Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, February 10, 2014 – 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 verified notice and 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, Jane Grams and Steve Segner (who was out of the room and rejoined the meeting at 4:07 p.m.). Commissioners Ann Jarmusch and Charlie Schudson were excused.

Staff Present: Audree Juhlin and Donna Puckett

Council Liaison Present: Dan McIlroy

2. Approval of the November 18, 2013 and January 22, 2014 minutes

MOTION: Commissioner Coté moved to accept the minutes from January 22, 2014.

Staff asked about the November 18th minutes and if a quorum of those present on that date was present. The Chair decided to defer this item until after Commissioner Segner rejoined the meeting.

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 requests to speak, closed the public forum.

4. Commission and staff announcements and summary of current matters

Audree Juhlin reminded the Commission that staff is doing the conference registrations. She has heard from Chair Unger and Commissioner Coté, so if anyone else wants to attend, let her know as soon as possible; the discount expires February 28th. The Chair requested that another email be sent as a reminder.

The Chair suggested moving to agenda item 7 for the benefit of the applicants and there was no objection.

7. Consideration of the following request through public hearing procedures:

a. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a storm water retention wall around the Historic Landmark No. 11 structure landmarked and shown on the National Register of Historic Places as the "Hart Store", also known as the Hummingbird House, located at 100 Brewer Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336. A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the area surrounding the northeast corner of Brewer Road and Ranger Road, west of S.R. 179 and south of S.R. 89A. The subject property is approximately 0.242 of an acre, zoned C-1 (General Commercial). (45 minutes, 4:45-5:30) Applicant/Property Owner: Annemarie Hunter. Property Address: 100 Brewer Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336. Parcel No.: 401-18-062. Property Owner: Annemarie Hunter, 100 Brewer Road, Sedona, AZ 86336. Case Number: CA 14-02

Chair Unger introduced the agenda item and reviewed the steps of the public hearing process.

Presentation:
Audree Juhlin presented highlights of the Staff Report prepared for the February 10, 2014 public hearing, including the need for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed retention wall and the purpose of the wall; the historic background of the "Hart Store" and its prior use as employee housing; the previous Certificates of Appropriateness for the structure; the previous flooding events and resultant damage to the structure, and the receipt of the following Small Grants from 2009 to 2012. In 2009, an HPC Small Grant was awarded in the amount of $9,109 to cover a portion of approximately $38,000 in repairs to the floors, etc., and a CLG Pass-Thru Grant was awarded by SHPO. In February of 2012, another HPC Small Grant was awarded for $3,200 for exterior work. Additionally in 2012, the City Council decided to provide assistance and funding to help construct the storm water retention wall through additional grant funds. In the 2013-2014 budget, the City Council allocated $45,000 as matching funds to assist in the construction of the wall.

Audree summarized the details of the proposed work and explained that the owners investigated a masonry wall, including red rock as a possible finish, steel walls and a corrugated wall. The property owners chose a steel wall, because it requires less disturbance to the ground and mature vegetation. Audree then provided the details and dimensions of the proposed wall that would be constructed of COR-TEN, which is a self-rusting material.

Audree explained that Public Works and Community & Economic Development staff will review all aspects of the wall approved by the Commission for proper storm water management and engineering, building safety, zoning and design standards. Staff received one note from a resident about making sure that the wall doesn't adversely affect neighboring properties by diverting storm water onto other properties.

Audree referenced the various resource documents available for the Commission's review and pointed out that in the *Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties Guidelines for preserving, rehabilitating, restoring and reconstructing historic buildings*, one guideline to help maintain sites states, "Protecting and maintaining buildings and sites by providing proper drainage to assure that water does not erode foundation wall; drain toward the building; or damage or erode the landscape." Staff believes the construction of the proposed wall is a necessary step to protect the structure's integrity and staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness. Audree then reviewed the review criteria met by the proposed work.

Commission's Questions of Staff:
Commissioner Coté asked if the steel is rusted at the time of installation or rusts over time and Audree indicated that it rusts over time; however, the applicant can address that. The Commissioner then asked about the proposed height of the wall in a 4 ft. flood. Commissioner Segner indicated that there would just be a little slop over the top and it wouldn’t get into the house.

Commissioner Segner asked why a permit is needed if it is not on their property, and Audree explained that a Right-of-Way Permit is needed and part of the wall is on the applicant's property, but ultimately any construction requires a permit. The Commissioner then asked why it is coming to the Commission, and Audree then restated that a portion of the wall is on the applicant's property and it has a visual affect on the appearance of the store, so it was better to err on the side of caution, to ensure the Commission was okay with it.

Chair Unger asked if the wall is going to cost basically $90,000; it is still matching funds. Audree explained that the City Council allocated up to $45,000 in matching funds, so if the property owner exceeds $90,000, the additional expense is theirs. The City will not allocate more than the $45,000.

Councilor McIlroy indicated that this has to be in place by June and asked if there is any doubt that it will be done if approved today, and Audree indicated that she is hopeful that it will be done in time. The Councilor noted that the money depends on that.

Commissioner Segner asked if the total is under $80,000 will the City pick up the first $45,000 and Audree indicated no, it is 50-50.

Chair Unger opened the public comment period of the hearing and having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.

Applicant's Statement:
Jac Robson, Co-owner: Indicated that in the last five to seven years, they have had a number of flooding issues, and he can't express the number of emotions involved each summer or the sleepless nights every time there is a monsoon. You get up, get dressed and go up there in the middle of the night to throw on a couple of additional bags, because you think you didn't do enough the day before. It is exhausting and they have put a lot of money into the building. They love the building and his wife enjoys the business. It is a great addition to the town and the first store, which he hates to lose over something like that. When they first took over the store, it was termite infested and had major damage, but he was able to fix that. Financially, they need help to put up the wall. They researched the materials and a 3 ft. continuous footing around the structure was devastating and would take the charm away. The intermittent posting of these walls would be best and the least damaging to the mature trees and that is the charm of the building. There are people from the Bank of America who come and have lunch on their front benches and chairs, so it is a nice relaxed area.

It is going to take too long to get the Soldier Pass job taken care of and he isn't sure if the 100-year flood is going to happen. The 25-year flood is going to help, but the wall will help a lot and it can be attractive with greenery around it. They were thinking of English Ivy or something that will do better in the shade. The wall is a self-rusting material and it depends on the moisture in the air as to how fast it works; the Brewer Road School took a number of years, because of drought. He will spray it with a hose to rust that wall if he has to. There is a chemical, but you need to be careful. Commissioner Segner noted that you scrub it and spray it with Hydrogen Peroxide and Sulfuric Acid. Mr. Robson indicated that before they put in any vegetation is the time to do that.

Chair Unger noted that they had planned on planting and that is good to mitigate the look. Mr. Robson explained that they also were meandering the wall by going around a tree and cutting the corner, so it is not a yard-like fence, and the rust and green will enhance the whole thing. The engineering for the masonry with stone came up to be so far above what they thought they would have to do, it would devastate the plant life.

Mr. Robson explained that they are 8 ft. posts imbedded in concrete; 12 inches will be the hole and they will be imbedded 48 inches down and welded to each post. The corrugated wall sounded great, but the engineer didn't think it would work. It was 3 ft. sections instead of 6 ft. sections, and they will hit some tree roots as it is, but hitting more roots will kill a tree, and if that was taken away, like in 1930 and 1940, it would have a different look. It makes sense to do this with the least amount of devastation to the plant life.

Commission's Questions of the Applicant:
Councilor McIlroy asked if they had funding in place to finish the job and Mr. Robson indicated yes, they submitted a financial to show they have the matching funds. He doesn't have a problem with June; they have a certified welder who is also a concrete contractor, and he can do the placement of all of the holes, and then set the concrete and add the 12 in. curbing on the bottom. Mr. Robson also explained that up against the building is lower than the fence, so the flood didn't get to the top of the fence; the fence is high enough for that.

Councilor McIlroy asked if the wall would have prevented the damage and Mr. Robson indicated yes. The flood gates are self-sealing and open only from the outside, and they are as strong as the steel walls. They also have to look at how much water will sheet off of the roof, because of damming the water inside, so they are going to put in a sump pump and be able to pump it out, and they are taking on that cost.

Commissioner Coté indicated she would hate to see the Commission approve it and have engineering determine that it impacts the neighbors too much, so has the applicant's engineer already evaluated that? Mr. Robson indicated that the engineer didn't look at that as much, because there is nothing to the south other than Tlaquepaque and the north is higher; that neighbor didn't suffer near what they suffered, and what was done in Tlaquepaque will probably help them quite a bit. The paint store was fine; they were hit 40 years ago with 4 ft. of water.

Chair Unger indicated that the Commission's main course of action is to determine if it is visually appropriate and what it needs to do.

Commission's Discussion:
Commissioner Segner indicated it is a good solution, and rabbit fencing that is twisted wire that goes in a loop could be tacked on the front out about one inch, and the vines would grow through it, so it would look old and cost almost nothing, and that way the plants don't get burnt. The applicant indicated that is a great idea; he doesn't want it to be just a green wall. The rust with the green will look good.

Commissioner Grams noted that they have done a lot of work on this and it is their property, and they are willing to put their money into this fence. She initially wondered if it would be strong enough, but apparently it is. Mr. Robson pointed out that 1/4 in. plate steel is heavy and it will be lifted in panels. Commissioner Grams asked if the curbing will be sufficient to not allow the pressure of a flood to flood in, and Mr. Robson explained that the 12 in. curbing will be 4 ins. above and 4 ins. below the ground, so the water hits that wall and comes back out, so it doesn't undermine, and the back of the fence will be reinforced, so there is a tubing of steel along the top and imbedding it in the concrete is the support at the bottom.

Vice Chair Holmes indicated that she is perfectly satisfied that this is the best solution.

MOTION: Vice Chair Holmes moved to approve the case number CA14-02 to construct and install a storm water retention wall as proposed by the property owners, Jac Robson and Annemarie Hunter, in their Certificate of Appropriateness application and as presented in the staff report based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the findings and applicable Sedona Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Coté seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

b. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing roof on the Historic Landmark No. 1 structure landmarked, and shown on the National Register of Historic Places, as the "Walter 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). (30 minutes, 5:30-6:00) Applicant/Property Owner: City of Sedona. Property Address: 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336. Case Number: CA 13-02

Chair Unger introduced the agenda item and reviewed the steps of the public hearing process.

Presentation:
Audree Juhlin reminded the Commission that the City is the applicant for a Certificate of Appropriateness to reroof the Jordan House, and there was a work session in November. The proposal from the Facilities Maintenance staff was to replicate the Jordan Fruit Packing Shed roof material, and there were some concerns by the Commission about the material proposed. Staff was asked to look at other options in terms of the roof when it was first constructed, the roof at the time of designation and what other historic homes used in that era. Staff then asked the Sedona Historical Society for additional photos, history, etc., to help determine the original roof, and they were able to provide a number of photos and those were in the Staff Report.

Audree explained that based on those photos and information provided by Ruthie Jordan, the original roof was a metal tin roof; however, it wasn't in place for long, because it wasn't durable, and it was replaced with the asphalt shingle. The current roof is over 20 years old, so that may be the original asphalt shingle roof. Staff was also asked to look at a rolled seamless roof material, but there was no evidence that material was ever used on the house, so staff didn't pursue it as an option for the Commission's consideration.

Staff did research three materials: Option 1 is almost identical to the 3-tab asphalt shingle on the house now. Option 2 is a dimensional shingle presented at the work session in November, and Option 3 is a metal material. All three options are provided in the Staff Report, but the first option is to almost replicate what is on the house now; however, that option is not as durable, so staff went back to the dimensional asphalt shingle originally proposed; those details were provided and a color sample is available of the two green colors. There is only one color of green in the 3-tab shingle. The metal material is a really good option for durability, warranty, maintenance and energy cost savings; however, it may not be indicative of how the house looked over time and the cost is beyond the City's budget, so it would require going to the City Council to request additional funds for that option. There is $15,000 available to spend.

Commission's Questions of Staff:
Vice Chair Holmes asked how much more the metal material would cost and Audree explained that staff received one informal quote and it would be about $8,000 to $10,000 in excess of the $15,000.

Commissioner Segner pointed out that wouldn't have been the metal roofing used historically; they would have used corrugated metal roofing; however, Audree explained that based on the research, it was not a corrugated roof; it was just like tin panels.

Councilor McIlroy asked if the asphalt shingles were under warranty for a number of years and Audree explained that Option 1 has a 10-15 year warranty and Option 2 has a warranty for 30 years. The metal warranty is lifetime. The Councilor then asked about the difference in cost between the two shingles and Audree Juhlin explained the dimensional shingle is about 20% more, but both are well within the budget.

Chair Unger opened the public comment period.

A member of the audience informally commented that an asphalt shingle roof would be less protective against fire than the metal.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment

Commission's Discussion:
Audree Juhlin pointed out that although the Sedona Historical Society is not the applicant, they are the tenant using the structures and they are very comfortable with Option 2 that was presented in November, and they like that it matches the roof on the Fruit Packing Shed. They were a lot less supportive of the metal material, because they felt it doesn't represent the history accurately. Chair Unger added that when it was landmarked, it had the current roofing

on it and she appreciates that staff found out what it was before. It further clarifies that the Commission should allow this to happen.

Councilor McIlroy asked who presented the information last time and Audree explained that it was a member of Facility Maintenance staff, and the dimensional asphalt shingle, Option 2, was favored.

MOTION: Commissioner Grams moved to approve case number CA13-02 (CoA) to replace the existing roof on the "Jordan House" with the roofing material Option #2 as presented by City of Sedona staff based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the findings and applicable Sedona Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Segner seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

2 Approval of the November 18, 2013 and January 22, 2014 minutes (continued)

MOTION: Commissioner Coté moved to approve the minutes for November 18, 2013 and January 22, 2014. Vice Chair Holmes seconded the motion.

Audree Juhlin explained that because of the possibility of a lack of a quorum for each meeting, they should be considered separately.

REVISED MOTION: Commissioner Coté moved to approve the minutes for the November 18, 2013 meeting. Commissioner Grams seconded the motion. Motion carried four (4) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. (Chair Unger and Commissioners Coté, Grams and Segner voted for and Vice Chair Holmes abstained, since she did not attend the meeting. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

MOTION: Commissioner Coté moved to approve the meeting minutes of January 22, 2014. Vice Chair Holmes seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Chair Unger, Vice Chair Holmes and Commissioners Coté and Segner voted for and Commissioner Grams abstained, since she did not attend the meeting. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

5. Discussion/possible action on the Commission's 2014 proposed work program (15 minutes, 4:15-4:30)

The Commissioners discussed the following items for the Commission's 2014 Work Program:

- City sponsorship of Commissioners' attendance to the Historic Preservation Conference.
- Meet ad hoc six times a year or as needed, but that will be discussed in the March meeting.
- Create a new Historical Pride Program for properties that aren't historic landmarks, but are recognized for their contribution to the history of Sedona.
- Landmarks and plaques need to remain on the work program, and there is someone who is interested in possibly landmarking.
- Review Certificates of Appropriateness.
- Move update of the Historic Resource Survey to next year and digitize it this year. The electronic record needs to be changed for fillable fields. Chair Unger offered to help.
- Have a dedicated page on the City's website and start organizing it, including the 89A History Project for handicapped that can't do the walk. Have the Commission as a group deal with it, not individually.
- No brochures will be done next year.
- The Commission will vote on the Endangered List and have that information or an article with possibly some photographs on there, and that will probably be the one thing for HP Month.

- Ranger Station - there will be a greater task force with one or two Commissioners on that task force.
- Remove the Community Plan update.
- Historic Walk won't really be on the work program, although Steve will make presentations.
- Landmark hearings, and meeting six times a year will be laid out in the March meeting, although we may have to have emergency meetings at times.
- Training for the Commissioners - that could work with the return of attendees from the HP Conference. Additionally, training to know where the properties are located, and having the properties on the website are all covered in what we have discussed.

Regarding a question about the number of Commission meetings being part of the work program, Audree Juhlin explained that every Commission is asked annually to create a proposed work program, which is part of the budget presented to the City Council, so these items may or may not be included, because City Council ultimately decides that. As far as the number of meetings per year, CLG requires four meetings per year, but there have also been discussions about meeting as needed, and that is not really a work program item, but it should be taken into consideration based on how heavy your work program is and how often you need to meet. That discussion will be started at the retreat.

Commissioners continued to discuss the following additional items for the Commission's 2014 Work Program that would commence July 1st:

- The retreat is probably the biggest part of our work program right now in that we are going to be reassessing ourselves.
- Budget for the Ranger Station - Audree Juhlin explained that staff in a number of departments is working on the budget for the Ranger Station property and that would be City funds. The Commission will be doing all of the Certificates of Appropriateness for the work done.

Councilor McIlroy indicated that the City is doing a 90-day due diligence for hazardous waste and building condition, and asked if this Commission plays some part in that process. Audree Juhlin explained that once the evaluation is complete, if Council moves forward to purchase it, then the Commission would provide guidance and approval for any exterior changes. The Councilor stated that March is when this all comes to a close, so that is within this budget year.

Commissioners again continued to discuss the following additional items for the Commission's 2014 Work Program:

- Line item for promotion of not only the website, and maybe in partnerships with the Chamber of Commerce, etc., to get the history out there to visitors more and to have more of a pride of Sedona -- like marketing education.
- Have photos of the 89A History Walk and a 3-minute film of what is going on, and then overlay it with the history of Sedona. Put that in the package on the City's website and put links on every hotel. Chair Unger noted that we have had advertisements for May events, etc., but that isn't as big a part of what we are asking for here, but it might be worth a line item to have some monies in case something comes up.
- Prepare the Commission's assessment of the Ranger Station property, so if the City purchases it, we have like a binder with relevant roofing, glass, etc., for each of the buildings, so the City has a document to use in maintaining the buildings, and that better delineates the Commission's work program item. Additionally as an expanded version of that, get the history of Sedona and what they were doing in the 20s, 30s, 40s and 50s as a point of reference, such as doing metal roofs or asphalt shingles, etc., although that can be pieced together as a group when doing the survey next year.
- Be more proactive about things we have already landmarked, in keeping up with their condition. There should be an annual evaluation of all landmarks. The letter to homeowners needs to be reinstituted. We look at it, and then in the letter we say that we saw this and that. Tackle however many we can do in a year.

- Used to have all day field sessions and survey; for training, possibly survey the Ranger Station all together and do each building in detail, because that knowledge needs to be passed along in book form and that can be part of a training session.
- Have more involvement with people of landmarked properties; have an annual party for owners of landmarked properties. Something special to honor them, bring them together and thank them. Commissioner Segner offered the use of his hotel.

Vice Chair Holmes commented that in thinking of all of these wonderful ideas while the Commission is in the midst of down-scaling its role, we have a lot to discuss in the retreat. The Commission will need to decide what the Commission's priorities are.

Commissioner Coté noted that some things can be done by Commissioners; it doesn't take a City employee to plan a party, and there is the question of where the Open Meeting Law gets in the way of Commissioners being able to do some things on their own. Chair Unger indicated that in the retreat, we can get a clear understanding of what we should and shouldn't be doing. In the past, so many things had been put on our plate, we were no longer doing what we needed to do.

Commissioner Segner commented about seeing what the Open Meeting Law allows, for example, having two people looking at the properties, etc., and how they can do that properly. Chair Unger referenced the Citizen Engagement Program and indicated that the Commission needs to discuss that in the retreat too, because that is something where staff is looking for things that people can do, and whether we are absorbing too much out of that or driving too many other things.

Councilor McIlroy explained the reason Council eliminated the Commissions was that they took so much staff time, and with the Open Meeting Law requirements, it became a burdensome process, and that is why the Citizen Engagement Process began.

Audree Juhlin noted that the Commission probably will need to prioritize the work program items.

6. Discussion/possible direction in preparation for the Commission's March 10, 2014 retreat. (15 minutes, 4:30-4:45)

Chair Unger noted that the Commission had transitioned into discussion of agenda item 6, and the Commission was joined by Judith Keane, who will facilitate the Commission's retreat. Judith Keane indicated that every Commission and City Council has fabulous ideas, so the challenge is to prioritize what we want to do, so we have the time, money and staff to do that.

Judith explained that to prepare for the retreat, she will individually interview each Commissioner to find out what is working with the Commission and what could be polished a bit more, so she has a sign-up sheet for the days she will be available. She would like about an hour and will come to their location, and then she will call them after getting the sheet with their preferred times.

Judith indicated that by getting the interviews done, the structure for the retreat can then be designed; various things have been discussed and things you need to know to do your work, and that will be part of the design.

8. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes, 6:00– 6:05)

The Chair indicated that the next meeting is March 10th from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the Vultee Conference Room. April is unknown, since the Chair will not be available that month.

9. Adjournment. (6:05 pm)

The Chair indicated that she wanted to adjourn the meeting; however, Councilor McIlroy indicated he had a couple of questions and asked if he is expected to be a player in the retreat and staff indicated that is up to him. The Councilor then asked if Audree has seen any reason why Brewer Road won't close in due course, from what has been discovered in hazardous waste, building

conditions, etc., anything that can be a glitch on the closing. Audree stated that she hasn't seen the report, so she can't comment on it.

The Chair again called for adjournment at approximately 5:29 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 February 10, 2014.

_____ _____

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant* Date