

2026

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

LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes

Thursday, August 13, 2026

This was a virtual meeting. The meeting was accessible at the link provided 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 1:04 p.m., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present (all virtual): Teresita Majewski (Chair), Andrew Christopher, Blake Houghton (left at 2:40 p.m.), and Savannah McDonald

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present (all virtual): Desiree Aranda, Jonathan Knighton-Wisor, and Michael Taku (City of Tucson Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD]); Jennifer Toothaker (City of Tucson Department of Transportation and Mobility [DTM])

Applicants/Public Present (all virtual): Alex Enoch (CadMan Designs, designer, 848 S. 4th Ave), John Burr (Armory Park HPZ Chair), Dane Donatelli (groundsman, 647 S. 4th Ave), Peter Melsted (owner, 647 S. 4th Ave), Susan Pope (Shive-Hattery Architecture)

2. Review and approval of 7/23/2026 Legal Action Report (LAR)/Meeting Minutes

Action was taken.

Motion: Commissioner Houghton moved to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of 7/23/2026 as submitted.

Commissioner Christopher seconded the motion.

No discussion was held.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

3. Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)

No public comments were received by the posted deadline.

4. Historic Preservation Zone (HPZ) Review Cases

UDC Section 5.8/TSM 9-02.0/Historic District Design Guidelines/Revised Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines

a. SD-0326-00051/TC-RES-1225-06221

Action

848 S 4th Ave (Parcel # 11708075B)

There are two major scopes of work proposed as part of the project: a detached 800 sq. ft. ADU and conversion of a carport into 309 sq. ft. of conditioned space.

Full Review/Armory Park HPZ

Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Contact: Staff Contact: Michael Taku, Historic Preservation Lead Planner

Staff Taku provided background on the project. The designer, Alex Enoch, presented the project. Commissioners asked questions and discussed the project.

Action was taken.

Motion: Commissioner McDonald moved to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions:

Carport conversion:

1. Infill to be brick pony wall and horizontal wood paneling to match the configuration of the previous addition
2. Revise the east elevation to show correct existing window sizes and the chimney
3. East new window to align with one of the existing windows on that elevation
4. Mechanical unit to be placed in the back yard behind a wall screened from view
5. Windows to be casements not sliders
6. The back porch at the primary residence that exists but was not previously reviewed/permitted is acceptable as built.

ADU

1. Applicant to revise the drawings to show to replace the double wood gate with fence and pedestrian gate 4' tall by 4' wide wrought-iron gate with a regular, alternating, or decorative pattern of wrought-iron pickets.

Commissioner Christopher seconded the motion.

No discussion was held.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

b. SD-0526-00084/TC-RES-0526-02663

Action

647 S 4th Avenue (Parcel # 117071410)

The proposed project is a bedroom addition, new bathroom, bathroom skylight, and roof dormer.

Full Review/Armory Park HPZ

Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards

Staff Contact: Staff Contact: Michael Taku, Historic Preservation Lead Planner

Staff Taku provided background on the project. The owner and applicant, Peter Melsted, presented the project. Commissioners asked questions and discussed the project.

Action was taken.

Motion: Commissioner Christopher moved to recommend approval of the project as presented with the following conditions:

1. The new wood dormer siding should be diamond pattern (or similar) to differentiate it from the existing scalloped dormer siding and include wood trim compatible with the house standard.
2. The new proposed dormer window should have a flat top instead of a curved top.
3. The new skylight should be indicated as having flat glazing.

Commissioner Houghton seconded the motion.

Discussion was held. McDonald asked for clarification that it is the trim, not the windows, that should not be arched.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

5. Courtesy Reviews

a. Acorn Luminaire Options for Dunbar/Spring Neighborhood Street Lights* Discussion

Department of Transportation & Mobility requests a courtesy review of information compiled at the request of Dunbar Spring neighborhood and historic district regarding new dark sky compliant luminaires for existing streetlights in the National Register Historic District.

Courtesy Review/John Spring Neighborhood Historic District (National Register-listed)

Staff Contacts: Jennifer Toothaker, Deputy Director, Department of Transportation and Mobility; Jonathan Knighton-Wisor, Cultural Resources Compliance Manager, Historic Preservation Office

DTM Deputy Director Toothaker, Susan Pope from Shive-Hattery, and Staff Knighton-Wisor presented different lighting options proposed for the replacements and background historical context. PRS members discussed the project and offered the following comments:

- Houghton:
 - Gets to the heart of preservation at the landscape scale, at the scale of a streetscape. Two different time periods: poles installed in the 1930s. Some might say we need to clearly differentiate between the original and 1986 poles. This is an opportunity for a unifying element. They're not replacing original elements anyway, they're replacing replacements. Need to think about the intent of this form. With Option 3, we lose the ambiance. Option 2 might be the best of both worlds, as it still allows for light shed to illuminate

the space as it would during its period, but it's differentiated enough. Thinks Option 2 is the best-case scenario. *[Commissioner Houghton left the meeting at 2:40 p.m.]*

- Christopher:
 - The feel of the lighting is important. Having a globe of some sort is important. The warmth and ambiance that a globe fixture gives to the street is what we're trying to preserve. Option 1 or 2 is his preference.
- McDonald:
 - Agrees with other commissioners that option 2 is a good fit. Also appreciates Option 3 as a replacement for the 1986 reproductions because the Dunbar/Spring neighborhood prefers that option and it is important that they have the ability to create their own identity which is often characterized by a thoughtful relationship with their environment. Perhaps a mixed approach for the two types of poles that remain based on Johnathan's research.
- Final thoughts:
 - Likely any option could work for the 1986 reproductions, including Option 3. On the original poles, Option 1 and 2 are recommended.

6. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

a. Minor Reviews

Staff provided an update on recent minor reviews.

b. Appeals

No appeals to report.

c. Zoning Violations

Staff reported on recent zoning violations and noted that cases will be brought to PRS when ready.

d. Review Process Issues

- We should have a future discussion of which version of the plans to share at PRS to avoid confusion.
- Existing conditions are important to see.

7. Future Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings

Next regular meeting is scheduled for August 27, 2026.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.