

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Work Session**  
**Vultee Conference Room – 106 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona**  
**Monday, November 18, 2013 – 4:00 p.m.**

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

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

Chair Unger called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Allyson Holmes and Commissioners Catherine Coté (arrived at 4:16 p.m.), Jane Grams (arrived at 4:04 p.m.), Ann Jarmusch and Steve Segner. Commissioner Charlie Schudson was absent.

**Staff Present:** David DeMerritt, Audree Juhlin, Donna Puckett and Kevin Snyder

**Councilor(s) Present:** Dan McIlroy

**2. Approval of the October 14, 2013 minutes**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Segner moved to accept the minutes as written. Vice Chair Holmes seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Three (3) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Jarmusch abstained; she did not attend the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

A quorum of the Commission who attended the meeting was not present to vote, so it was noted that the agenda item would have to be readdressed if another Commissioner arrived or be reagendaized.

**4. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters**

Audree Juhlin announced that Chair Unger and Commissioners Grams and Schudson were reappointed.

*Note: Commissioner Grams arrived at this time.*

**2. Approval of the October 14, 2013 minutes (continued)**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Segner moved to accept the minutes as written on October 14<sup>th</sup>. Vice Chair Holmes seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Motion carried four (4) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Jarmusch abstained; she did not attend the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**4. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters (continued)**

Commissioner Jarmusch reported that November is National Native American Month and she had attended some of the lectures. She would like to volunteer to find out what they are going to do next year, so the Commission might be able to tie into it.

**5. Discussion regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing roof on the historic structure known as the “Jordan House”, located in the Jordan Historical Park 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. (60 minutes, 4:15 – 5:15 pm) Applicant: City of Sedona, Property Address: 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336, Property Owner: City of Sedona, Case Number: CA 13-02**

Chair Unger introduced the agenda item, and Audree Juhlin explained David DeMerritt would be presenting the proposed material for the roof that was based on the packing shed roof material; however, the staff did find any Certificate of Appropriateness for the packing shed roof; therefore, staff determined that this work session was in order. David DeMerritt then discussed the budget, the current condition of the roof on the house, and the architectural-type of shingle that had been proposed.

**Commission's Comments/Concerns:**

The Commission discussed with staff and Councilor McIlroy the following topics:

- The historical materials used, the cost for those materials, the packing shed roof in 1994, the house's roof when it was designated, which was the current roof, and the 1940s addition.

*Note: Commissioner Coté arrived at this time.*

- The question of needing matching roofs and the potential change in appearance with the architectural-type shingle
- Request for staff to see if the Historical Society has any pictures of the house from the 1950s to provide a basis for looking at flat rolled roofing
- The need to maintain the original look of the building as much as possible, and the acknowledgement that the other roofs will eventually have to be replaced, so the Commission can make policy now and then follow-through as needed
- Information from a T&D Publication titled, "Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Building Materials: Siding and Roofing", the characteristics of rolled roofing versus shingles, and the original color of the roof
- The City's budget of \$15,000 for a roof and bids from Hale's, Behmer and Hahn Roofing.
- Suggestion to check other houses for original roofing records, consideration of matching the roof on it when it was designated, which is the current roof, or matching the roof material on it in the 1950s
- Allowing owners the option to match it as of the day of designation or make it authentic.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff is looking for direction on what the Commission would find to be appropriate, and then staff will do the research and bring it back to the Commission, and if it is within our budget, we will schedule a public hearing for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The Commission then discussed what would be considered appropriate, and the general consensus was that when there is an opportunity to restore the structure to its authentic original condition without costing more money, that is the time to do it, but additional cost shouldn't be forced on the owner, and duplicating the roof that existed at the time of designation would be appropriate. Additionally, 21<sup>st</sup> century materials can be used, as long as it looks the same, and the Commission would like facts on both approaches. Commissioner Jarmusch offered to assist if staff needs help with the research.

Audree Juhlin noted that staff would like to bring forward an after-the-fact request for a Certificate of Appropriateness on the packing shed roof, so it can be documented, and David DeMerritt indicated he would determine the cost to match what is on the roof now; however, a request was made to also determine the cost of the original material used.

**6. Discussion/update on the Historic Preservation Commission's Small Grant Program. (15 minutes, 5:15 – 5:30 pm)**

Audree Juhlin noted that the City Council encouraged the Commission to review the Small Grant Program and the Land Development Code, to evaluate where changes may be needed, so staff will research what other communities are doing, etc., and bring back some recommended revisions in late spring. Staff will put a call out to the Commission if help is needed. Additionally, staff is not recommending moving the program forward this year, because the revisions will not be ready to implement.

**Commission's Comments/Concerns:**

The Commission then discussed the following topics:

- Enticement to landmark shouldn't be the reason for the program, should there really be a grant program, does the Commission want to landmark more buildings, and the use of a grant for restoration rather than maintenance.

Audree asked for clarification on what the Commission would like to see, because it was originally an incentive program to promote landmarking, then that information can be taken to the City Council to see if that is the direction they want.

- Request for research on other communities before having a philosophical discussion, obtain information from appraisers to determine if landmarking adds value to a home
  - Money could potentially be needed for city-owned historic structures, consider not having the program if the funds can't be increased, determine how many more homes the Commission wants to landmark, inability to have a reserve fund that accumulates for emergencies, etc., funds for restoration is an incentive, and give staff the authority to give money for emergencies to stabilize
  - The meaning of landmarking to new homeowners and the necessity for public funds spent to have a public purpose and fit the criteria of a public use or benefit and return on investment
  - Decision needed is whether the Commission wants an enticement or preservation focus, preservation should be the incentive, some homes became landmarks with the understanding that this fund would be available if needed, funds could be used to assist with the additional cost of using correct materials, and make the program itself important through publicity rather than the grant as an enticement
  - Suggestion to ask what the City Council wants done in the area of preservation, enticement, restoration, etc., requirements for assistance need to be clarified, improvements are needed at Cook's Cemetery, research is needed before going to the City Council and there is a need for consistency in the research based on the Commission's focus
  - The Commission's interest in going toward preservation and in being involved in the research, staff's determination of the best course of action and the questions to ask target cities
- 3. 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.)**

*Chair Unger opened the public forum and having no public present, closed the public forum.*

**7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes, 5:30– 5:35 p.m.)**

There will be no meeting in December. The January 13, 2014 meeting may include a work session or public hearing on the roof for the Jordan house and the Commission's Work Program, then staff can put together the budget implications from the proposed Work Program. Discussions about Cook's Cemetery, with a representative of the Sedona Historical Society, and next year's National Native American Month were requested. Commissioner Grams indicated that she will not be available in January.

**8. Adjournment. (5:35 p.m.)**

The Chairman called for adjournment at approximately 5:51 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 November 18, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date