



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 19, 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 site access/ technological issues, the Meeting was called to order at 6:46 pm when a quorum was established with all six members present: (In-Person) Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Mr. Pat O'Brien, Mr. Stan Schuman, Ms. Lyn Southerland; and (Virtually) Mr. Maurice Roberts.

Members Absent: None.

COT staff: (In Person) Mr. Michael Taku & Mr. Gabriel Sleighter, PDSD; (Virtually) Ms. Maria Gayosso, PDSD; Ms. Jasmine Chan & Mr. Elliot Welch, P&R. Ms. Gayosso recorded the meeting for the COT.

Guests: (In Person) Mr. Matt Smith & Mr. Eric Barret, ARC Studios Inc.; Mr. Michael Becherer & Ms. Valerie Rauh, Swaim Associates LTD, (all item 4b); (Virtually) Mr. Axel Golden, Golden Studios (item 4a); Olivia, resident).

2. Approval of LAR/ Minutes*– (actually) **October 15, 2024**, (and by consent) **November 12, 2024**

Mr. Burr noted that the posted LAR for October was incorrect and requires the following corrections: the **actual meeting date was 10-15**, not 10-17; the header incorrectly states it was a hybrid meeting; **it was virtual only**, due to inability to access the site; **paragraph breaks (7) are required**, per the draft, for reading comprehension and clarity, under item 4; the trailing sentence "Mr. T..." was, per the draft, a note that **Mr. Taku recorded the meeting for the COT**. Both versions were available to the board prior to the meeting. Motion to approve the amended 10-15-24LAR/ Minutes as corrected was made by Mr. Schuman, seconded by Ms. Erickson. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

Although not yet posted on the COT website, the draft LAR/ Minutes for the November 12, 2024, Special Meeting were available to the board (and staff) for review prior to the meeting. Motion to approve the 11-12-24 draft LAR as presented was made by Ms. Erickson, seconded by Mr. Schuman. 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-0824-0080, 720 S. 3rd Avenue (CONTINUED) *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/ Estimated time: 30 minutes.

Note: This item is continued from the 9-17-24 Meeting. (Please see LAR relevant snippet attached below.)

Mr. Axel Golden, architect, presented the revised design proposal. He briefly went through the list of requested revisions. Most of the plans have been updated to include dimensions. A floor plan, door and window schedule have been added, as are revised elevations. The wood double hung windows on the renovated porch enclosure have been inset 1" within the frame walls. All windows on the main structure are now proposed to be replaced/replicated in kind (note: ogee details omitted) and inset 4". The expanded kitchen window is now proposed to be a horizontal double hung wood window with a replaced/ extended voussoir and expanded sill. The stem wall on the enclosed rear porch is now proposed to be exposed brick (most sections recreated to match existing brickwork), and include repaired and new subfloor vents, with new stucco above. The existing rear porch will be stuccoed, with new simple railings (also on new rear stairs). A new metal panel (7'H x 4'2" W) will screen the new exterior water heater. The front yard wall/ gate plan/design is now included, and proposes a front wall of 4', with 6'h masonry sidewalls and a modern gate design.

Other items that were clarified during the review include: the repair of all stem wall vents/screens, repairing the front gable louver, retaining the existing front door and screen, notation of the earlier replacement of the north front porch door with a newer single light wood door which is acceptable, relocation of the electric service due to TEP line siting.

The Board were generally pleased with the revised renovation plans for the work on the rear enclosed porch. The design, including wall surface treatments, wood double-hung windows, wood doors, etc. all seemed appropriate. The screening panel for the water heater was acceptable. However, the Board had concerns on three specific items: 1) front masonry wall/gate; 2) plans for the reconfigured kitchen window; and 3) replacement of all the original windows.

Front wall and gate: Previously, a simple 4' high, stuccoed wall was proposed to enclose the front yard. The revised plans now show double brick capping on the stuccoed masonry wall, with the sidewalls, from the street front back to the facade now raised to 6' high. The gate is a modern metal frame with solid wood inserts. TSM 9-02.7.2.D.9 reinforces streetscape standards to limit front walls (opaque) to no higher than 48", front and sides, to the front facade line of the contributing structure. Mr. Taku concurred, noting that un-permitted fences in the area could not be used as a precedent. The brick capping is fine, but the entire opaque masonry wall will need to be reduced to 4'. Future plans to raise the side fence total height by adding a transparent design element (i.e. open iron work, etc., on top of the side walls) could potentially be considered at a future minor review. The modern design of the front gate was also generally considered inappropriate and should be revised to be more historically

compatible with both the site and development zone.

The kitchen window: As expressed previously, the extant, historic voussoir over the original window opening should be retained as-is, to indicate the dimensions and placement of the original window opening. Creating a new expanded voussoir in the repaired brick work would create a false sense of history. An expanded sill would however be acceptable for functionality. The board noted that all historic windows in the historic district from the original construction era (c 1907) would have been vertical in form, possibly in series; not a single, short and wide window. Two verticals, side by side, wood double hung windows, separated by a center post (wood or wood cased structural metal) would be a more appropriate design. After lengthy discussion on the mechanics of the required masonry repair/ steel structural support elements, Mr. Golden agreed to the revision.

Replacement of all original windows: The Board had already agreed replacement with in-kind replicated wood windows would be necessary for the east (front parlor) and west (return of a window to a non-historic door modification) (2) openings on the south wall. Minor repairs for the other windows had been previously proposed, with the board suggesting glass storm windows could be made (that would fit in the original screen slots) where thermal conditions suggested. Because UDC 5.8, TSM 9-02, and the Secretary of Interior Standards require repair over replacement when possible, the Board felt that a better assessment of the actual window conditions should be made before any replacement plan approval. Mr. Taku concurred and clarified that replacement is acceptable for windows damaged beyond repair (or improperly replaced) only. It was agreed that an on-site assessment review meeting could be held before any formal approval of the proposed replacement plans.

Action Taken: Ms. Erickson made a motion to recommend approval of the revised design plans as presented, with the following conditions: 1) the front wall will be reduced to no more than 48"; 2) a minor review will be made to A. consider a more historically compatible front gate design and B. assess which original windows can be repaired vs. replaced/replicated (except the two south windows discussed, which are approved for in kind replicated replacement; and 3) the expanded (combined) kitchen window will retain the original voussoir, repair string courses, allow for an expanded sill, and feature two side-by-side wood double hung windows with a center post in the now horizontal opening. Motion seconded by Ms. Southerland. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

Noting it was not their purview, members of the board encouraged the owners to retain the original pocket doors which are proposed to be removed, since they are a character defining feature that adds value to the property/structure. The Board thanked Mr. Golden for his generally well conceived plans and for working with it to better the project. Mr. Taku outlined next steps. Hopefully, an on-site review could be done before PRS full review.

b. SD-0924-00098, 222 S. 5th Avenue (CONTINUED) *Removal of the existing stage, plaza area, games area; restroom renovation for ADA compliance; addition of a new central plaza with overhead shade structure;*

addition/alteration of trees/plantings, park lighting; parking improvements; addition of dog park. Full Review/ Contributing Resource.

Note: This item is continued from the 10-15-24 Meeting. (Please see LA relevant snippet attached below.)

Mr. Matt Smith began the presentation, noting that changes had been made based on our previous feedback, and based on the Historic Landscape Subcommittee's review of further refined plans on October 31, 2024. Briefly those recommendations were: replacing the planters with low seat-wall platforms, which will be faced with "A" mountain stone (or similar) to reference the base of the original (c 1909-11) bandshell structure; open the back area to allow for temporary backdrop installations as needed; remove turf from the central plaza area; replace fallen cypress trees (which had been removed from the plan); shrink the dog park footprint further by eliminating the central path and pushing it north. The focus of this review is to finalize recommended approvals for the shade structure and dog park plan, so design/engineering can move forward. A few key changes are: replacing recent storm toppled trees in kind; adding succession plantings along the cypress allees (oaks for evergreen color, not deciduous trees); retaining the oleanders near the bathrooms; removing hackberry trees from the proposed plantings, and potentially using vines/ ground cover at the back of the new bases of the shade structure supports. The dog park has been pushed north (with access on 12th Street, with a 145' x 50' footprint for both areas (about 7000 ft sq.), now conjoined. City requirements will retain the 5' height of the proposed fence. All park furnishings will now be concrete. The City is also willing to consider a large specimen tree in the south quadrant per the neighborhood's request for a memorial tree.

Mr. Michael Becherer, next presented a significantly updated plan for the shade structure. The overall form is the same— a square shaped structure with 38' sides, rotated on a 90-degree axis, with a long ridgeline (with E/W orientation). The supports are now two-armed, outward branching trapezoidal steel columns on each side rather than the processional 3 angular archway forms shown in the previous plan, that better ground and balance the roof structure. The bases are now rectangular, with 2 tiers (each 18" H) of benches, the lower level faced with dark masonry or stone and capped with precast concrete panels. Open cabling between the angle of each support will allow for vines or backdrop installations as needed. Flush/side mounted linear LED panels will provide ambient lighting under the roof. Diamond patterned; matte-finish metal shingles are proposed. An under-roof color of yellow/gold was shown, with bronze paint on the steel forms.

For the plaza area, the turf has been removed since it has always been a paved area. Two options—a semi-circular form and a larger square form were shown. He showed a timeline of forms the footprint of the plaza has taken over the past 135 years, based on reasonable estimates. Arguments can be made for either form. A central circle was likely to at least 1919, with some level of remnant arced edges remaining into the 1960's, though a general larger squarish form seems to have prevailed by the 1930s. The paving patterns/textures are yet to be finally determined.

Mr. Taku asked if conceptual approval was what is being requested. Mr.

Becherer again responded that approval of the shade structure and the dog park need to have action taken to continue the review process/ engineering design. The bathroom renovations have not changed except the addition of internal roll-up gates. Additional fixtures/stalls will not fit in the ADA compliant space. The parking, demolition, overall planting design (all hardscape plans) need to move forward. However, elements such paving patterns/ texture, colors (for the structure, fences, lampposts etc.), lighting and other details (planters, furniture, memorial tree) can (and will be) back for review later.

As always, Board discussion was lengthy. Largely unchanged items— parking, demo, tree removal, restrooms were again supported, as was the planting design. The addition of the succession planting of (evergreen, slow growing oaks was favored. Overall, the design of the shade structure is well thought out and reinforces the centrality and geometrical historic design of the park. Though more modern than expected, it is generally elegant and refined. After some discussion, the diamond pattern (metal) shingles appear to have district precedents.

However, the dog park is still contentious. Previously, the Board had requested SHPO consultation that it would not impact the (again) pending individual NPS nomination and potential listing. SHPO has not been consulted. Most agreed it is an unfortunate intrusion that disrupts both the historic geometry and historic open space patterns of the park. That said, the design team have minimized its impact as much as possible due to the political decision to mandate it. Mr. Welch confirmed that it could be removed in future if it becomes a health hazard due to its limited size and functional use.

The final shape of the plaza had no definitive consensus among the board. Many preferred the semicircular rounded form, noting that, if it was removed, all reference to the bandshell, and the circle form of the original design language in the park will be lost. Most felt some reference to the circular form should be retained, even if it may only be in the patterning in the pavement. The smaller footprint will also be a smaller heat—sink, considering the park’s western orientation. Arguments for the squarer form included larger capacity, time duration the form, etc.

Action Taken: Mr. Shuman made a motion to recommend the plantings, shade structure, bathroom renovations and other discussed and agreed elements of the revised plans as presented and as shown during the meeting; with the condition the board does not recommend approval of a dog park but recommends the minimized impact plan shown as an “intrusion” if approved; and with the understanding that details such as lighting, all colors, pavement patterns/surfaces, etc. will be brought back for future review, consideration and recommendation. Motion seconded by Ms. Southerland. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. *Update on the design guidelines*

Mr. Burr did not provide an update due to time constraints.

6. Minor Reviews

Mr. Burr noted he had participated in 3 minor reviews since the last meeting:

- 138 E 14th Street for a metal roof: approved.
- 748 S 4th Avenue for a roof replacement: approved.
- 105 E 17th Street for a solar installation: approved.

Mr. Burr also noted that he had participated in a courtesy meeting in early October, with Mr. Taku, to allow appropriate stucco repairs at the Temple of Music and Art.

Mr. Taku has scheduled an early morning virtual minor review on 11-21 for a solar installation at 846 S 2nd Avenue. It's a simple installation behind a parapet. Mr. Burr has sent comments, as he is unable to attend. A request was made for a volunteer to participate. No one else was available to attend. Mr. Taku felt the comments, and review by a member of PRS were sufficient. No other minor reviews are scheduled or anticipated.

7. Call to the Board

- Mr. Burr noted that he had participated in an IID-DRC meeting the previous week to approve new affordable housing on N Stone Avenue.
- Ms. Erickson is working with the HC to update the National Register listing application for Armory Park.
- Ms. Southerland noted that APNA is having a Holiday Party on 12-7-24 at St. Andrew's Parrish Hall, 5-8pm, and that the board is invited.

8. Staff Updates and Future Agenda Items— Information Only

Ms. Gayosso noted that the application period for candidates to fill the HPO position, and others, has been extended at least into December. Mr. Taku is leaving for extended vacation on December 12. The December meeting will need to be virtual (by Zoom), due to limited staffing. Mr. Burr hopes staff can ensure the two approved 2025 candidates for the board (Mr. Grede and Mr. Smith) can have their names placed on the December M&C agenda for appointment.

9. Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting is December 17, 2024.

Addendum

Note: for reference, the discussion sections and actions taken for both item 4 prior reviews are attached, from the approved LARs:

9-17-24 LAR: SD-0824-00080, 720 S. 3rd Avenue

"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 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 in the development zone. Mr. Golden noted that many of the questions the board had were actually

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 existing 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 rollcall vote: 5 in favor, 0 opposed. Note: Ms. Southerland left the meeting at 8:10 pm due to technical difficulties."

10-15-24 LAR: SD-0924-00098, 222 S 5th Avenue

"Mr. Matt Smith, began the presentation, noting that Elliot Welch is the project Manager for the COT but was not available for this meeting. The site plan with proposed demolitions came first. The existing, building adjacent sidewalk, plaza area, band shell structure and parking access lane will be removed, as will all the game area concrete/fixtures. Plantings to be removed are the nine ash trees that are around/ within the existing plaza area, or non-salvageable ash/ mulberry trees on the north and south edge lines. The oleanders near the bathrooms, and a non-salvageable sahuaro will also go. New ash trees will be planted along the N,W,S perimeter, and the new 10' wide north-south axis line that will serve as an access route for special event vehicles will be lined with Pistache trees.

Other new plantings will be ironwood and hackberry trees in the desert areas to the east and palo Blanco trees on the sheltered west side of the building. Re-stripping and new bump-outs at perimeter corners /access routes, plus eight new spaces in the empty 5th Ave desert planter, will provide 6 net spaces to the plan. A new semi-circle area with turf and a new, centered plaza area (overall about 30' x 50') with a shade structure, will recreate the original central axis design of the park. New ramps, stairs, planters will provide proper access to the building. The existing scoreline patterns will be retained on the diagonal sidewalk extensions, with a broom finish on the concrete, while the plaza area will have exposed aggregate concrete.

The Board were generally agreed on recommending these aspects, as they we're not substantially different than previous iterations. The neighborhood association has recently requested an additional large tree (Pistache?), on the south side (for balance) to serve as a neighborhood memorial tree, possibly with a plaque. Recent storm damage to the cypress trees (they will be replaced) led to the question of long-term outlook for the climate challenged trees (ash, cypress). Interplanting is the preferred response but creates problems of visibility through the park. The Board recommended the designers consult the Landscape Subcommittee for guidance.

Mr. Michael Becherer next presented the proposed bathroom remodeling. The version shown during the meeting was the latest iteration, which was significantly different than the plans presented for board review. The existing two-bathroom concept, each with two stalls and a sink have been re-envisioned as a single room, two stall, one sink option, with a plumb chase/storage area, two large openings on north and west walls for policing visibility. Discussion took place, with the Board favoring interior roll-down gates rather than anything on the exterior. Concerns were for the reduction, by half, of the number of fixtures. Unfortunately, portable toilets will be required for most events. The plans may change again due to City reviews. Next up was a completely new idea for the shade structure, finished just before the meeting. Mr. Becherer showed the previously presented 3 options, a 4th (shell/dome option seen by PRS but not APHZAB), and that in the project packet pre-reviewed by the Board. Unfortunately, the shell concept was outside the budget. Showing new historic photos from 1862 (tents-then Camp Lowell), 1891(open space), 1901(original Washington Park), 1911(the free-standing original bandstand, predating the 1914 Armory), and a 1950s view, conceptual context was developed for the new plans. Since an arched bandshell, like the original, is not possible, for many reasons, the "Tent" option was used as the basis for more recent iterations. The one shown in the provided plans, has again been entirely refined and redesigned. It still features a 38' x 38' roof outline, set on a diagonal to the plaza, with a long axis ridge projecting outward (west) at a pitched angle. The rest is new. The now 6 smaller columns create a scaled set of three arched frames (steel), now anchored in ovoid planter bases, with a semitransparent masonry screen, creating a backdrop to the now quarter circle stage set in turf.

Generally, the Board favored this latest iteration, although it is still conceptual, and which will require further refinements/plans for a

recommendation. Discussion was lengthy, noting corrugated metal profiles, stage size and access, etc. One point of discussion was to ensure both SHPO and the NPS would interpret changes as “compatible”, since the Park is in the process for a possible individual listing. Most felt the geometry of the design for the structure was compatible.

Mr. Smith next provided the proposed changes to the “Dog Park” concept.

The angled points have been removed but the cut-corner square form of the conjoined two dog parks (small and large dogs) appears to intrude more into the performance space. New (15') gates will be required for access to a 1940's water main. The turf is planned to be retained.

The Board discussion was again lengthy, and heated. Generally, the small (non-)functional space/large intrusion into the park situation again came up. Points made were that it intrudes into the public performance space, compromises the national memorial aspect of the park, privatizes public space and may create a health hazard. The impact to the geometry of the historical design of the park was of serious concern; again, the Board requested SHPO/ NPS comment. Noting the various stakeholders in the overall discussion, it was asked that a possibly re-envisioned design, that might be more compacted and pushed to the north and northwestern edge, might impact the park less, overall. It was also asked if the City might alternately consider the option of relief stations for an open leash-only plan. Although it may provide a relief station to area apartment dwellers, it may be too small to function as a play area for animals. Generally, the Board would prefer an alternate site for a dog park.

Next discussed was the proposed lighting and fixtures. Further information was requested. Apparently, the specified (but not shown) benches and tables may be concrete rather than proposed metal fixtures specified, with an unknown design. The proposed fencing, and colors for fixtures will need further discussion.

Due to the disparities from the pre-presented plans, and ongoing flux in designs/plans, both the design team and the board felt a continuance was in order, noting the discussion was helpful towards a final design plan.

Mr. Taku clarified that although consensus was achieved on parts of the plans, a completed design plan (including revisions) was best for a recommendation, as PRS will require a final plan.

Action Taken: Mr. Roberts made a motion to continue the case to review a completed design package, at a soon- as- possible Special Meeting (to allow PRS timely review), seconded by Ms. Southerland. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.”