. Staff then explained to remove the language in question would require an amendment to the Unified Development Code (UDC) which would be initiated by the Mayor and Council.

Additional staff and PRS discussion was recommended, and the item will be kept on the agenda.

No action was taken.

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

5a. **Discussion on Best Practices for Naming of City- and County-Owned Physical Assets**

No report was given.

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

6a. **Minor Reviews**

Staff Brown provided updates on 582 S. Main Avenue, roof shingles replacement [Barrio Historico]. Staff Taku summarized project reviewed at 112 E. 1<sup>st</sup> Street for solar panels [West University]. Commissioner Riojas volunteered for the review. Staff Taku requested availability for upcoming minor reviews: 620 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave for solar panels [Armory Park]; 350 S. Convent for door replacement [Barrio Historico], and 256 E. Congress for Chela's sign [RNA]. Commissioner Riojas volunteered to assist in the reviews scheduled for May 1, 2024, at 9:00 A.M.

6b. **Appeals**

Staff Taku noted no pending appeal(s).

6c. **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. Staff noted that there are violation

cases being worked on in Armory Park and West University that eventually will be reviewed by PRS.

**6d. Review Process Issues**

None.

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

No public comment was received by the posted deadline.

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

The next scheduled meeting is May 09, 2024. Staff Brown noted that potential cases included Item 4a on this agenda and potential cases from the advisory boards.

**9. Adjournment**

**The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 P.M.**