

**Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room – 106 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona
Monday, August 5, 2013 – 4:00 p.m.**

(15 minutes, 4:00 - 4:15 p.m. for items 1 - 3)

1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Roll Call: Chairman Brynn Burkee Unger and Commissioners Catherine Coté, Ann Jarmusch and Steve Segner. Vice Chairman Allyson Holmes and Commissioners Jane Grams and Charlie Schudson were excused.

Staff Present: Audree Juhlin and Kevin Snyder

Councilor(s) Present: Dan McIlroy

2. Public forum for items not on agenda. Limit of 3 minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public.)

Chairman Unger opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

3. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters.

Audree Juhlin announced that the City Council will be discussing the Commissions and the new Citizen Engagement Program on Wednesday, August 14th at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

4. Consideration of the following request through public hearing procedures: (1 hour, 4:15 – 5:15 p.m.)

Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate a historic structure, the “Telegraph Station”, from outside of the City limits to the Jordan Historical Park located at 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336. A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to Jordan Road between Orchard Lane and W. Park Ridge Drive. The subject property is approximately 3.598 acres, zoned CF (Community Facilities) and further identified as Assessor’s Parcel 401-03-001F. Applicants: Sedona Historical Society/City of Sedona Property Address: 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336 Property Owner: City of Sedona Case Number: CA 13-01

Explanation of public hearing process by Chairman Unger. Presentation by Applicant’s Representative, Janeen Trevillyan, Sedona Historical Society.

Janeen Trevillyan referenced the Staff Report and explained that they researched other historic parks and properties in Arizona where other structures have been built or planned by consulting with Don Ryden, a SHPO-approved architect in Scottsdale, and these cases are reflected in Exhibit C8d. They also consulted with Nancy Burgess and she offered a letter of support to bring the historic artifact to the Jordan Historical Park. A letter of support written by Ruth (Jordan) Van Epps who was raised at the family home was also read. After reviewing numerous sites, the Museum Board determined a preference for Site 1; however, they would not oppose Site 2 and are proposing both equally.

Commission’s Questions:

- Regarding their sources of information for the restoration of the interior, Janeen explained that they are relying heavily on footage from the video.

The Chairman opened the public comment period.

Kathy Levin, Sedona, AZ: Spoke in opposition to the proposed relocation of the structure, because the placement would introduce new history onto the site and the term “new construction” in Standard #9 is being misused and the proposed structure would adversely affect the character and integrity of the historical setting and buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places by introducing new history. Kathy then referenced a Master Site Plan for Jordan Historical Park that depicted new office space for expanded exhibit and administrative purposes and indicated that efforts should be refocused to expanding into new facilities to better full the mission of the Sedona Heritage Museum.

Commission’s Questions:

- Regarding why a new building is okay but not the proposed building, Kathy explained that a new building is distinguishable from the historic structures and carries no stories, in her opinion.
- Regarding her source of information for the plan to expand, Kathy explained that there was a master plan with a new building depicted on the east side that has an opportunity to tell the story of filmmaking without compromising the integrity of the site.

Bob Huggins, Sedona, AZ: Spoke in opposition to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, because the park was created to interpret the pioneer farming homesteading and story of the Jordan family. Ruth’s dream was to keep this as a preserve of the early farming and it wasn’t intended to celebrate the entire history of Sedona. Adding buildings outside of the scope adds new history to the site, which muddles the story. He doesn’t see any historic significance to the structure, because it has been moved multiple of times and adapted for different uses. The worse thing is that it would create a non-history; there was never a railroad through Sedona or a telegraph office on the Jordan homestead and the park was never used in the motion picture industry. The only possible purpose for the building is as a tourist attraction.

John Warren Oakes, Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Spoke in support of the relocation of the telegraph office to a site that is more than just a farm. It has become a very important historical presentation in Sedona. The history of filmmaking could be introduced at that facility that will be attractive to people who visit, and the Museum has the ability to make clear that this is part of a presentation of the history of Sedona and not necessarily for that farm.

Holly Epright, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that the Sedona Main Street Program Board of Directors is fully supporting placing the telegraph office at Jordan Historical Park as an exhibit.

Jennifer Wesselhoff, President and CEO of the Sedona Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Sedona Historical Society, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that this new opportunity provides an opportunity to share the history of Sedona, and after studying Sedona’s tourism industry to create a long-range tourism plan, an incredibly important item was tourism product development and how to create new or enhance existing products to better tell Sedona’s story, create a better visitor’s experience, and create a better quality of life for residents. This project has the potential to do that. The Sedona Heritage Museum, its Board of Directors and its volunteers are doing something to enhance what we have here and we should allow that to happen.

Anthony Caetano, Sedona Historical Society Board Member, Sedona, AZ: Indicated they are in the process of developing the telegraph office as an historic exhibit and educational piece for the students, the community and the visitors to see that Sedona was a location for western films. It is going to take about \$100,000 to restore it to its historic nature, furnish it and make it into an exhibit of historical significance and educational relevance. From the Board and some supporters, they have already received commitments for about one-third of that amount, and he believes he can get the rest of the monies from corporations and foundations.

Peter Fisher, Sedona, AZ: Indicated it is the best neighbor he ever had; he lives directly behind the barn, so if anyone should be concerned, he would be him. The fact that they want to bring in something that is historically relevant to Sedona would be great.

Jim Eaton, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that the Jordan Historical Park was never intended to be nothing but a farm or orchard operation. It covers the early pioneers, the orchards around the valley, the movies and other interests on this property. It was never intended to be a monument to the Jordan family, but they are pleased to have the approval of Ruth Jordan. The National Register is a minor consideration and the things they can do with the historic structure far outweigh other considerations. Sedona had a telegraph office and *Angel and the Badman* was made in Sedona. Losing the National Register listing as a result of adding this building is unlikely, but in the worst case, you got a little prestige and a nice bronze plaque, and weigh that against all of the things we can do with this building. There are already some non-contributing, non-historic structures in the park, and they aren't applying for landmark status for the telegraph office. Many people have worked to remove the non-historic parts of the building and they are going to fully restore it. The building has been moved twice and the last was to become the home of the widow of Otto Hallerman, the father of Sedona's movie industry, and the proposed location will have no visible impact on any of the landmarked structures. Other sites aren't practical and the potential in education and visitor experience far outweigh other concerns.

Commission's Questions:

- Regarding whether or not there are limitations on the use of the site, Mr. Eaton stated no.
- Regarding whether or not the Sedona Historical Society is the only group focused on telling Sedona's history, Mr. Eaton indicated yes.
- Regarding a request to quantify "considerable support", Mr. Eaton indicated that in addition to more than 20 people who have worked to remove the non-historical parts of the building, they have a goal of \$100,000 and have already raised \$25,000 without any public effort.

David Thomas, Board Member, Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Discussed the broad spectrum of Sedona's history and heritage that the museum presents and indicated that the relocation of the last surviving building of the old movie set to Jordan Historical Park will add an additional artifact and allow for the movie room in the Jordan home to be moved to its own exclusive exhibit. He encouraged the Commission to vote yes to save an important piece of Sedona's heritage.

Having no additional requests to speak, the public comment period was closed.

Applicant's Representative Janeen Trevillyan, Sedona Historical Society, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that in terms of the Jordan Historical Park being a memorial to the Jordan family, the Commission heard the letter from the family, and in 2006, the City approved a revised master plan that supports locating a new museum building for exhibits and administration close to Jordan Road. The park property lends itself well to the addition of some buildings, and in the last 15 years, there have been two additions to an historic building plus three non-contributing structures have been added. Additionally, the downward slope of the site provides some natural buffer. The addition of an historic artifact to the park can be successfully accomplished and this structure is an historical artifact worthy of preservation. SHPO's three points were that a property be used for its intended use or placed into a new use with minimal change and the use of a historical park and museum has already required the changes mentioned in the report. Their second point was the historical nature of the property will be retained with no removal of features and there is no removal proposed. Their third item was that each property be recognized as a physical record of time, place and use, and changes should not create a false sense of historical development, and this can be done.

Commission's Discussion:

- Chairman Unger noted for the record that she has had some issues with communications going on outside of this Commission. She has talked with Kathy Levin and other Commissioners have talked with Janeen.
- Regarding the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Standard #3, it sort of jumbles the timeframes of the property, so it is public perception of the integrity of the property.
- One concern is the integrity of the property as it was designated on the National Register, and the violation of the part that talks about spaces between buildings and open landscapes.

- On the more liberal side, the tent building has been put there and the orchard is just some trees that were planted, etc. The preference would be for the building to be someplace else, but a concern is whether it should be a building when it was a prop. A prop would be more integral to making the movie, whereas a station wasn't in Sedona, so it makes more sense as a prop.
- The public doesn't want their houses landmarked, because then they lose the freedom of how they can use their property. This property wasn't intended to be restricted to the Jordan story; it was to tell Sedona's story. It is the Historical Society's home, so where else are they going to be able to tell the story. We either need to find them a new home or give them the ability to tell the whole story. There is some concern about setting a precedent, but Sedona had a telegraph station, so it is part of our history. What is more important, a plaque or the value that we have in Sedona's history, and then we hear that a brand new building is okay.
- It was explained that people walking up to the site should be able to determine new buildings from the original buildings.
- SHPO's three points and the ending comments seem to say there is a little bit of discomfort in considering this, and the Commission's decision can't be about whether or not it will bring tourism to the City. SHPO doesn't say that we can't do this, but that we have to ensure it is not going to impact that property in any way that would make it not what it is. It was presented as the Jordan Ranch to the National Register and one of the last agricultural farming properties within the City limits. It doesn't mean that you can't add to the property, but the Commission's discussion has to be how much it is going to impact the property as a ranch property.
- One concern is that it was a prop and part of the history and the value of the property isn't as a working farm; it is our historic park and probably has to catch all of the historic things we want to say in our City
- When something is added, we have to be able to remove it from that space and leave the space as it was before.
- We have a responsibility to the community, and if not there, then where and if not them, then who? Preserve with integrity, but also keep within reason what we are trying to preserve – the history.
- Distinguish between the Museum and its collections and the Jordan historical ranch. The collections can be displayed in other locations, but the Jordan homestead is where it is. To bring in a non-related building from a different time dilutes the story. It appears to be a train station in the Victorian style generally found on the east coast and shipped to Arizona as a kit. Creating a historic context statement for this building is problematic. The people portion adds to the story, but the preference would be for the building to be used somewhere else – like the gas station at the "Y".

A Point of Order was called to ask if the Commission has a tie vote and goes out of business in two weeks, what happens. Kevin Snyder explained that if the Commission doesn't have a positive motion to approve it, then it is not approved, but the City Attorney may say it needs to be taken to the City Council, so staff will have to get confirmation, because there is nothing in the Code that speaks to a tie situation, but another option would be to continue the item to a date certain to see if more Commissioners could be present. Commissioner Segner then indicated that he would like to delay this meeting and continue it.

MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to postpone this for five days, ten days, whatever it takes to pull together another meeting and continue this.

Kevin Snyder explained the need for a specified date and time certain and Commissioner Coté and Chairman Unger expressed agreement with a continuance.

AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to continue this for two weeks, to August 19th.

Kevin Snyder noted that there must be a time in the motion and Commissioner Segner stated 4:00 p.m.

The applicant's representative, Janeen Trevillyan, indicated that she would not be available on that date; she is available on the 12th and the 26th.

SECOND AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to continue this meeting to August 12th at 4:00 p.m.

Kevin Snyder explained that unless there is a motion and the majority of the Commission votes to reopen the public hearing, the Commission is returning for deliberation purposes only. Commissioner Segner expressed interest in having other Commissioners hear the whole meeting and Kevin indicated that would be addressed at the beginning of the next meeting.

Commissioner Coté seconded the Second Amended Motion.

VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chairman Allyson Holmes and Commissioners Jane Grams and Charlie Schudson were excused.)

Councilor McIlroy asked, if this item goes to the Council, would the Council have the authority to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness and the Chairman stated yes, there is an appeal process. Councilor McIlroy then announced that his motion to reconsider the vote regarding the Commission's status will be heard on August 14th.

5. Discussion regarding feedback from attendees of the Historic Preservation Conference. (15 minutes, 5:15 - 5:30 p.m.)

Commissioner Coté expressed that by going to the conference, she understood why the Commission is needed as more than an advisory group. Chairman Unger indicated that the state has indicated that even who is on the Commission will be important going forward and a report has to be given to the state annually. The Commission also must ensure that the local populace knows what the Commission is doing. They also discussed that we are sort of stifled by Prop 207, because if anyone considers their property losing value because of landmark designation, they can have the landmark designation removed and do what they want with the property. There are legal battles going on in the country on the basis that their historically-recognized buildings can lead to the enhanced character of life in the community, but she doesn't know how much we could do here. The Chairman then highlighted additional presentations attended, including several on rehabbing buildings for reuse and how old buildings can be used to show how to build newer buildings. They also announced that they are going to have funds for Main Street Programs and historic preservation.

A future agenda item to discuss how the Commission can fix itself and be a more efficient operation was suggested.

6. Discussion and update on the proposed self-guided "History/Movie Walk". (10 minutes, 5:30 - 5:40 p.m.)

Commissioner Segner indicated they have a stand that mounts to the railing that could go from Pink Jeep Plaza to possibly L'Auberge and have 100 plaques. Engineering has signed off on it and the Design Group has helped with the look. Other groups are coming up with a list of 100 ideas for plaques. We would like to show it to the City Council, because he wants to make presentations to various organizations. He would like to initially do 25, which would cost about \$30,000. It could go along Tlaquepaque to the Owenby Ditch and on to Hillside, so a walk could go from the historic park through Uptown to Hillside, and the property at the "Y" could be a little mini-park with a restroom.

Commission's Questions:

- Regarding a source of money for maintenance, Commissioner Segner indicated that money could be put aside from each donation. The idea is to install the plaques so they can't be stolen and it is going to be done without City funds.
- Regarding whether or not there were enough movies made here for plaques, Commissioner Segner indicated that one plaque will have all of the movies made in Sedona listed by date.

7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes, 5:40 – 5:45 p.m.)

Chairman Unger stated there will be a meeting next week.

8. Adjournment. (5:45 p.m.)

The Chairman called for adjournment at 6:11 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the actions of the Historic Preservation Commission in the meeting held on August 5, 2013.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date