



Design Review Board  
P.O. Box 27210  
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210  
Phone: (520) 791-4213  
TDD: (520) 791-2639

## **DRAFT** Legal Action Report – Meeting Minutes Design Review Board (DRB)

Members of the Design Review Board (DRB) held a meeting, which was open to the public on:

**Date and Time: Friday, February 6, 2026, 8:30 AM**

**Location: Meeting was held virtually using Microsoft Teams**

### **1. Call to Order / Roll Call, 8:31 AM**

#### **Members Present:**

- Rosemary Bright (Vice Chair)
- Caryl Clement – Left meeting at 9:53 am and returned at 9:54 am; quorum was maintained
- Daniel Maher
- Grace Schau
- Chris Stebe (Chair)

#### **Members Absent:**

- Paige Anthony
- Cade Hayes

**A quorum was established.**

### **2. Review and Approval of 1/9/2026 Draft LAR and Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made by Chair Stebe to approve the 1/9/2026 Meeting Minutes and the Legal Action Report. The motion was duly seconded by DRB Member Clement. All in favor. Motion passed 5-0.

### **3. Call to the Audience**

No speakers came forward.

### **4. SD-1225-00192 – Wave Lab, West Facade Modifications**

**Related Activity #s: TC-COM-1025-01978**

**Address: 111 S 6TH AV (Parcel #11717007B) Zoning: OCR-2**

**Rio Nuevo Area (RNA) Review**

**Action Taken**

#### **Staff Clarifications**

Staff introduced the project, noting that the building is a noncontributing structure to the Downtown Tucson National Register Historic District and therefore did not require review by the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission's Plans Review Subcommittee.

Staff also clarified that no change of use is currently proposed and that the applicant coordinated with the Downtown Transportation & Mobility (DTM) landscape architect regarding the proposed street tree species.

**Applicant’s Presentation**

The applicant team presented the proposed west façade renovation, describing the removal of non-historic materials, restoration of existing brick masonry, and installation of a new steel-and-glass façade system to increase transparency, natural light, and street engagement. The presentation discussed the vertical rhythm of the new façade, the durability of hot-rolled steel materials, and the recessed entry condition. Applicant clarified the stucco of the north façade will be painted.

The applicant also reviewed proposed right-of-way improvements, including replacement of a previously lost street tree, and discussed existing outdoor lighting, materials, and maintenance considerations. Applicant clarified the existing tree on the north façade is a Palo Verde tree, and that the existing knockout on the sidewalk is where the new tree will be planted, which is on the side of the adjacent property to the south, and that it is not known yet if there is irrigation system available. Additionally, applicant indicated the existing sidewalk along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue will not be modified, and that the Turquoise lane will remain as it exists.

**DRB Discussion**

Board members discussed façade rhythm, transparency, materials, and lighting. Discussion focused on pedestrian-scale lighting along the façade, particularly the potential need for an additional exterior lighting toward the north end of the building to address darker sidewalk conditions. Members also discussed irrigation responsibility for the proposed street tree and whether the tree should be tied to an adjacent project if irrigation infrastructure is shared.

**Motion**

Motion was made by DRB Chair Stebe to recommend approval, finding the project in in compliance with the design standards set forth in UDC Sections 5.12.7.C.1-15 and 5.12.7.D, subject to the following conditions: 1) Applicant to provide two outdoor lighting fixtures on the west façade: one above the entry door and the other in the general location of the existing light fixture on the north end; and 2) Applicant to clarify that the tree shown at the southwest corner in the right of way is technically part of the adjacent proposed project with the condition that if this adjacent proposed project is delayed or does not move forward this project is responsible for installing and irrigating the tree in the right of way. The motion was duly seconded by DRB Member Maher. All in favor. Motion passed 5–0.

**5. TP-MOD-0126-000005 (DDO-26-12) – Crivanjas New Storage Building**

**Related Activity #: TD-DEV-1025-00273**

**Address: 1400 E Apache Park Place (Parcel #13216925A)**

**Zoning: I-1**

**Development Design Option (DDO) Review**

**Action Taken**

**Staff Clarifications**

Staff introduced the proposal and clarified the DRB’s role in reviewing and forwarding a recommendation to the Planning and Development Services Director under UDC §3.11.1.C.3 and explained which findings applied to each modification request.

**Applicant’s Presentation**

The applicant team presented the proposed site plan, building footprint, vehicle circulation, drainage strategy, and landscaping approach. The presentation emphasized operational needs for large truck access,

first-flush water harvesting, and retention basins. The applicant explained constraints related to drainage conveyance, existing site conditions, and the rationale for requesting modifications to the landscape border and setback standards.

Landscape consultants described how trees were redistributed to improve survivability and irrigation access, while still meeting the overall intent of the landscape code.

### **DRB Discussion**

The Board engaged in extensive discussion regarding the reduced south street setback, the relocation of required trees, and the impact of drainage infrastructure on the ability to provide an effective landscape buffer along Fair Street. Members questioned whether the requested modifications were driven by site constraints or by building size and operational preferences.

The Board discussed alternatives for water conveyance that might allow required trees to remain within the south street landscape border and expressed concern that relocating trees away from the street edge reduced the visual buffering intent of the code. After discussion, the Board reached consensus to approve some DDO requests while denying others.

### **Motions**

The DRB made two motions:

- First motion was made by DRB Chair Stebe to recommend approval of applicant's DDO requests 1), 4), and 5), finding them in compliance with the findings for DDO approval set forth in UDC Sections 3.11.1.D.1, 3.11.1.D.2 and 3.11.1.D.3, with no conditions. The motion was duly seconded by Vice Chair Bright. All in favor. Motion passed 5–0.
- Second motion was made by DRB Chair Stebe to recommend denial of applicant's DDO requests 2) and 3), finding them not in compliance with the findings for DDO approval set forth in UDC Sections 3.11.1.D.1, 3.11.1.D.2 and 3.11.1.D.3, with no conditions. The motion was duly seconded by Vice Chair Bright. All in favor. Motion passed 5–0.

## **6. Staff Announcements**

Staff announced that the Stravenue Social project in the Sunshine Mile District is anticipated for review at an upcoming DRB meeting.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:14 AM.