



**Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board  
LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 19, 2022  
Virtual Meeting**

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Meeting was called to order at 6:32 pm when a quorum was established with seven Members present: Ms. Sara Bachman-Williams, Mr. Tom Beal, Mr. John Burr, Ms. Helen Erickson, Ms. Martha McClements, Mr. Pat O'Brien, Mr. Maurice Roberts.

Members absent: Mr. Glenn Furnier, Mr. Robijn van Giesen.

COT staff: Ms. Jodie Brown, HPO.

Guests: Mr. Cade Hayes & Mr. Jerrick Tsosie, (plus 1-unidentified) architects with DUST (4a); Mr. & Ms. Wilke (Mike & Chris), property owners (4b); Mr. Bill Mackey, Worker Architecture PLC, (briefly by telephone - 4b); Ms. Sara McDowell, UA Urban Planning Dept. student (guest).

**2. Approval of Minutes— March 15, 2022**

The revised LAR/ Minutes were made available prior to the meeting ("comments available by request"). Ms. Bachman-Williams made a motion to approve the revised LAR/ Minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. The motion was approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor; 0 opposed, 1 abstention (Mr. Beal, due to absence).

**3. Call to the Audience**

Ms. Brown noted that she had received no comments prior to the meeting.

**4. Reviews**

**a. 807 S 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue (continued)**

Construction of an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and carport structure.  
Courtesy Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Hayes and Mr. Tsosie, architects with DUST, presented an updated design concept to the Board. Since the prior courtesy review (see *APHZAB LAR 3-15-22*), the building has been refined and now shows windows and doors within elevations and a corrugated metal hip roof (14' peak, 12' midpoint height standard). Two iterations for a possible covered parking structure were presented in new perspective renderings: attached with a shed roof (16' x 11'4" footprint) and a free-standing flat-ish roof structure (16' x 10' footprint). The revised site plan shows a new gate (proposed as out-swing), and a new storage accessory structure. A floor plan for the new ADU was presented as were new photos of the

existing east facade with French type, multi paned doors. The site plan shows the existing “contributing” shed, which the property owner still wishes to remove if it is reclassified as non-contributing.

Generally, the Board was supportive of the refinements to the proposal. The pairing of the side-by-side, double hung 3 windows along the north facade with the 3 double doors on the south side, create a balance of the elevations. The Board noted that the windows were less vertical than those on the contributing structure but would appear compatible, especially behind the wall. The Board did suggest that the doors should be French doors that mimic those on the contributing structure, not sliders (an option shown) which are incompatible in the HPZ. Questions were made about the narrow width of the space between the existing wall and the north facade. The alignment of the north facades of the new structure(s) with the contributing structure will allow for retention of existing trees and possibly provide a space for a sliding gate. Several members noted that the gate cannot swing out across the public pedestrian walkway. A few members preferred the attached shed roofed carpet design as it mimics the roofline of the primary structure. The Board was supportive of the new small storage shed. Regarding the existing shed, a determination that it is not a contributing structure will need to be made by the HPO. Mr. Hayes showed 1919 and 1948 Sanborn maps that did not show the structure, in support of the proposed demolition. A determination will be made prior to the full review. Finally, in terms of the proposed height, it was noted that height in HPZ’s was defined differently than in the rest of the UDC. Mid-point peak (total) height is generally used on primary structures, but the ridge midpoint height has been used on smaller accessory structures. Ms. Brown clarified that since the roofline is below the contributing structure, compatible in the development zone, and follows HPZ guidance which prevails, the proposed height appears compliant with ADU rules.

The Board again thanked the design team for coming in before a formal proposal is made. Next steps will be a submitted design package for formal review, and a determination on the status of the listed accessory structure. The full review will be made with an assigned HPZ number.

**Action Taken:** None- courtesy review.

**b. HPZ 22-025, 844 S 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue (T19CM03071/T19SA00164)**

Building addition and accessory structure.  
Full Review/Contributing Resource

The project was reviewed and approved with conditions in May- July 2019. (*Please see 5-21-19 APHZAB LAR*). The Planning Director’s Approval Letter, also with conditions, is within the current application package. A new HPZ number has been assigned. After much discussion and misdirection, it became apparent that the previous permit for the primary structure is ongoing and current until May 31, 2022. The previous application (HPZ 19-41) was presented again with no changes to the primary structure/addition which may require minor reviews for potential changes that may be needed to comply with the listed conditions (i.e., non-approved translucent roof panels in the breezeway area).

The one change that is being requested at this time is a change in materials/

construction methods/ door placement of/in the accessory garage structure. A brief audio call with the architect, Mr. Bill Mackey, confirmed this, although he was not present for the meeting. Mike and Chris Wilke, the property owners presented the case.

The initial plan was to build the structure as an insulated concrete form, with corrugated siding and a standing seam roof to match the addition to the primary structure. The doors were towards the west with a storage/office space to the east. The costs became prohibitive. A prefabricated metal building with PBR siding and roofing is now proposed. The overall footprint is the same, as is the roof pitch (5.5/ 12) and exposed rafter tailings, although they will now be painted metal instead of wood. The door locations had to be revised to work with the metal frame post construction, but the doors are essentially the same 8' x 8' doors. Apparently, the floorplan from the 2019 package page has been selectively revised to show this new placement and a new page with modified elevations has been added to the initial package.

Once clarified, the Board was largely supportive of the change but concerned about PBR, a metal industrial siding, being used in the HPZ without precedent. Both standing seam metal roofing and corrugated metal siding are present in the HPZ and development zone but not PBR. However, the rear of the parcel is at the edge of the HPZ with metal commercial buildings across Arizona Ave. It was noted that little of the building would be visible from the 5th Avenue frontage.

The Board made several iterations of various motions reflecting the ongoing discussions during the meeting. It was noted that any changes to the primary structure/ addition were not a part of this review and may require further review if changes are made, consistent with the PDS Director's decision letter. The final motion as (amended for clarification by Mr. Burr and agreed by both the motion maker and the seconder) and approved is below.

**Action Taken:** Mr. Beal made a motion to recommend approval of the change of materials/ plans of the accessory garage structure as presented on the otherwise pre-approved project with the condition that the Board finds the use of PBR panels reasonable at its specific location in its development zone, and as a specific case. Ms. Bachman-Williams seconded. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 6 in favor, 1 opposed (Mr. Roberts).

## **5. Design Guidelines Project**

### **a. Update on the design guidelines**

Mr. Beal said he had received the edits from Mr. Furnier but had not fully reviewed them. They will meet to make simplified revisions to be reviewed soon by the Board.

## **6. Request Funding from Armory Park Neighborhood Association to Digitize Files**

Mr. Burr noted that APNA had, at its last meeting, voted to disperse funds when requested by the APHZAB Chair.

**Action Taken:** Mr. Burr made a motion for the Board to direct the Chair (Ms. McClements) “to request appropriate funding from APNA for the further digitalization of APHZAB files”, seconded by Mr. Roberts. Motion approved by roll-call vote: 7 in favor, opposed.

## **7. Call to the Board**

- Ms. Erickson noted that the National Trust had last year provided funding to create a questionnaire about historic construction trades and their ongoing disappearance. Older specialists are retiring, and few replacements are being trained. Pima Community College is considering developing a program to counter the trend but requires a market study. She would like to share the link to the survey with the Board and other interested parties through the chair. She hopes for a good response before the end of May.
- Mr. Beal asked if there were any updates on returning to in-person meetings. Ms. Brown noted that M&C were now trying to develop a hybrid type meeting, but BCC’s will take longer. Locations with the necessary equipment for a hybrid meeting for us will take more time to establish.
- Mr. Burr requested that a standing item be placed on upcoming agendas with updates on the split in COT and County Historic Commissions. It appears that a suggestion/recommendation has been made to eliminate HPZ boards in the process. Ms. Brown clarified that the recommendations were still being discussed by the stakeholder group and regular updates are made at the full TPCHC meetings. Ms. McClements and Ms. Erickson are in that stakeholder group. The next meeting will be on April 27 to finish discussion of the findings. It also appears that some combined collaboration, including possible shared members and subcommittees may be considered.
- Mr. Roberts requested guidance and feedback on how the new ADU ordinance will apply in HPZ’s. Ms. Brown clarified that HPZ guidance takes precedence and that they will still be required to be compatible within development zones. It was noted that the initial rezoning request for 375 S. Stone Ave. has been updated to the PRO site but under the prior 2019 rezoning activity number. It has not been revised yet with items that were shown at more recent affiliated project meetings. Ms. Brown does not think it will be coming to the Board soon.
- There were no minor reviews in the past month nor are any yet scheduled. Mr. Beal had one last month. Ms. Brown noted that minor reviews may be now either remote or on site.
- Ms. McClements did note that several files have been relocated to the Historical Society.

## **8. Future Agenda Items—Information Only**

Ms. Brown noted that she was not sure any major projects were likely to come for review in May but would keep the board posted.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be May 17, 2022.