

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, May 12, 2014 – 4:00 p.m.

(10 minutes, 4:00 - 4:10 pm for items 1 - 3)

1. Verification of notice, call to order, roll call

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. Commissioners Ann Jarmusch and Charlie Schudson were excused.

Staff Present: Audree Juhlin and Donna Puckett

Council Liaison Present: Dan McIlroy

2. Nomination and approval of Chair and Vice Chair

Brynn Unger explained that this item should have been addressed in December and opened the nominations for Chair.

NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIR: Commissioner Grams nominated Brynn Unger for Chair. Vice Chair Holmes seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. VOTE: Nomination carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

Regarding the Vice Chair position, Chair Unger indicated that she had spoken with Allyson Holmes and Allyson is absorbed with her job now. She also spoke with Ann Jarmusch who indicated she would be willing, and with her background, she would be able to launch into this without too much difficulty. Ann has asked to be involved in more meetings with staff, so we get her on board to take over for the Chair, etc.

NOMINATIONS FOR VICE CHAIR: Chair Unger nominated Ann Jarmusch as Vice Chair. Commissioner Coté seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. VOTE: Nomination carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

Chair Unger thanked Commissioner Holmes for her service over the past year as the Vice Chair and Allyson indicated that the City got the Ranger Station, so that was 100% for her. The Chair expressed the desire for Allyson to stay with the Commission to work on that as we move forward.

3. Commission and Staff announcements

There were no announcements.

4. Approval of the March 10, 2014 minutes

MOTION: Commissioner Coté moved to approve the March 10, 2014 minutes of the retreat. Commissioner Grams seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioners Jarmusch and Schudson were excused.)

Chair Unger thanked Donna Puckett for the minutes, which was a difficult set of minutes, and in reviewing them, she found it was pretty remarkable in how many things were covered in that meeting, and they were actually captured in the minutes.

5. Review/discussion of March 10, 2014 Retreat (10 minutes, 4:10-4:20)

Commissioner Coté indicated that the Work Program is probably the biggest thing that came out of the retreat for her, in terms of defining our focus for the next year, and starting to dig into that. Chair Unger asked staff if there were any comments and Donna Puckett indicated that two responses had been received for the prioritization, but it wasn't distributed, because we were hoping to get more responses. If we go into the Work Program in agenda item 9, then copies can be provided.

Chair Unger indicated that she was very impressed by Mike Goimmarac's presentation. He answered some questions that she had over a long period of time. She thought it was going to be a cookie-cutter presentation, but he did a wonderful job, so she would like for staff to thank him again. She also has put that information in a package so she can revisit it if she has any questions. Also, Audree's whole presentation on the Roles of the Commissioners was a very important part and something she (the Chair) will have with her on a regular basis now, and Commissioner Segner's point that we should be doing our homework before coming to the meetings was a good point. If Audree has anything further to discuss, we can come back to this, because it is something that we should regularly review to see where we are.

6. Update/discussion on the self-guided "Walking History" project (10 minutes, 4:20-4:30)

Commissioner Segner indicated that he has \$6,000 in matching money and a \$15,000 commitment from Sedona 30, so basically \$25,000 is committed. The money has been sent to Sedona 30. They are a non-profit, so people can write checks to them, and they make a notation that they want to buy a plaque. The plaques are between \$300 and \$500, and Sedona 30 is matching that amount. He is working with Ann, so about seven plaques are three-quarters done, but he wants the City and everyone to see the first one.

Commissioner Segner then showed the Commission a plaque about Joe Beeler that is hermetically sealed, guaranteed for 10 years and won't fade. The stands are made, so he just needs to get with the City to get the permitting and the little Engineering Study done and a couple of things that Audree wanted first. We will meet with the City Engineer to ensure everyone is happy, and then we will order about six plaques. He hopes to have half of them up by October. There will be a 4 ft. plaque, and then plaques turned vertically or horizontally, and they will be over the edge of the railing. There will also be like kiosks in groups about every 20 ft., so there will be a 4 ft. plaque and a couple of short plaques. For movies, he will have all of the movies made in Sedona on one plaque with a brief history, then some good art plaques showing movie posters and who was here, and there will be other shots with movie sets and the background of Sedona. That is all laid out now and he is working with Ann to write it up. It takes 30 days to get them made, and we have about 20 plaques laid out.

Commissioner Segner indicated that it is not as fast as he would like, but they are close. He sent this first plaque to the City Council to look at the last two weeks, so he now hopes to get with Audree and set a meeting up with the City Engineer to see if we can get all of the little stuff done.

Chair Unger indicated that Commissioner Segner has also indicated he wants a plaque that commemorates historic preservation in Sedona, so she and Audree are discussing having some photographs done for a plaque. Commissioner Segner added that Pink Jeeps is going to do a plaque and more people want to do a plaque than we have subjects for at this time and matching money. He hopes that once the first batch is up that people will want to continue it, and within two years, he thinks that it will be the thing people do when they come to town. Next year, maybe this group can put together a video or something on the City's and Chamber's website that would talk

about this being something you do when you come to Sedona and post all of these plaques on the City's website too.

Councilor McIlroy stated that Steve's work is wonderful; he reviewed it at Council, but his concern is defacement or vandalism. Commissioner Segner indicated that they are guaranteed and if he had to redo one, it would be \$270, because the artwork is the expensive part; however, they are guaranteed for 10 years. Spray paint, etc., comes right off and if it is defaced, they will replace it. This is the new system that the Forest Service has authorized, so all of their new plaques in the Forest Service and at National Monuments are using this and that is why it takes so long to make. Once they print it, it is hermetically sealed in clear plastic. We also have a little kitty, so if one needs to be replaced, we will replace it.

Vice Chair Holmes asked if the way they are mounted puts them out of reach of people and Commissioner Segner noted that it is on a busy street with a railing and the plaque is beyond that, so kids won't be hanging on it. If someone jumped up and down on it, they might break the stand, which isn't a big deal. If you go to the new Forest Service building, these are the same material from the same company that they are using. The metal plaques are a problem, because they are bronze and people steal them to melt them down.

Councilor McIlroy asked about the schedule and Commissioner Segner indicated by the end of June, he would like to send off about eight or nine to be done and he would get them back in July or August. Around September, he would like to mount the first batch and coordinate with the City in terms of how they want to do it. He would like to put up a good center section of six or eight at once, and then other sections. Then, we may announce it to everybody in October, so there are enough that it is effective. He still needs plaques at the beginning and end to explain the plaque program and who sponsored it, etc.

Councilor McIlroy asked if the project is fully funded at this point and Commissioner Segner stated yes. They have given him \$10,000 and indicated they would provide another \$5,000 in the third quarter, and he has been writing checks all along, so he really hasn't used any money.

Commissioner Coté asked how long it has taken for this idea and Commissioner Segner indicated that he talked about it 4 years ago, and Uptown talked about it. If it had been done through the Commission, everything would have had to be sent out for three bids, and it just couldn't have gotten done. He has had volunteers helping, but they work for about two plaques, so he had to start paying people. He is paying for people to write it and do the layout, and that is pretty much the slowdown. They are doing it for a reasonable rate, so he can't push too hard. Last year, he finally just said to let him do it. Main Street had talked about it and he had a meeting with some groups, but he could never get past the groups, so he just said to let him do it, but he is passing it around to everybody, so they see everything.

7. Update/discussion on the historic resource survey (15 minutes, 4:30-4:45)

Chair Unger explained that there was \$6,000 to work on the survey this year and the Commission discussed perhaps using that money to make the survey something that would be on the Web; however, Audree actually made an executive decision, which was a brilliant idea, because she was told that we could not move the \$6,000 into next year and if we wanted to use it, it had to be used this year, so she hired Nancy Burgess to go over the survey, and Nancy has started to do that. The Chair then asked Donna Puckett if there was anything else and Donna agreed that in discussions with the City Manager, Audree was advised that the money couldn't be carried over and our budget for next year is very lean, so the idea was to put the money to use while we have it, and Nancy is in the process of surveying properties. The Lomacasi survey draft that she did is in the packet. Also, they are going to convert the format to SHPO's current format as part of that process.

Chair Unger added that staff also found that it is digitally recorded, so some of the steps to make it digital don't have to be taken, which is good. She has been going through HPC's photographs of

the different buildings and filing them, so they can be found according to location, and she started by going through the survey that was done in 2001 and putting those photographs in a file on a thumb drive that can go to the City to tell you the location and the year it was taken. It is interesting that a couple of properties on the survey were removed, because they no longer were relevant as a historic site, since they were changed so much, and those photographs are being placed in a separate compartment, so people can see those. That may be something that happens this time too, because there were 260+ homes on the survey.

Audree Juhlin joined the meeting at this time and Donna Puckett indicated that perhaps the only thing we haven't pointed out is that the money is there until June 30th and if Nancy hasn't completed everything by that time, then anything remaining will be picked up by volunteers on the Commission.

Audree Juhlin explained that Nancy is doing the update of the Historic Resource Survey, which we have to do periodically. We want to go back to the landmarks every few years or so to document their condition; there may be additions without approval or a lack of maintenance, etc. We also take pictures so we have a timeline of the structure and the history through pictures as well. Commissioner Coté asked if she is actually making physical inspections and Audree indicated yes. She is also doing properties that have potential to be included in the survey, like the Babbitt cabins and the Leakey house.

Commissioner Segner asked about the location of the Babbitt cabins and Chair Unger explained that they are behind Poco Diablo. Commissioner Segner indicated that the Design Group called him and asked him to speak to the owner, because he didn't know if he should list them. Audree Juhlin added that they were sent an application for landmarking, and Chair Unger indicated that she interviewed the Babbitt that owns the house and has photographs, and that is why she is filing the photographs. We also will take the photographs that Nancy Burgess is making and add those too, because it is critical that we do this. Audree explained that it is more than critical; the CLG Agreement between the State and the City requires it. Chair Unger noted that Nancy Burgess is a professional photographer and will probably come up with some very good representations and different angles. Some of the photos we have didn't include views from the other sides, etc.

Chair Unger noted that there were 265 properties in the survey, but we have lost some in the last survey, and we may find that some more of them need to be eliminated. Audree explained that even when they are eliminated, we still keep the information in case someone asks about the property, then we can say it is not eligible for these reasons.

Chair Unger indicated that Nancy Burgess is brilliant in these things and if you read her assessment of the Purtymun property, you can tell how much she knows, and she will use the original survey as a base. She added a lot more information to the Purtymun property, but it is something we can review. It will include the landmarks, but we also have to be aware of what is happening to the properties on the survey, which is about 260 properties.

Audree explained that she is not going to all of those; staff prioritized the ones that we could do in this amount of time for this amount of money. Chair Unger added that there are some that have some relevance, but not as much as the ones she is looking at and by the end of the year, we will probably want to look at the others, even if it is just a photograph. One issue is that we can't just walk onto the property.

Commissioner Coté asked if we have a database of all of the owners, if we wanted to send emails or a mailing. Audree Juhlin explained that is what staff is in the process of doing, it is all in electronic format, but it is not organized, and we will be doing that in-house with staff as time allows. Chair Unger noted that the survey does have the owner and address as of the date of the survey, and Audree added that having that ability in electronic format is the goal. The Chair indicated that it will probably be kept just in the electronic format rather than a printed binder, because a lot of money was spent to put this together and once the timeframe is over, they are no

longer relevant. Audree agreed and indicated that we are looking at an electronic version that is a living fluid document.

Commissioner Segner indicated that a suggestion would be to sign up for Google Street View to pull a lot of the stuff up and hit print. Commissioner Coté questioned if that would be current; you can't say that is as of today, so it really wouldn't be an accurate update; however, Commissioner Segner pointed out that it is always going to be captured at a point in time.

Commissioner Segner asked if there is any money in next year's budget, if Nancy doesn't finish it and Audree indicated no. She was told to get as much done as possible with the existing money. Commissioner Grams asked to get her booklet back and Audree indicated that staff will get it to her. Chair Unger noted that the survey is worth looking through and Audree added that some of the properties may have been in there since 1998, when we first started doing landmarks.

Councilor Dan McIlroy asked why money can't be carried over from year to year and Audree explained that the budgeting policies don't allow it. The Councilor then asked if that is local policy or state statute and Audree indicated that she didn't know, but if it is something that is almost completed, you can carry it over, but to carry it over because the money wasn't spent, it has to be submitted as a new budget request.

Commissioner Grams asked about a cabin by Junipine and Chair Unger indicated it is probably outside of the city limits. Commissioner Coté added that it is the Purtymun cabin and the Junipine Oak Creek Estates Subdivision owns it, and the owners of the community can use it as a guesthouse for parties, etc. The orchard is also there.

8. Discussion/possible action regarding the Lomacasi property (15 minutes, 4:45-5:00)

Audree Juhlin explained that the Lomacasi-Purtymun property is located in Uptown and the owners don't want the property, because they have lost a lot of money on it, so they are looking at selling the property. They talked with staff about demolishing the buildings, including the Purtymun house that is not landmarked. We haven't done a site inspection in a number of years, so she made that one of Nancy's top priorities. We don't have any leverage without landmarking, but we can try persuasion; however, it is going to be difficult. They have been willing to work with the City to relocate the house, but its construction cannot be relocated. Staff talked with the Sedona Historical Society and they are not interested; they have their hands full and don't want to be part of anything to save it at the moment. The owners then presented the option of the City buying it and we don't know, but we need to take it to the Council for consideration, so she is in the process of looking at staff's and the Commission's perspective as to whether we want to buy that property or not, and that is why she is turning to the Commission to discuss the property and determine if we need to send a few Commissioners on site to look it, etc.

Commissioner Grams indicated that she would like to see it and Audree explained that we don't currently have permission to access the property without them being present, so we need to coordinate with them.

Councilor McIlroy asked if the property is for sale and if so for how much, and how many acres it is. Audree indicated it is approximately nine acres and it isn't officially for sale. It hasn't been appraised and we want to know their asking price. Her understanding is that they are willing to take a loss. Commissioner Grams asked about the zoning and Audree indicated that it is primarily Lodging and there is some Commercial zoning.

Commissioner Coté asked for what purpose the City would buy it and Audree explained that is the purpose of the discussion. Do we want it and why? The Council has talked about creek access for some time and this location has a gorgeous creekside access and it is very flat, but just to the south by Therapy on the Rocks, you can't access that from this property, because of a huge rock

outcropping, so there is no continuous access, unless you go across the creek onto Forest Service land, so maybe we would talk with the Forest Service about acquiring some of that as well.

Commissioner Coté indicated that at the retreat, we discussed incorporating education and overlapping different things, and this is perfect for the Commission to go and evaluate the house as to if it is worth even worrying about it. Commissioner Segner stated that we did that about five years ago and nothing has changed. They were going to build 110,000 sq. ft. of commercial there, which is more than all of Sedona, and the building is three or four buildings put together. We decided we didn't want anything to do with it. It is in the flood zone and it T-bones into 89A. The Purtymun house is worthless and will cost money to tear it down; it probably has asbestos and there is nothing unusual about it. You come up blind to S.R. 89A and the traffic is so bad, it is crazy. What scares him is that all of a sudden we are going to have a beach on weekends for those from the upper canyon to come into the City, so just stay away from it. Audree agreed that the biggest issue is traffic and if we go, we will carpool.

Chair Unger clarified that the Commission didn't totally decide that it wasn't a worthwhile building; we haven't been in it. It may not have asbestos, because of the way it is constructed. It is more like the Bisbee homes; they put 12 x 1s next to each other and cross-membered it, then put metal on either side of it, so who knows what condition it is in. In the 50's, they decided to put stone on the outside of the building. There are going to be varying opinions in terms of its historic relevance, as to if it is in any condition to save. Purely on historic relevance, that is a different story, whereas, Commissioner Segner is looking at the condition as compared to the Forest Service buildings, and the condition of the roof and inside would really dictate whether or not it is usable.

Vice Chair Holmes asked why the owners have discussed tearing it down and Audree explained that the owner that had the proposal that Commissioner Segner referenced lost the property in bankruptcy, and these owners acquired it. They now have a property that doesn't have any development rights and are in a bad situation, but they have zoning for Lodging. Currently, vagrants are living there and setting fires inside the buildings, setting up shop and home, and they constantly have to put up with this, so they are concerned about liability and the fire hazard. People are literally camping inside the homes, having fires inside the houses. They put wooden planks up all over, lock it up and the following week, everything has been removed and people have moved back in. It is a real problem that they don't want any longer.

Vice Chair Holmes asked about buying it just as a preserve to leave it the way it is, although with what was just said, that makes that look silly. Audree indicated that is something that needs to be explored. Chair Unger added that the one building has historic relevance; the others with significance have been knocked down. Other buildings were put up later, so the only one that would be relevant would be the cabin. Audree explained that Nancy indicated that it needs further review; some of the others may be from the 50's era and worthy of consideration, but from staff's perspective, it is history in its setting and time, and that with its relevance as far as the story is probably the most significant things left on the property, but telling that story is important.

Chair Unger indicated that in telling the story the question is if we want the buildings there. Commissioner Coté indicated that when the ordinance was talking about what could be designated, her interpretation was that you can't do it just because of the story; the building itself has to have integrity, etc. Audree indicated that there are five criteria that can be considered and the setting is always important, but you won't get a landmark just because it was an early settlement.

Chair Unger indicated that we are also talking about the Purtymun house, but it was altered in the 50's, although it can be considered with the changes, like the Hummingbird House. Commissioner Segner suggested that the Commission either look at it or move on; half of us have no knowledge of it. Audree is correct, it is a worthwhile setting; the building is a piece of junk, but if the City wants to say this is an historic setting and would it be worthwhile for the City to own it, everybody has to look at it. Audree explained that her concern about presenting this to the Council is going to be the traffic access. Councilor McIlroy indicated that the Council has wanted creekside property for

something to have opened to the public, and we can't have access at L'Auberge or Tlaquepaque, but this would provide access. Nine acres of creekside property has to be worth millions. Commissioner Coté indicated that there is a limit; there is some property off of Red Rock Loop Road that has something like a \$15 million price and people aren't going to pull out their wallet for just anything. There is a value, but all of those parameters come into play such as what you can do with it and how much is floodplain, access, etc. Her question is if the City could do a fee use to control the number of people. As someone who doesn't own a multi-million dollar home, etc., she would like to see the working person in Sedona have a way to enjoy the things that you have to have millions of dollars to enjoy here and get to the creek safely. It is something to be considered, but we need to see it.

Chair Unger asked how we get to that spot and will the Forest Service allow the City to do that. The rock outcropping perhaps could be knocked down. Audree Juhlin stated that the Army Corps of Engineers isn't going to allow that, and Commissioner Segner indicated that in the previous plan, they were going to build an 11 ft. high wall with parking on top, and build up from that, because of the floodplain, and sewers, water, etc. is a mess. Somebody should build a nice little home and, in the hotel association, they try to forget the city boundaries and say we have Slide Rock and Grasshopper Point, etc., that people can use only six minutes away, and this would become a focal point, because you can walk to it from Uptown and it would be a mess. The wait is sometimes an hour from Midgley Bridge, if you drove to it.

Chair Unger indicated that for HPC those factors are really irrelevant. We have to see if it is historically valid, but the Council has to debate these other issues. We have to determine if it is worth doing as a historic site. If we knock the cabin down, does it remain a historic site? That is something we can address; other uses that were there are no longer there either. The original vision of the river as it was, if another house is built, will not be there and we don't have another place where that happens, so the only thing we need to think about is whether or not the cabin is worth being there, and if the cabin isn't there, is it still worth having a space that speaks to what Sedona looked like on the river that many years ago.

Commissioner Coté proposed that the Commission go to the property and use this experience as a tool to discuss why it does or doesn't meet the things you are talking about. Audree indicated that she would get with the property owner to get possible dates and times, and then send out an email to see what will work for the Commission. You will need hiking shoes and walking sticks, because we have to walk into the property.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he is going to look at it from the owner's view and say that he has a worthless piece of property with possibly a historic building on it, so maybe the City will buy it or I'm just going to knock it down. He hasn't established a price or said that he is going to sell it; he is just saying this is the only card he has and by threatening to knock it down, maybe the City will purchase it. We went through that before and said knock it down, so let's look at it and then say knock it down or don't, but we are playing into his hands. He doesn't like that it isn't for sale with a price on it, etc. It is just talk and the City is spending a lot of time on it. Audree explained that they seem to be at a point that they are willing to work with the City on a price. The price might shock you, but he still has to go to the other partners.

Councilor McIlroy asked if a price has been mentioned and Audree indicated that they are talking about the assessed value and that is a little over \$2 million. Chair Unger indicated that it would be appropriate for the Commission to know what we are looking at, and then decide if there is any relevance; that is all the Commission can do. Commissioner Coté indicated that it is on the agenda and she wasn't here five years ago; we should give it a serious evaluation. Chair Unger added that the Lomacasi property has been on the Endangered List for three or four years

Commissioner Segner indicated that we should agendize it and go look at it. Commissioner Coté indicated that she is on vacation from May 27th through July 1st, if those dates can be avoided. Commissioner Grams stated that she is unavailable from June 24th through July 15th.

Councilor McIlroy repeated that the Council is interested in a creekside park and a river walk concept, this fits both of those visions, and we have Development Impact Fees of over \$1 million, so he would love to see this looked at from that perspective for the future of the City. Chair Unger added that even if the building is knocked down, the river ran through there for how many years, and that is within our purview. Audree added that it is preserving the lifeblood of our early settlers.

Vice Chair Holmes asked if that is the outcropping that people rock climb and Audree indicated that she thinks it is. The Vice Chair then noted that is something to consider as a recreational facility.

The Chair indicated that staff will let them know of the timing to look at the property. Councilor McIlroy then restated that the Commission should take a field trip and look at the property to come up with a decision regarding destroy or not destroy and come back to Council with the Commission's position, etc., take the building out, look at this park if you want creekside and perhaps for a river walk, but the building is the key part right now.

Audree indicated that the property owner indicated that they may do a demolition permit for all buildings, so she wants to know the Commission's feeling for the next meeting, before that is approved. Chair Unger indicated that the Commission should do it sooner rather than later, but she won't be available next Thursday or Friday.

9. Review/discussion of the Commission's work program, recommended priorities and strategies to streamline the work of the Commission, including number of meetings, distributing individual/committee assignments, and other related work requirements (30 minutes, 5:00-5:30)

Chair Unger indicated that she reviewed the Work Program items and removed some to come up with pinpoints of the things she felt were most important, which included the following:

- Attendance at the Conference has been taken care of with three going.
- Rework the Grant Program
- Decide on meetings as needed.
- Training for Commissioners
- Landmark hearings and Certificates of Appropriateness reviews
- Create a new Historic Pride Program.

Commissioner Segner suggested tying the Historic Pride Program in with the history walk; however, Chair Unger explained it is a little different from that, but it may be at the bottom of the list, although she wants the community to know the Commission is still interested in the community. Commissioner Segner then suggested going through the whole process with Lomacasi as part of the training and take a second property that same day. Audree Juhlin indicated it could be the Leakey property.

Chair Unger indicated that could be added, and then she continued to list the Work Program items as follows:

- Improve the website - the survey will be part of that
- HP Month - she is going to talk with Ann about writing an article.
- Ranger Station - we want to have a couple of Commissioners working on that with the City as it goes forward to prepare the program for it.
- Be more proactive with the landmarks and surveyed properties - that should be taken care of as we do the survey.
- Have more involvement with people who have landmarked properties - maybe sending out a letter.

Chair Unger pointed out that the items interface with each other in a lot of ways, but given the fact, that this will be probably be launched in July, if we do these things, that is a lot. We may need to bring this back to the Commission to review, but does anything need to be added.

Commissioner Coté indicated that she is unclear, because she thought we were going to take the thing Donna sent us that we were asked to prioritize, so we could start working. Now, we are going to take another month and talk about it again. Why can't we just pick three things that we want to work on? Chair Unger explained that Commissioner Segner has gotten the beginning of the training down. Commissioner Segner then talked about when the Commission used to spend a half-day doing some of the buildings.

Commissioner Coté suggested picking something, so maybe within a month we do something. Chair Unger stated that the Commission is going to do Lomacasi, but Leaky is gone until the end of the summer. Audree indicated that another property might be the Rigby property and the Chair indicated that would be good to do. Commissioner Segner suggested the Gassaway House too and Audree indicated that the Commission could do a follow-up to see the roof. The Chair indicated that Lomacasi will take a little time, but we could go from there to Gassaway and then Rigby, if we can fit them in as part of our training.

Regarding meeting times, Chair Unger indicated that for now, we will have to stick with where we are until we get on top of stuff. We need the training, etc., and she and Audree discussed breaking the year into two halves with August and December off. Later we may decide that we just need meetings as they come. Additionally, she noted creating a Historic Pride Program, but we could possibly have a couple of people to start talking about that. Audree indicated that she could ask for volunteers to work with her to look at possible programs to bring back to the Commission.

Commissioner Coté asked if we should take what we have and hold an appreciation party for landmark owners. Just get what we have cleaned up and organized, and then introduce the next chapter. Chair Unger indicated that the survey work happening now is cleaning up. Commissioner Coté indicated that they will then have a mailing list and it may take three months to organize a party, so if we want to have it in the fall, we should start working on that in June. Commissioner Segner indicated that hiring a person to do the survey took a lot of work that the Commission doesn't have to do now, and a party would be nice if we had the new rules in place on how we are going to help them. He would do it at his hotel and have them come in the evening, but have the rules worked out first. Vice Chair Holmes added that it could then be an informational gathering. Commissioner Coté indicated that she is thinking about the fall; however, Chair Unger indicated that is too soon to have the rules worked out.

Chair Unger indicated that the Grant Program needs to be brought to the forefront; that and the survey are the two things we have to jump on, plus the training for the Commissioners, so we have something to talk about at the party. Donna Puckett asked if the pride program, party, etc., are things you are going to address after you do the two things the Council directed or if you are doing them in advance of those things, which ties into what Commissioner Segner suggested about having the rules before having a party. Chair Unger indicated that the Commission will have to understand what we are doing with the Grant and the Land Development Code changes, etc. Additionally, the training is important to have before that, so we are aware of what we are doing with the homeowners.

Commissioner Segner suggested seeing all of the landmarks in the half-day session and Audree indicated that would be two trips. Commissioner Segner then indicated it would be nice if the Commission wrote the plaque on the history of Sedona or Midgley Bridge.

Chair Unger summarized that the Commission needs to do the Grant Program, the Land Development Code changes, and the training, and if those are done in the next two months, that is a big advancement, and we do need something soft and fuzzy. If we have something in the paper this month to talk about historic preservation, that could be a soft and fuzzy thing.

Commissioner Coté then stated the three things are the survey, which is being done for us, the Grant Program, and the training, so we are working on the Work Program with a deadline by July. Chair Unger stated probably the end of July. Commissioner Coté asked what the Commission is

trying to accomplish by August; she is hearing the completion of the survey that Nancy is working on. Audree explained that the next step would be for the Commission to review what is submitted by Nancy, and if the Commission isn't satisfied, then prioritize which ones you want to go back and look at.

Commissioner Coté then said that by August, we want as much of the survey as Nancy can accomplish for us to review, the revision of the Grant Program, the implementation of the training. Chair Unger then added that the Commission needs to look at the Land Development Code, which we should start looking at next month.

Commissioner Segner pointed out that these aren't 1½ hour subjects; the Grant Program or Land Development Code should be for one-half day for just that. Commissioner Grams indicated that she thought from the last meeting we were definitely to have something on the Grant Program and we had to get that to the City Council immediately after this meeting, so where did we get off track. Chair Unger indicated that she and Audree discussed that and Commissioner Grams's suggestions were great and we can move on to the next agenda item to discuss the Grant Program.

10. Review/discussion of the Historic Preservation Small Grant Program (25 minutes, 5:30-5:55)

Chair Unger indicated that she and Commissioner Grams sent in things on the Grant Program, and she talked with Audree about how we could make it so we rewrote it, and the better thing may be for staff to ask for volunteers to bring it back as one piece. Commissioner Coté explained that she didn't feel qualified to comment on the program, so she was deferring to the other Commissioners.

Vice Chair Holmes indicated she would like to keep on the table the idea of doing away with it and Commissioner Segner agreed. Vice Chair Holmes explained that considering that there isn't that much money, and that it sounds like it is only going to get worse, even though it is done with good intent, we aren't helping people that much. She would like to see the Commission build the camaraderie and pride in the experience of being the owner of a historic property and really work at that PR, and not get hung up on the stuff like last year. It was just bad feelings and probably not necessary, but they happened and we aren't accomplishing much with this program.

Commissioner Segner agreed and indicated that he got upset because people were asking what we were going to give them for doing this. Others will give me more, so why aren't you doing as much. Then it comes down to what we are going to cover -- the roof, not the roof, and some of the things we paid for were normal maintenance of a house. He would rather say they should be proud that their home was picked and thank you. The minute we put a dollar value to anything, it opens Pandora's Box. He is totally against a grant program. Thank you for your home, here is a plaque, etc., but when it gets to what they get out of it, it turns into something else.

Chair Unger explained that the Grant Program was created to have some incentive, because other cities give tax breaks. Initially, it was \$15,000 and that was how we could entice people into landmarking their homes. Often times, the people who asked for money came in at the same time asking for the home to be landmarked. We didn't demand that and we should have, because some places didn't landmark. She liked Commissioner Grams's suggestion to call it a Preservation Grant Program if we do anything, but she thought we got more people interested by having the program.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she was actually the staff person and when the Commission was first formed one of the goals was to establish landmarks, but we couldn't get anyone interested, so the first ones were the Forest Service and the City's property. Then, the Commission said some incentives had to be offered, and this program came out of that. At the time, we had \$20,000 and that made a difference, but \$4,000 doesn't. Vice Chair Holmes noted that the money could be used to develop improvements to the website, etc., to make it appealing. If we spend all of our time determining if we are going to give someone \$2,000, she can't see it.

Commissioner Segner indicated that any project should have a beginning, middle and end. What properties are out there that we want landmarked, that aren't? For a while, it seemed like a numbers game to landmark everything we could. Are we going to landmark every Madole house? Is it a numbers game or are there seven or eight homes that should be landmarked? He would rather take the money and do other things.

Chair Unger indicated that there are still properties worth landmarking, but this isn't a numbers game. We have 23 landmarks and it is on our CLG that we have to keep looking. A Design Group house may be so spectacular that we have to do it. It is a little sad in that there was so much work to come up with the program, but it has diminished and certainly it doesn't mean that we couldn't look at it in the future and say let's do a preservation thing, when the City has more money. We are still going to be chasing our tail two months down the road with this.

Vice Chair Holmes indicated that in the owner gathering, we could say that we have suspended it for the time being, because we can't fund a meaningful grant for you. We want to develop dialogue and hear from them what they think would be good. Commissioner Segner indicated that no matter how much money we have, it will never be enough. We know what a roof, woodworking and a new front door costs, and \$4,000 will do nothing, so kill that idea and say that every year there will be \$5,000 at staff's discretion that can be used to mitigate immediate damage, until the homeowner can rectify it, so it is there as emergency money to help stabilize it until it can be fixed, but it opens the door to everything and he doesn't want to spend time in meetings worrying about whether we should be fixing flashings on an older home. It is their house and they should maintain it.

Audree Juhlin reminded the Commission that even though we only had \$4,000, we couldn't spend that, and last year we only spent \$1,000 of it, so it has been a struggle to even get someone to come in. Vice Chair Holmes is bringing up a good point; something is wrong with the program, so let's ask them. Vice Chair Holmes indicated that the Commission should show trust in these people; they have taken this on and maybe we don't know everything. Commissioner Coté added that it shows a team effort rather than the Commission having control of their property by them landmarking it.

Chair Unger indicated that it has been awkward as to how the decisions are made and who should be considered. The Chair then asked if it is possible to make a motion to suspend the program and Audree indicated no, because it is not agendaized for action, but she can say through consensus that staff has gotten that message, and we can update the Work Program based on consensus, so you don't have to take a formal motion. Your discussion tonight is loud and clear, so it doesn't need to be formalized through a motion and she will update the City Council that it is being suspended until further evaluation.

Commissioner Segner indicated that if it is suspended, we can now have a party, so we can do something in November at his place to welcome everybody and thank them for doing it. Chair Unger indicated that we do need to look at the Land Development Code first, and not do anything sooner than November. Audree explained that the direction from the City Council was an emergency clause, because we have no ability for a property owner of a landmark to take emergency action, and they have to go through the 30 to 60-day process. Chair Unger noted that should be discussed at the next meeting. Audree Juhlin then indicated that she would welcome volunteers to research what other communities do, and it is typically called a Certificate of No Effect where they define the parameters for when it doesn't need to go for a public hearing, and gives them the ability to come in at a staff level, and then staff lets the Commission know what was approved. Chair Unger explained that it doesn't change the visuals of the building, but right now even in those cases, they have to come to the Commission, so this would allow a homeowner with a leaking roof, etc., to go to staff and it is going to look exactly like it did before, but it has to be worded appropriately.

Commissioner Segner indicated that the wording is staff's function and then we can look at the wording. Chair Unger clarified that Audree is asking for one of us to research the wording and bring

that back, rather than reinventing the wheel. Vice Chair Holmes then indicated that would be something to present at the owner gathering as a sign of good faith.

Chair Unger indicated that someone could also ask SHPO. Commissioner Coté indicated that if staff needs someone to help, she has time to contact two cities to get their language, and Audree indicated that would be super. Commissioner Coté then indicated that regarding suspending the grant program, she sees it as a huge red flag to do this as an announcement when they are coming as a group to have fun. Perhaps a letter saying that due to the lack of need, use, etc., we are suspending it, and ask if they have an objection to it to let us know.

Commissioner Segner stated that it shouldn't even be brought up; it was done from year to year and it just wasn't funded. Chair Unger agreed that the party isn't a function of this. We may individually talk to the homeowners to ask if they are interested, but leave it for now, because we don't even have the money for it, so leave it until possibly next summer, but it is a great idea to get people involved. Commissioner Grams indicated that half are going to be one way and half the other. Some people took money when they could have done anything they wanted, but they were looking for \$1,000 from the City. You are going to get a reaction from some people who have taken money and a reaction from more modest situations, and the public probably doesn't know, but we have put a ton of money in salvaging the Hart Store as a special emergency situation.

Chair Unger indicated that she doesn't want the Commission to be in the position of having to make those decisions anymore; that was very difficult. Audree indicated that notifying them could be opening up a wound; some property owners already have some hurt feelings around the whole program, and if we make a public announcement, it could look bad. If we go in with the approach of suspending it temporarily, because we know it has some problems, so let's look at it and evaluate where we can do better and if it is appropriate or not, and when we have an idea of what that looks like, then come back. Chair Unger agreed and we haven't had a lot of response in the last couple of years, so it isn't going to be something noticed unless we make a big issue of it.

Commissioner Segner added that the only way we got anybody was to bug them; we sent postcards and letters and we begged them to spend money. Commissioner Coté stated that is why she doesn't understand why it would be a big deal to notify them. Audree explained that we aren't saying it is taken away; it is suspended. Her concern perception-wise, is we are now taking one more thing away from historic preservation, as if it is not important, and that is not what we are saying. Commissioner Grams added that if somebody calls in, there is no problem in saying it has been suspended.

Councilor McIlroy asked if there is any money requested in this budget cycle and Audree indicated \$4,000, so if we temporarily suspend it and then in October we come to a realization as to how to spend it, we have that ability. It could be used in the Pride Program or the Grant Program could be resurrected in a few months, we just don't know what it looks like.

Commissioner Segner suggested doing a plaque of all of the listed properties and said here is your listing with the address, so they are on the history walk. Chair Unger indicated that she doesn't know if that would fit into the budget and some people don't want the name and address there, so asking them would be important. Audree indicated that sometimes it is just the name and a picture of the home that isn't identified by location. Chair Unger indicated that next month we can start thinking about doing something at Commissioner Segner's perhaps in November, but we do need to get the Land Development Code in, because she wants to be sure the Commission does what the City Council has asked us to do first. Chair Unger then asked Audree to write Commissioner Coté a note giving her the assignment of what she is to do, and then we may be able to craft it in the next meeting. With Lomacasi, we will do some training and maybe do the pride thing in November, because the owners will be happy to hear that they don't have to come to the Commission if there is an emergency. Audree Juhlin added that she likes November from the perspective that November equates to thankfulness.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he could do a plaque of the Gassaway House and another one and say this is a sample. People might ask how to get on a plaque, then it might start the ball rolling, but we should take some that are significantly interesting and do a picture of them. Audree Juhlin indicated that might be the incentive program.

11. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items (5minutes, 5:55-6:00)

Chair Unger indicated that we will have the training session before if possible, but next time, we will talk about the Land Development Code with Commissioner Coté's help and the November appreciation party, and in July, maybe we can take a trip to see all landmarked properties. The next meeting is June 9th at 4:00 p.m.

Commissioner Coté asked Audree to send her something that she could forward to show credibility, in case it comes up.

12. Adjournment (6:00)

The Chair called for adjournment at approximately 6:03 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 May 12, 2014.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date