



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, September 17, 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.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Due to technological/ accessibility problems, the Meeting was called to order at 6:48 pm when a quorum was established with six members present: In Person: Mr. John Burr, Mr. Pat O'Brien, Mr. Maurice Roberts, Mr. Stan Schuman. Virtual: Ms. Helen Erickson, Ms. Lyn Sotherland. Members absent none

COT staff: Mr. Michael Taku, (PDSD, in person); Christina Anaya, (COT, virtual- left meeting at 8:30pm); Maria Gayosso, (PDSD, virtual- joined meeting at 7:30pm). Staff recorded the meeting for the COT.

Guests: Mr. Axel Golden, architect, Studio Golden, (virtual).

2. Approval of LAR/ Minutes— May 21, 2024

The draft LAR/ Minutes were available to the board for review prior to the meeting. Motion to approve the LAR/ Minutes as presented was made by Mr. Roberts, seconded by Ms. Erickson. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

3. Call to the Audience None: No one spoke, and no written comments were received prior to the meeting.

4. Reviews

a. SD-0824-00080, 720 S. 3rd Avenue *Repair back porch enclosure. New stucco. New window and door locations. Repair back porch stem wall foundation. Modify (1) window opening and replace (1) side door with window on main part of the house. New masonry wall at front of house with gate 4' max height. Full Review/ Contributing Resource.*

Mr. Alex Golden, architect, presented the design proposal. He showed the site plan which is a traditional lot with a jog: 60' wide on the east, 66' on the west, and the usual 184.8' depth. It has a rolling gate and shed at the rear. He showed site plan, development zone, arial views and context photos. He then showed photos of the existing building, noting the rock foundation, brick walls with the belt course generally serving as the sill for most of the original 3'W x 6' H double hung windows. Besides basic repairs including brickwork and repair of windows, the two changes proposed on the main structure are for a current door on the south-side to be returned to its original window configuration with appropriate masonry infill, and a consolidation of two windows on the north side into a larger single window. They have an artisan who is capable of replicating or duplicating historic damaged windows.

The bulk of the project is re-envisioning the enclosed rear porch that has been repeatedly modified over time without permits. The intention is to shore up structurally the stem wall /piers and bring into building code compliance the whole addition, replacing all windows with a standardized double hung form, add a door on the north (with steps), and stucco the entire section, while retaining the existing rear porch. The footprint and roofline will not change. Mechanical changes will include relocation of the west mini split to the south side, replacement of the electric service to a single 200-amp box and add an exterior water heater with enclosure on the south-side in the elevation of the enclosed porch/ main structure connection. Finally, a 4' stuccoed masonry front wall with a gate is proposed.

The Chair noted that no permits other than utilities upgrades, and side fences appear to have been applied to the property over the last 50 years. From Public records it appears that the original porch was enclosed at some early time, extended in 1972, and that the property was reconfigured as a triplex by 1987, with 3 baths. It was listed as a duplex in 2020, and again reconfigured as a single-family home by 2024 just before its sale in April this year, after the long-term owner's death. Numerous changes over time include the window to door on the south (now proposed to be returned to the window configuration), replacement of several windows, new openings in the brickwork, the replacement of the north door underneath the porch, and the boarding up of the south front window.

The board were largely agreed that conceptually, the proposed project is well thought out, appropriate and agreeable. However, there are significant problems with the design package as presented. The existing elevations are incomplete, and the proposed renderings and elevations have no dimensions, legends or clarifying notations. No front masonry wall plan was included in the review package (a non- dimensioned image was shown during the meeting). Omissions include: a second existing chimney is not shown, nor are the subfloor vents just above the foundation line, which will need to be retained/repared. Also, the recent door replacement on the north facade, and the substantial repair to the south front window are not called out or specified. There is not a window or door schedule, with dimensions. No materials are listed, i.e. door material/ configuration, stucco type or finish, etc. The design guideline page will need to be revised to reflect changes specifically on details, projections/recessions, etc. The rendering on the rear porch will need to be revised to reflect actual specifications.

The board clarified that the development zone is the east and west 3rd Ave block faces between 17th and 18th Streets. The wall examples shown are side walls, not front walls, and are not within the development zone.

Mr. Golden noted that many of the questions the board had were contained in the construction documents, a few of which were shown during the meeting. Mr. Taku clarified that while the board does not review interiors, all information on the building envelope, including dimensions, materials, configurations, products, site improvements, etc. are required for historic review. The information on the building plans that address the boards questions should be included in the revised historic design package.

After lengthy discussion and clarifications, and in addition to the above requested information, the board also recommended:

- all new windows be inset into the wall, not flush mounted. Dimension on plans (i.e. 2'6" x 3'10").
- Specify door configurations/ materials/dimensions.
- indicate which windows can be repaired vs replicated.
- the reconfiguration of the kitchen window should retain the exiting voussoir, western window line, replicate any extension of a needed brick sill, so the "history of the original window can be

read” and consider a double hung type, rather than a casement type window, as there were none originally.

- consider reimagining the existing (non-permitted) rear porch to be more compatible, possibly stuccoing the exposed concrete block (non-appropriate material). Specify details if any railings are considered.
- consider vents, scoring lines, and other options for the proposed ground to rafter stucco finish on the rear addition renovation to minimize moisture problems, provide continuity to architectural lines. Specify type and finish for stucco on plans.
- consider screens/ storm windows for insulation and function of the restored windows and potential modifications for the opaque (inappropriate) front door security screen.
- consider screening options/ relocation of water heater/ enclosure which will be visible from the street and any external mechanical equipment.
- Show plans and elevations with dimensions of the proposed wall and gate (including materials).

Action Taken: Mr. Roberts made a motion to continue the case so that a revised complete design package with requested information as discussed could be reviewed, seconded by Mr. Schuman. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

Note: Ms. Southerland left the meeting at 8:10 pm due to technical difficulties.

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. *Update on the design guidelines*

Mr. Burr noted that he now had access to all the files from the final version the Board approved in 2019 and will work on them going forward, since all HPZ boards are now revising their guidelines.

6. Minor Reviews

Mr. Burr noted that he had participated in one minor review since May— for a solar installation at 345 S. 4th Avenue, which was approved as presented because all equipment would be hidden from street view by parapets. Mr. Taku did not expect any pending minor reviews to be scheduled in Armory Park, currently.

7. Call to the Board

- Mr. Burr noted he had approached 15-20 people to join the board this year, with no useful results and encouraged other members to help find new candidates, if possible. He noted that both he and Mr. O’Brien term out at the end of the year leaving 4 members for 2025. He offered to help in future as a non-voting advisor to the board if needed, requesting a future agenda item to discuss when/ how that could be achieved. There will be a Special Meeting, concurrent with the (in person only) APNA Annual Meeting on November 12, to hopefully vote to recommend new candidates for the board.

- Mr. Burr noted recent changes in PDSO staff: Jodie Brown, HPO, resigned at the beginning of the month; the City is hopeful to hire a replacement in the HPO position by year end, working with a new subgroup from the Historic Commission to help define roles, duties, and organizational structure towards that goal. The Planning Director, Kristina Swallow is now Assistant City Manager overseeing PDSO and other departments including Transportation and Tucson Water. Koren Manning is now Acting Planning Director, while Dan Bursuck is now Planning Administrator, now overseeing the historic division, with Maria Gayosso helping to facilitate the process. The chair and Board asked that Mr. Taku reach out to give Ms. Brown our thanks for her past help and service.
- Mr. Burr noted that Plan Tucson is expecting to have outreach meetings in the following weeks. He also noted that he had conversed with Dan Bursuck over the issue of ADU heights in HPZ's following state law changes. It appears that criteria in UDC 5.8 and TSM 9-02 will still ensure that new ADU's will not be taller than the contributing historic structure on sites.
- Mr. Roberts noted that he had noticed construction generally had slowed due to a lack of money in the industry.
- Mr. Schuman asked what will become of an approved FLD site in Armory Park, now that it is for sale. Mr. Taku and Mr. Burr clarified that the property is offered with the approved plans but that the individual buildings will still require review before anything might be built there. Mr. Schuman also asked about the ACC approval of the TEP project. Mr. Burr noted that it will not affect Armory Park, with Mr. Taku noting that plans will be reviewed at PRS.
- Ms. Erickson noted an open meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2024, at noon for Plan Tucson. She also praised the COT for its collaborative approach in drafting the update.

8. Staff Updates and Future Agenda Items— Information Only

Ms. Gayosso introduced herself, noting her 26-year tenure with the city and as Principal Planner. While she is familiar with the historic process, she had relied on the HPO for guidance. She will be overseeing Mr. Taku, with Mr. Bursuck having oversight of all things historic. Ms. Gayosso did ask the board to reconsider meeting dates in the near future, due to staffing issues. Options will be discussed at the next meeting. It is hoped WUHZAB, who meets at the same time, may change their dates, as APHZAB has been on the 3rd Tuesday for over 30 years. Mr. Taku noted that the board will be notified of any new cases.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting is October 15, 2024.