



FULL HISTORIC REVIEW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DATE: August 04, 2026

ACTIVITY NUMBER:	SD-042600059
RELATED ACTIVITY NUMBERS:	TC-RES-0326-01222
LOCATION:	829 N 5 TH AVENUE (PARCEL #11703069B)
ZONING:	HR-3
HISTORIC ZONE/DISTRICT:	WEST UNIVERSITY HPZ
CONTRIBUTING STATUS:	CONTRIBUTOR
APPLICANT:	PETER ZORILLA, TAMARRON HOMES, INC.
PROJECT NAME:	DRIVEWAY AND FENCING
STAFF CONTACT:	MICHAEL TAKU, HP LEAD PLANNER

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project includes addition of a concrete driveway and a wrought fence with 3' tall gates at the front yard of an existing historic residence. A portion of the existing rock retaining wall at the front of the property is proposed for removal to make way for the new driveway. A new walkway is proposed from driveway to entry. The applicant also proposes relocating a portion of the existing corrugated metal fence to allow more space for the new driveway.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The lot is 0.18 acres (7,980 sq. ft), with an existing contributing historic residence, constructed in 1905. The residence is a one-half story with stucco exterior, gable roof with asphalt shingles and a chimney. The front entrance has two pillars with two bay windows and a stone retaining wall.

APPLICABLE PRESERVATION STANDARDS

Pursuant to provisions of Section 5.8.9 of the City of Tucson Unified Development Code (UDC), the proposed project must be reviewed for compliance with historic preservation standards by the Historic Preservation Office (HPO), the West University Historic Zone Advisory Board (WUHZAB), and the Tucson Pima County Historical Commission's Plans Review Subcommittee (PRS). Applicable preservation standards include:

- Section 5.8 of the City of Tucson Unified Development Code (UDC)
- Technical Standards Manual Section 9-02
- The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
- HPZ Design Guidelines

HISTORIC ZONE ADVISORY BOARD COMMENTS

This was reviewed by WUHZAB on July 7, 2026, and with the consent of the applicant, continued to a future meeting. WUHZAB provided the following comments:

- (1) Show on the plans the location of the existing mechanical equipment;
- (2) Provide the photos and full drawings of all the existing and proposed elevations;
- (3) Show proposed curb cut width, the driveway length and square footage;
- (4) Indicate any restriction to a longer driveway to the rear;
- (5) Identify section of the existing historic front lava stone retaining wall proposed to be removed and state how it will be repurposed;
- (6) Provide a solution to the grade differential between the lot and adjacent property to the north; and
- (7) Provide the proposed side corrugated metal and front wrought iron fences and gates design with associated heights.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT

The Department has not received any public comments regarding the proposed project.

ZONING & BUILDING CODE REQUIREMENTS

This review applies only to the project's compliance with historic preservation standards. Compliance with all other applicable zoning and building code regulations is required to obtain a building permit. Changes made to the plan to achieve compliance with these other code requirements may require another review for compliance with historic preservation standards.

STAFF FINDINGS

Historic Preservation staff find that the proposed driveway does not meet the WUHZAB Design Guidelines for off-street parking, which discourages driveways at the front of the lot. The WUHZAB Design Guidelines note the following:

- "Curb cuts and driveways generally do not bisect residential lots along the street front. Alleys always in the rear of the property accessed garages, when they were built. A defining characteristic of the neighborhood is the general lack of driveways and parked cars visible within the front yards of properties" (p. 10).
- "Off-street parking should not be visible from the street; place parking and service facilities to the rear. Screening may be required on a case-by-case basis. Utilize landscaping and other screening elements to screen these areas without negatively impacting adjacent properties" (p. 26).

One consideration is that the subject lot does not have an alley, so rear parking access is not an option.

The proposed fencing meets the WHUZAB Design Guidelines and is typical within the Development Zone. Applicant will need to provide elevation of proposed gates, which the site plan notes at 3' tall.

The proposal includes the removal of a section of the rock retaining wall along the front perimeter, which is a character defining feature of the property, however most of the wall would be retained.

Note: It is advised that the applicant confer with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as early as possible to ensure that the proposed project will not compromise participation in the State Property Tax Reduction Program. Contact SHPO at: spt@azstateparks.gov

Contributing Property Modifications & Additions (UDC 5.8, TSM 9-02.7.0, SOI Standards, HPZ Design Guidelines)					
S	D	NA		S - satisfies D - does not satisfy NA - not applicable	Staff Comments
☐	☐	☐	(1)	<u>Minimal Exterior Changes</u> Exterior alterations and changes are minimal; property to be used as it was historically or given new use that requires minimal change to distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships	See comments above.
☐	☒	☐	(2)	<u>Visibility</u> Alterations or renovations visible from the street are minimal	
☒	☐	☐	(3)	<u>Height</u> Height generally conforms to typical height within development zone; new additions are no higher than the tallest contributor of the same use in the development zone (e.g. principal buildings are compared to principal buildings, accessory structures are compared to accessory structures except for Accessory Dwelling Units, which are compared to primary buildings); and height of new buildings are compatible with the height of neighboring contributing historic properties.	
☐	☐	☒	(4)	<u>Roof Types</u> New or replaced roof is compatible in configuration, mass, and materials to that of the existing structure	
☐	☐	☒	(5)	<u>Setbacks</u> Maintains prevailing street and interior perimeter yard setbacks within its development zone	
☐	☒	☐	(6)	<u>Site Utilization</u> Spacing between buildings is consistent with that of contributors within the development zone	
☐	☐	☒	(7)	<u>Building Form</u> Size, scale and mass of additions are compatible with existing structure and with contributors in development zone	
☐	☐	☒	(8)	<u>Proportion</u> Changes are consistent with proportions of existing structure and with prevailing proportions of contributing properties within development zone	

☐ ☐ ☒	(9)	<u>Projections and Recessions</u> Appropriate to the style of the existing structure	
☐ ☐ ☒	(10)	<u>Rhythm</u> Proportion, patterns and rhythm of openings, including at additions, are compatible with those of existing structure and those of contributors within development zone	
☐ ☐ ☒	(11)	<u>Windows & Doors</u> The size, shape, and materials of window and door openings are maintained; repair options fully explored before replacement is considered; removals/infills are limited to only where necessary; evidence of original opening is maintained; where replacement is the only option, the new features will match the original	
☒ ☐ ☐	(12)	<u>Materials</u> All construction materials are appropriate to the building and to the neighborhood	
☒ ☐ ☐	(13)	<u>Surface Textures</u> Appropriate to historical style of existing structure; and may be differentiated at additions	
☒ ☐ ☐	(14)	<u>Colors</u> Appropriate to architectural style of structure and historic period (may only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)	
☒ ☐ ☐	(15)	<u>Character-Defining Features</u> (a) Alterations or changes to character-defining features are minimal; any historical and distinctive architectural details remain (b) Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship are preserved; No chemical or physical treatments that would cause damage to historic materials (c) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved (d) Repair options fully explored before replacement is considered; where replacement is the only option, the new features will match the old; replacement of missing features substantiated by documentary and physical evidence	<i>Although part of the rock retaining wall along the front perimeter, which is a character defining feature of the property is being removed, it will be reused and most of the wall is retained.</i>

☒ ☐ ☐	(16)	<u>Architectural Style</u> Architectural style of alterations and new construction is compatible but differentiated from historic structure on site and surrounding properties, but there are no conjectural features or elements that give a “false sense of history” (Renovation to earlier historic style of property is acceptable if based on documentary evidence)	
☒ ☐ ☐	(17)	<u>Details</u> New additions are appropriate to styles found within the HPZ, while avoiding a false sense of historical development such as by adding conjectural features from other buildings	
☒ ☐ ☐	(18)	<u>Reversibility</u> New additions, if removed in the future, leave the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment unimpaired	
☐ ☐ ☒	(19)	<u>Landscaping</u> Plantings and ornamental features reflect the historic period of subject structure (may only be considered as part of a required HPZ review)	
☒ ☐ ☐	(20)	<u>Enclosures</u> Fences, walls, or other physical features are compatible with architectural style of subject structure and contributing properties within the development zone	
☐ ☐ ☒	(21)	<u>Utilities</u> New above ground power and telephone lines and utility connections are appropriately located	
☐ ☒ ☐	(22)	<u>Motor Vehicle & Parking Areas</u> (a) Off-site parking spaces for uses within HPZ are not more than 600 feet away (b) New and modified vehicular use areas are landscaped and screened using compatible structural and plant materials	According to WU Design Guidelines, “place parking and service facilities to the rear”

REQUESTED ACTION

The Department seeks a recommendation whether to approve, approve of the conditions, or deny the proposed project.