

2026

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

**LEGAL ACTION REPORT/Minutes**

Thursday, May 14, 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 1:00 p.m., and per roll call, a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present (all virtual): Teresita Majewski (Chair), Andrew Christopher, Blake Houghton, and Savannah McDonald (left meeting at 3:30 p.m.).

Commissioners Absent: None

Applicants/Public Present (all virtual): Sam Nicolary and Ellen Vincent (owners, 217 E. 17<sup>th</sup> St.); Jennifer Levstik (WestLand Resources); Mark Cross (Owner's Representative - 1742 N. Oracle Rd.); Gene Goldstein, Kyle Vilaubi, Kevin McQuaid, Ingrid Rodriguez (Bramic Design Group - 1742 N. Oracle Rd.); Lisa Bowers (Sonoran Development Consulting - 1742 N. Oracle Rd.); Ken Scoville (Tucson Pima County Historical Commission); John Burr (Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board); Elaine Hill (audience)

Staff Present (all virtual): Desiree Aranda and Jason Lilienthal (City of Tucson Planning and Development Services Department [PDSD]), Matthew Christman (City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Department), Ian Milliken (Pima County Cultural Resources & Historic Preservation Office)

**2. Review and approval of 4/23/2026 Legal Action Reports (LAR) and Meeting Minutes**

Action was taken.

Motion: Commissioner McDonald moved to approve the Legal Action Report/Minutes for the meeting of 4/23/2026 as submitted.

Commissioner Houghton seconded the motion.

No discussion was held.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

### 3. Summary of Public Comments (Information Only)

Staff noted several comments were received by the posted deadline, including emails from Helen Erickson regarding item 5a. Santa Rita Bath House signage and an email from Ken Scoville regarding item 5b. 1472 N. Oracle Road. Chair Majewski recommended hearing the comments during the relevant items.

### 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-0226-00030/TC-RES-1225-05979** **Action**  
**217 E 17<sup>th</sup> Street (Parcel #117071590)**

The proposed project is a 405 SF Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). It will have a maximum height of 13' with a decorative parapet with single-sloped galvanized metal roof. Will be built with insulated concrete foam blocks clad in sand-floated plaster in an un-pigmented white Portland cement with natural sand. A new 6'-0" corrugated metal fence is proposed on the north property line, and along the eastern alley side, a 6'-0" wall constructed of Mikey block and clad in lime plaster—matching the materials of the ADU—will extend south from the north property line to a gated entry. Proposed demolition of a rear addition and rehabilitation of the rear porch. The original brick walls on the North and East sides of the residence would be preserved. PRS may recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the project.

*Full Review/Armory Park Historic Preservation Zone*

*Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards*

*Staff Contact: Jason Lilienthal, Historic Preservation Lead Planner*

Staff Lilienthal provided background on the project. The applicants/owners, Ellen Vincent and Sam Nicolary, presented their 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. New porch windows to be aluminum-clad wood.
2. The ADU should be shifted to the west so that the east setback is no less than the existing house, and that a 4' setback on the west side would be acceptable.
3. The 2' setback on the north is acceptable.
4. New wood and glass lite door on north elevation to match the existing front door.
5. All new mechanical equipment to be screened from view from the street.

Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion.

No discussion was held.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

## 5. Courtesy Reviews

### a. **Santa Rita Park Signage** **Courtesy** **401 E 22<sup>nd</sup> Street (Parcel #11709001B)**

The Parks and Recreation Department and Historic Preservation Office seek input on proposed interpretive signage for the Santa Rita Bath House and Pool, which will be installed at Santa Rita Park, a public park owned by the City of Tucson.

*Courtesy Review/Santa Rita Park*

*Staff Contact: Desiree Aranda, Historic Preservation Officer*

Staff Aranda presented background, shared public comment, and introduced Matthew Christman from City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Department who presented the proposed signage. Commissioners asked questions and discussed the project. PRS comments included the following:

- More interpretive panels to cover additional history are warranted
- Can the signage include more history of the park beyond just the history of the pool; a more comprehensive history of the park
- Additional consultation with the Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation, and Mexican American and African American cultural organizations was recommended
- Mention that the park was initially called South Park, connected to the historically Black neighborhood of South Park that is adjacent; explore the historical association to Black history
- Recommend deleting the contemporary image of the pool and bath house that is not flattering; if a better photo of the building can be found, use that
- The original plan of the park or historic map of the park would be great to include
- More insightful detail and history
- Would like to see the revised version and learn more about the sign itself—material, size, location, how it gets mounted, etc.
- Historic photo is good; other images detract
- More details about desegregation would be good to include

No action was taken as the item was a courtesy review.

### b. **TP-PRE-0426-00094** **Courtesy** **1742 N Oracle Road (Parcel #115070750)**

The proposed redevelopment of the Hacienda Motel, a contributing property on the National Register-listed Miracle Mile Historic District, seeks to maintain almost all of the existing building footprints, maintain the exterior historic look, and convert this property into mercantile/wholesale gem and mineral vendor-oriented lease spaces

with an Oracle Road frontage. A new building (building 3) added to the west is intended for entertainment themed use along with the existing pool area for gem and mineral shows and presentations. The project also proposes a new perimeter fence and entry gates, demolition of three buildings at the rear of the parcel, a new one-story addition and decorative rooftop sculpture to Building 7. There will be 4 one-bedroom apartment units on the existing 2nd floor of building 6.

*Courtesy Review/Miracle Mile Historic District NRHP*

*Contributing Resource/Rehabilitation Standards*

*Staff Contact: Desiree Aranda, Historic Preservation Officer*

Staff Aranda provided background on the project. The applicant, Kyle Vilaubi, presented the project. Commissioners asked questions and discussed the project.

- Overall comments:
  - It's great to revitalize the building and give it some new life.
  - PRS commends all the people involved in the project. Appreciate the passion and desire to keep it as true to its historic form as possible.
  - Our main concern is to maintain contributing status to the National Register Historic District.
  - There was a discussion of integrity—location, setting, materials, design, workmanship, feeling and association.
  - Questions about whether everything is adding up to preserving the integrity of this site, or not. Some fear the cumulative changes would render the property no longer contributing.
- Plan corrections needed:
  - Incorrect door note
- Entry gates and perimeter fence:
  - Would like to see through the gates too; its important to see all the way through (versus the solid gates as proposed)
- Signs:
  - 2 historic neon signs will be retained and restored by Cook Signs, which PRS supports
- Sculpture:
  - Crystal sculpture is crazy and cool; fitting with tourist roadside architecture; the crystal is taking that idea to the max
  - Sculpture is really cool but might be going too far. Thinking about viewsheds, the giant sculpture is not part of historic feeling of that neighborhood. There needs to be a balance. At 52.5' tall, you'd be able to see it for miles. During early colonial days, the church was the tallest building around for that purpose. Doesn't know that it has a place in that area.
  - Could scale come down a bit?
  - Considering the visual and vertical impact, could it be put on the ground with a base, at a strategic location?

- Roof:
  - On the roof tile, go with a terra cotta color paint
  - Parapet detail: paint it a different color than the masonry (looks like it was a terracotta or brick color)
- Posts:
  - Stone veneer removal is good
  - Decorative steel posts would be preferred over stuccoed beams
  - Wrought iron posts contribute to workmanship
- Windows:
  - Existing windows are steel framed. We'd expect steel casement windows with fixed portions. Rather than aluminum-clad wood windows, the better choice would be casement.
  - Inset of infilled windows is good
- Pool area:
  - Pool infill is fairly common
  - Would retain low stone wall around the pool area
  - Prefer not to see stucco over river rock at the retaining wall
  - New building proposed for pool area
  - Overall character of the hotel features a center court. PRS has concerns about the new building that would block the court from the street and has some hardships with concealing that important element. A new building at this location has significant characteristic changes on the elevation. Might be more of an Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (AZ SHPO) question.
- New construction/replacement buildings at rear/plan and space:
  - Applicant claims proposed buildings to be demolished are currently fire-damaged beyond reasonable repair.
  - Building should be distinctly new; it should be compatible but should not look like it was originally there. Recommend keeping south elevation of building 1 and preserve the exterior space between buildings, so that the new building is a separate structure (like the demolished buildings) and not an addition
  - Replacing buildings at rear of the property with one building might compromise the integrity, as it will change the flow and space

No action was taken as the item was a courtesy review. Staff Aranda noted she will reach out to AZ SHPO for comment as a next step.

*Commissioner McDonald left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.*

**c. Section 106 Invitation to Comment as a Consulting Party  
9861 N Shannon Road**

**Courtesy**

Verizon Wireless Terracon proposes a 17-foot Monopole Telecommunications Tower and invites the Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission to consult on the effect to

historic resources within the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The APE is located within unincorporated Pima County.

*Staff Contact: Ian Milliken, Historic Preservation Officer, Pima County*

Chair Majewski suggested PRS defer to Pima County Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Office for this consultation. PRS members agreed. No action was taken as the item was a courtesy review.

## **5. 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**

Chair Majewski asked if there is a way to better gather names of attendees.

## **6. Future Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings**

Staff Aranda shared upcoming agenda items. Staff and PRS discussed the meeting schedule and due to staffing challenges at the end of May, it was decided that the next regular PRS meeting would be moved to June 4, 2026.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.