

Draft Action/Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Monday, July 6, 2009 – 4:00 pm

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

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Roll Call:

Commissioners: Chairman Brynn Unger, Vice Chairman Greg Ruland and Commissioners Richard Mayer, Marjorie Miller and Noreen Wienges

Staff: Kathy Levin and Donna Puckett

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).

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

3. Consent agenda:

a. Approval of minutes of May 11, 2009 meeting.

The Chairman indicated this item is for approval of the minutes of May 11th.

MOTION: Commissioner Miller so moved. Vice Chairman Ruland seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed.

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

Kathy Levin announced that 1) A public notice was placed in the Red Rock News and the Red Rock News also carried a news release on the Commission vacancies, and the deadline for applications is July 10th. 2) Tim Ernster is our new City Manager and his first day was on June 22nd. 3) She distributed the Commission's adopted budget, and indicated the amounts provided were very close to the amounts requested, and 4) Tentatively, the agenda item involving Commissions and Committees is on Council's agenda for July 28th at 4:30 p.m.

Chairman Unger referenced a handout and explained she is trying to put together a CD of important items for HPC, and she requested that the Commissioners review the list and ensure nothing important is omitted. She hopes to get those in a format that enables Commissioners to fill them out on computers rather than by hand. She also explained that information regarding the conference that she, Commissioner Wienges and Kathy Levin attended will be included for discussion in the next meeting. Regarding the webpage, she met a woman during the convention, who may be working with the City on the website, so the woman is going to provide some information on what we need to do to improve our portion of the website. Once that information is available, she would like to work with Commissioner Wienges on looking at that.

5. Discussion/possible action on Small Grant Program for FY 2009-10 including funding, evaluation criteria, process and oversight.

Kathy Levin explained this is an overview of next fiscal year's small grant program. We have \$12,000 and had requested \$15,000. Jessica Williamson is going to continue to provide oversight and assistance on the program. She and Jessica have discussed their key concerns and how the program can be strengthened. We both feel it is critical to designate two Commissioners, alternately, with construction, design and/or architectural background, to assist staff in reviewing materials after the grant award is made and before the work begins. She will send a notification that grant application packets will be available to the Red Rock News and all property owners of historic properties probably about the third week of July, with a deadline for applications of August 28th.

Commissioner Mayer suggested adding a request to speak to the contractor before the work is started, just to check their credentials and let them know what is expected of them and what they can expect from us, because we will be inspecting it, before they receive any remuneration. Kathy confirmed with Commissioner Mayer that he was suggesting that after the Commission has made the grant award and before it begins, subsequent to your approval of the material, that same designated Commissioner and/or staff would meet with the designated contractor, and possibly the property owner. Commissioner Mayer added that it doesn't have to be anything extensive, just so they know what we expect. Jessica Williamson explained that they are currently in the process of looking at the last application packet, to see what needs to be tightened up, and we should consider that; it sounds like something we might want to add in there. Commissioner Mayer pointed out it may help develop relationships with the contractors, and they will know what we expect.

Chairman Unger agreed and indicated that we probably should have the homeowner there too. She doesn't think the same two people have to review all of the grants, we may split it up amongst us, but before the grant is awarded, we should have more of a discussion amongst the Commissioners, before it is granted. Last year, it was shortened; Kathy pointed out that we had an accelerated second cycle and had to turn things around quickly, but she doesn't anticipate that the process would change. She and Jessica will review the applications for completeness, and if they are insufficient, the property owner will be given a week to address the deficiencies, and then we will evaluate them and bring all applications to the Commission for a decision on funding.

The Chairman added that the two people assigned should be also be in charge of checking how it is going throughout the process, because things fell through the cracks last time. They may need to set up a schedule for different phases of the project, for example, when they started pulling things off of KSB, because it would have been easier on all of us, if someone more in tune with what was going on had been involved. Commissioner Wienges agreed. Kathy added that the continuity and consistency would be good. Chairman Unger indicated that the contractor and the homeowner should be responsible to come back to us, if there are different parts to it, like something has to be torn off, so we know what is happening during the process; it will be different for each project. Jessica pointed out that some of them are so small that phasing is not an issue. The Chairman indicated that a roof can sometimes be an issue, because there are different components.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if staff had identified the cracks and knows what went wrong before, so we can fix the problems. Jessica indicated that the biggest problem she saw was in the approval of the materials; it appeared that some were approved and others weren't, so that is the major thing we are going to discuss tightening up, and if you have any other items, let staff know. The Vice Chairman indicated that it somewhat feels like overkill in response to the situation presented, but he isn't sure, so as long as we know where the cracks were, those are what we need to patch. Jessica agreed that we have to be careful not to become a burden on the process, because there are time constraints, and the awardee is actually putting out funds, so we will certainly look for a balance.

The Chairman agreed we shouldn't be on it every 5 minutes; a lot of it has to do with the materials and them coming back with a list of what is going on. On Doris Banks' house, they said they were going to replace the roof with what was there, but they interpreted what was there differently than we did. Jessica indicated that was a crack that she had identified, and that is what we are looking to resolve. If there isn't a material, then you have to take quick action to permit something else. The Chairman agreed and indicated that is why she would like for a team of two to be responsible, so they can make that decision, unless it is too big. Jessica Williamson explained that the expectation is to do that before the work starts, so everything is approved and understood, and that would go a long way toward resolving the issues.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that materials are a small crack to fall through compared to what happened with Jill Sands. He gave her some recommendations for people in town, but she chose an unlicensed contractor and we gave her choices of materials, but she went with another material that the contractor said was correct for the pitch of the roof, and we know what happened after that. It doesn't need to be a big deal, but we need to know what is going on. Jessica pointed out that they won't be able to participate in the program, if they aren't licensed, so that is not acceptable. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that there are some licensed people who are doing substandard work, but we need to know a few details.

The Chairman added that you can check the licensing of the contractor to see if the contractor is doing substandard work, and we should check with the state on the status of the license; you can check it online. Vice Chairman Ruland suggested having a list of approved contractors; however, the Chairman indicated that could be awkward and be a legal battle, as to whether or not we could dictate who, because half of the money is from the homeowner. Kathy indicated the Community Development Department does have a list of architects and designers that is meant to be a comprehensive list of people who have done work in the community, but it makes no recommendations; she can find out if we have one for contractors, but the list doesn't qualify their workmanship or reputation. She doesn't know if we could create a list of preferred contractors; the Chairman indicated that it possibly couldn't be a preferred list, but there could be a list.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked what the obstacle would be, and Jessica indicated that we should check with Legal. Commissioner Mayer explained that the homeowner could come back at us, if something went wrong, and the Chairman agreed that is probably why we don't do it, because that is the reason homeowners' associations don't do it. Commissioner Mayer indicated that another example is when SAC came to us for the staircase, and there were two bids, one was for someone connected to SAC and the other one was for a non-existing contractor, even though he said he was a contractor, so we have to be a little more

vigilant on that point. Once people know we aren't fooling around, they won't try to go around us.

The Chairman indicated that she thinks people would like to have a list of people who are licensed in town, but we have to say they can choose who they want. Jessica added that we should look into what would be permissible, and there may be something that could be added to the website or a professional association that could be referenced, because the website could link to sources of information in a way that sort of separates the City from making recommendations. The Chairman indicated that she has already started looking into the website as a source of resources. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that as we go along, we will be developing a list through the grants awarded.

No legal action was taken.

6. Discussion/possible action on citywide fieldwork regarding residential buildings with dates of construction before 1960.

Commissioner Mayer presented a slide presentation titled, "Potential Structures for Historic Resource Survey, City of Sedona, Historic Preservation Commission, June 2009" and recapped that Commissioners were sent out to identify potential structures, and this presents what was accumulated after deleting photographs that couldn't be seen, structures that were not labeled as to location, and a myriad of other problems. He selected what was identifiable, but he would suggest starting again with two Commissioners who would be in charge of this project. We can incorporate what we have, but there is a lot missing that should be done by two people with one camera and in one format with an outline.

Commissioner Miller asked if there are areas that are greyer than others, where we need to concentrate, so we don't need to cover the whole spectrum. Commissioner Mayer repeated that we should start from scratch; it is hard to say what we missed. Kathy explained for the new Commissioners that a couple of years ago, Steve Segner suggested this project, and we requested data for all structures built before 1960 from the Counties, and from that we identified their locations, dates of construction, site addresses, owners, etc. She then had that information translated into our GIS maps and we divided up the community. Commissioner Mayer indicated that we do have that information, so we don't have to look at every structure. Kathy then explained that in a variety of formats, Commissioners paired up, and typically during the second meeting of the month, they tried to photograph and write information about the properties, and that information was given to her, which brings us to where we are today. The buildings weren't assessed for their history or necessarily for their architectural uniqueness, and many aren't unique, but are representative of a certain period, so we will be looking at a cold list of pictures today that Commissioner Mayer feels we should toss out or keep and do more research on, and with those decisions, he is suggesting that we return to the field to get a full compendium of photos and surveys. The next step would be to determine which ones we are going to research, by checking the County files to see who built it, its purpose and function, and to give it some relative significance in terms of its historic value.

Chairman Unger added that what fell through the cracks was the way it was put together; we took a picture of the house and then a picture of the card that related to the house, but that information didn't connect correctly. If you don't have a thing in front of it as a

number, all on one photograph, those things get jumbled. It was just an awkward way of doing it, and each person did it a little differently; her son even said it was ridiculous and too disconnected. Commissioner Miller asked what could be done about the camera situation, and Kathy explained that she purchased a camera. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that we only need one camera. Chairman Unger asked if it would help to have a laptop when we do it, and Kathy indicated if we are trying to record data rather than write it on a form; she has done that for land use surveys. The Chairman noted that it would probably depend on who does this and what they are more comfortable with.

Kathy explained that the former Chairman felt that if we took ownership for specific areas, they could be completed A to Z, but it proved to be too cumbersome, and she would agree that it would be far easier for one or two individuals, than trying to get all of the cats back into the burlap bag. The Chairman indicated that a lot of photographs were taken and a lot of history was written that wasn't going to be used. It will take a selective eye on the part of who goes out there. Kathy added that if you run into the property owner, as the former Chairman did, she would take copious notes and talk to them, so she was able to document some very good information on some unique properties. Commissioner Mayer indicated he also rang the bell at times to see if someone had some information, but there needs to be an outline of how to do it, and only two people and one camera. It is subjective, because how do we know if a plain home has history behind it, but this way was not a clear picture; even knowing what areas were finished was a problem, so we need to finish an area completely, and then move on to the next area.

Commissioner Miller suggested correlating the three pieces of paper into one survey form to simplify things. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated the project seems to be an overwhelming amount of work, so he is wondering about the purpose of going house-to-house in every section of town. Commissioner Mayer explained that we don't go house-to-house, we identified the homes that are 50 years or older, which eliminates quite a few, and it would be left to the discretion of the two people, because some have been too modified, so you would just note that it has been modified. The Vice Chairman asked if there is not a single photograph with an address that would be able to go in a hopper for two people to look at and say this is worth going back over. Commissioner Mayer explained that from what we have here, yes, this whole presentation is; these are the ones that were legible and the properties we have the information on. The Vice Chairman indicated, then it is not a matter of so much starting from scratch as just refining and focusing resources on what we know is going to fit. Commissioner Mayer added, and a process that is simple to do, and some taken were already in the resource survey, so they shouldn't have been on the list. The Vice Chairman summarized that it is just narrowing down the scope and getting more thorough with the properties that are really eligible. Commissioner Mayer repeated that it is subjective; for some people, it may be hard to tell that a home has been modified a lot, where it seems fairly obvious to him. The purpose is trying to find structures before they are modified; a lot of homes we thought still existed were gone. Kathy recalled a situation that was found during this project, and it was in the data, but was already a tear down.

Commissioner Mayer showed slides of several properties photographed, and pointed out unique architectural qualities, such as rock work, chimneys, roof structures, board and batten siding, etc., or typical construction of specific eras, plus various visual problems with some photographs taken.

Kathy recalled the former home of Ethyl and Fred Ritzinger, and that Ethyl was in her 80s when she built the rock wall. Commissioner Mayer showed a slide of one of Howard Madole's favorite homes on Sky Mountain, and indicated that Howard explained that to level the lot, they didn't use a backhoe, they used dynamite to blow the whole top of the hill off in those days, and this was a pretty amazing social and party house. The Chairman noted that the house is incredibly situated on the property and the owner is supposed to be 98 or 99-years-old, but lives somewhere in Tucson. Commissioner Mayer also indicated that one on Color Cove should definitely be checked further; the Chairman indicated the owners might be willing to landmark that, and Commissioner Mayer expressed that the condition and architecture is interesting. Commissioner Mayer also advised the Commission that the Gillenwaters are not interested in landmarking their property.

The Commissioners recognized that photographs of many properties were missing, and Commissioner Miller indicated that we have to get a camera that has some control of the light and shadowing. The Chairman explained that the use of a digital camera may solve that, and we may have gone too rapidly through it, but she thinks Commissioner Mayer is correct about doing an overlay of the ones we already have in our survey, over the ones of that age and going back to them, and we may want it on next month's agenda to think about going forward and have a Commissioner look at what we need to put together.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that his term is up in September, but he is willing to go out with someone as far as framing shots or looking at characteristics of structures, to help them in identifying things, but someone has to take this on. It just has to be done in a way that is usable. The purpose is to find structures that we aren't aware of and should try to preserve, and there are a few there. He suggested taking one area, survey it, select the homes and go for landmarking of any of those structures that are important, instead of trying to get all of the information citywide first.

Chairman Unger indicated that we could also use that area to learn how to do it better. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that if we do one area, then we can exhaust the possibilities and never have to go back to that area, unless we think they may landmark someday, then we don't have to keep rehashing. Chairman Unger explained that it may take a little thinking before we address it totally, so we may come up with some ideas for our next meeting. Commissioner Mayer indicated that we may just have to find one or two Commissioners that want to do it.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if the photographs shown are done deals and we are satisfied with those, except for the ones that are already in the resource book; in other words, some of those are ready for research work right now, so they would be separate and apart from the duo going out. Commissioner Mayer responded yes, that is true, but they are scattered, and we can check them against the survey book, so there may be some to subtract. The Vice Chairman suggested that maybe they can be on parallel tracks, but it seems that we got that much done. Chairman Unger indicated that we may look at it as two separate things. One being the two Commissioners, and not waiting for this until we get that done; we could work on these too, because we put our time in on it, so we could start looking at those, but we do need to come back to assigning the properties to each Commissioner. At the next meeting, we may look at all of them and choose to go forward. Doing the Van Ess structures is a great idea and the other Madole homes on that list are great ideas, so maybe

we can do that. She hesitates for the Commission to make a decision right now as to who is going to do what, but maybe we can put on the next agenda.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that he was here when you were wrapping it up, and whatever problems there were, it is also important to honor all of that effort, and we are going to try to improve on what was completed. Commissioner Miller added that it created some bonding too. Kathy Levin indicated that she will give some thought to how we want to structure the methodology for researching the properties, including where we are going to go, what we are looking for and how we are going to document that. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated the research piece would be something he would have the ability and time to do, but he is not sure he would be able to go out on field trips. Kathy Levin indicated it could start with the property owner to find out what they know, but then it would involve going to the County Recorder's office, looking at the deeds and trying to pick up some history of who, what and where, and that may lead to the archives at the Sedona museum or old newspapers, etc. The Chairman indicated that we will start assigning those things to individuals, and it is right, she would hate to see the previous work dumped.

Commissioner Wienges suggested having one person in charge of organization to keep track of what everybody is doing, look at overlapping, and take a look at what has been done in the past to see what can be salvaged. The Chairman agreed and asked the Commissioners to be thinking about it, and in the next meeting, we will decide who is going to take that responsibility. The Chairman thanked Commissioner Mayer for all of his efforts on this project and an incredible amount of time.

Commissioner Mayer pointed out that we got worried, because people were ripping down homes and they took that Howard Madole home apart piece-by-piece, so we went out there and tried to do everything too fast, but the intentions were right, and we found some interesting places. The Chairman agreed and indicated we lost 4 Madole homes last year, and that is just testimony as to why we needed to do that.

No legal action was taken.

7. **Discussion/possible action on Red Rock Village. Request for a Conceptual Review of a proposed mixed-use development consisting of 160 single-family residential condominiums, approximately 70,000 square feet of commercial space and a religious facility including a 300-seat sanctuary and an educational and recreational facility. The property consists of five adjacent parcels located west of the Safeway shopping center. The total acreage involved is 15.49 acres and the parcels are zoned C-2 (General Commercial) and RMH-10 (Mobile Home and Single-family Residential). Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 408-24-093, 408-27-092, 408-24-090A, 408-24-087 and 408-24-088. Applicant: RMB Sedona, LLC; Case numbers: ZC09-3, SUB09-3 and DEV09-2**

Chairman Unger asked if the Commissioners were able to pull up the information on the Internet, and Commissioner Wienges indicated she had trouble with the maps, but got the printed material. The Chairman indicated she got most of the maps, and she has the other photographs, and only one is clear as to where the Madole-Rigby House is. She also identified the location from a Google search and distributed information with the notes on the Rigby House that talk about the house and that the campus was designed around an

existing house. They recognize there is an historical house on the property, and they have decided to leave that standing, but they don't discuss what it will be used for and they are indicating that they are leaving a lot of space around the home.

Kathy Levin explained that this is a Conceptual Review and the purpose is to give the P&Z Commission and general public an opportunity to familiarize themselves and provide comment on the development proposal in its early conceptual stage of design. The applicant also has the opportunity to become aware of major issues, concerns and suggestions prior to the completion of more detailed plans, so it creates a more timely mechanism through which early design concepts may be revised to reflect areas of concern. This will come back to you under Development Review, and your recommendations will be forwarded to the P&Z Commission.

The project is a 15-acre, plus or minus, mixed-use project and the property includes the former Windsong Trailer Park, 2 single-family residences, the Wesleyan Church property with the Rigby House and the propane gas distribution facility, now owned by Washington Federal. The proposed uses are 70,000 sq. ft of commercial retail space, 3 commercial sites along 89A, a range of 175 to 180 residential units over the commercial, and they will range from 600 sq. ft. to 1,000 sq. ft. each, in 2, 3 and 4-story buildings. The church portion includes a 300-seat sanctuary, an educational facility and recreational facility. The property on which the Rigby House is located is roughly 9-10 acres, and the church sold off 3 of those acres to the applicant, who is requesting a Planned Area review for all 15 acres, although the portion for the church facilities is not owned by the applicant. The Rigby House is on your 2009 Sedona's Most Endangered Places List; it is not protected, since it is not a local historic landmark. Commissioner Miller did substantial research, and with her information, the draft Statement of Significance was prepared and forwarded to the planning staff, so when they meet with the applicant, they are aware of the historic significance of that home.

Kathy indicated there are 3 or 4 areas for the Commission to consider as follows:

- They have retained the home in the development, so it hasn't been pushed aside as insignificant, but you might want to ask if the context or size of the area and the proposed adjacent uses are appropriate.
- What proposed uses does the applicant anticipate?
- Will the building be publicly accessible? Even if it were a landmarked property, we wouldn't require that it be publicly accessible, but you might like to know that, since there are unique interior features.
- Should they consider more open space on the west side, where it abuts the parking lot, for a little more contextual area around the dwelling?
- At the zone change phase, you would want to consider a Landmark designation as a Condition of Approval.

The most salient parts about the project that pertain to the Rigby House are displayed on the site plan and on page 5, and in describing the church portion of the property, they identify an existing historically significant house to be preserved, and they say the church development is situated on the northern part of the site. It consists of three main uses and an historically significant house will be incorporated into the program with an adaptive use.

Any comments about the development will be passed on to the planning staff and they will go to Planning & Zoning.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if it would be a report or recommendation from the entire Commission, and Kathy indicated they would be framing the issues and concerns, so we can provide them before Development Review. At the next stage, you would give recommendations, so in this phase you can comment and they may change some things.

Chairman Unger indicated the Commission should recommend that Landmark designation is something they should do before a zoning change, as a Condition of Approval. She would also agree that the parking lot is very close to the building on the west side, so we should recommend that they give it more room on that side. There are issues about vernacular of buildings, etc., and given the fact that this has such historic significance and it will be close to all of the other buildings, they say that they are going to tie into the look of the Southwest, etc., but it would be nice for them to consider using some of the materials, like the adobe and other elements on the Madole home, since this is an adobe Madole home, and she is sure that P&Z will be asking them for more on the visuals for this also.

Commissioner Miller indicated that their vision was a relief, considering how long we have been concerned about this property without any response or answers for 4 or more years, so she was pleased, but her first concern was the parking being so close on the west, and she would like to take the education building in Phase III and the Phase I auditorium and switch their locations. There is a wonderful view from the Rigby House to the north, and it would be nice to keep that. She is quite pleased, considering the house and its location and treatment; she feels it will be very accessible to public; it is all on one floor, and the interior is marvelous. It could be a gem of the project. They don't have to follow form-based codes for the other buildings to the south, but maybe P&Z should go there, although we probably are to concern ourselves only with the Rigby House. Chairman Unger indicated that is true; our real thrust can't be making any demands in terms of the other buildings. Kathy clarified that, as it impacts the home, any observations about phasing or view corridors would be appropriate. Commissioner Miller added that she likes the green space allowed to the north and east, but we are cutting it a little short on the south, which is the front of the structure. If we could get a little more out of that, and make the exchange of the two buildings, then other than that she is quite pleased.

Chairman Unger indicated if you look at the Google view, you see that the existing road up to the Rigby House passes close to the front of it, so they may argue it is already set up that way, but we can ask. Commissioner Miller indicated that she is also pleased with the continuing access to Madole parcels.

Vice Chairman Ruland concurred with Commissioner Miller's comments; the Statement of Significance is well done and makes the case. We should also applaud the developer for having done this and make a big deal out of that fact, to encourage others to consider it. Chairman Unger suggested putting that statement first; they will make alterations after P&Z reviews it, but this is when we need to applaud anybody for doing this, and to give them that draft, it gives them more fortification for why it works for us.

No legal action was taken.

8. Discussion/possible action on proposed revisions to the Land Development Code regarding the landmark designation criteria in §1507.03.

Kathy Levin explained that she prepared proposed revisions for the Land Development Code that involve Minor Amendments and housekeeping changes, in Article 7, 8, 9 11, 12, and 15 and the one that she has brought to the Commission involves Article 15, because it is an historic preservation matter. These revisions are intended to clarify the intent of the landmark criteria, by adding "or" as highlighted and the word "and" to the list of criteria, thereby emphasizing the last two as threshold criteria for designation. If you recommend these changes, then they will go forward with the other changes that P&Z will consider this month, but if you wish to leave them unchanged, she will withdraw them from consideration. That criteria figured prominently in your review of the Doodlebug Ranch, when Vice Chairman Ruland asked several questions about how to interpret the criteria, because the punctuation doesn't exist and the lead-in sentence would imply that any and all criteria can be applied in your deliberations for landmark designation. It says, "The Commission shall evaluate each structure, site, building or property within an area that is included in an application, and may designate it as a landmark, if it is determined to have historical or other cultural significance or integrity and is suitable for preservation using the following criteria." They read like a laundry list; it doesn't say it has to meet one of these or all of these, etc., or if any have a greater weight than others. In suggesting adding those conjunctions, it will distinguish the last two by emphasizing them as threshold criteria, which would mean 1) Has the home achieved significance within the last 50 years or is it at least 50-years-old and 2) Does it have integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association. The integrity issue comes up when you look at a building and say this has been remodeled over time, so has it lost its integrity or did the remodeling take place in the last 50 years? If so, it is within that historic window.

The other criteria enable the Commission to analyze the property by having association with events, significant people and unique workmanship, and those embellish the story of the building, while the other two are unique to deciding whether or not it can be landmarked. As it reads now you have a great deal of discretion, and you applied that in your decision on the Doodlebug Ranch. If you make this tighter, you will be placing restrictions on the way you evaluate potential properties.

The Chairman indicated it basically groups the bottom three together, and making them almost mandatory in the decision. When we don't have the "or" or the "and", we are saying that any one of them can matter or not matter, with the "ands" in the final three, D, E and F become mandatory. The question becomes if we lose out on buildings that we currently might be able to landmark, for example, would we lose out on Doodlebug or the Art Barn? This is a monumental change; if I heard correctly, when we designated Doodlebug, the person who wrote this made the determination not to do that, so we would have a little more latitude. The question is do we want that latitude and how serious do we look at designating landmarks, if we don't have that tightening up of our definition. Kathy indicated that in the case of the Doodlebug Ranch, it was one feature alone that we knew had been added, but others might have multiple reiterations over time; also, it was the predominant history, story and occupants, and our fear that it could be lost, that weighed heavily on your decision.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated with the wordsmithing, you basically convert it to A, B, C and D; it becomes 4, and he doesn't think there is a single property around that is going to qualify under 4. Kathy explained that "or" is between A, B, C and D. Vice Chairman Ruland pointed out it is or, or, or and D is and, and, so to qualify under D, E and F, it must be at least 50-years-old and possessing integrity, plus it also must yield information important in the understanding of the pre-history or history of our community.

Chairman Unger explained it doesn't have to be A, B, C and D to qualify; we could possibly qualify it under A and B, but the significance of D is much greater, and maybe by doing that we are weighting D much heavier than the others.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated no, and clarified A or B or C or DEF, because they are all together. It doesn't get more importance, it is that DEF become insurmountable. No one will ever qualify under DEF, because they have to have pre-history and 50-years-old and integrity; all three must be together to qualify under DEF. Kathy indicated that A through D are all "or", so you can pick 1, 2, 3 or 4 of those. The Chairman pointed out that we still have the flexibility to say it qualifies under A so we can do it, or it qualifies under B, so we can do it, etc.; the question is if we want to say that in order to qualify under D, it has to qualify for all of those, because you linked them.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that if that is the way you want it to read, she would suggest removing E and F and having it all be one paragraph. Kathy explained that the intent was that you could choose any of the preceding four characteristics and apply it to the description of the property, and the last two were threshold criteria, both of which needed to be met to Landmark. Chairman Unger indicated it doesn't come out that way.

Vice Chairman Ruland explained that the conjunction joins them all into one, all of his previous issues can be satisfied with an "or" in every case, then he would be happy. Chairman Unger agreed that makes it much more clear. That is the way it has always been; that is the way it should have probably been written in the beginning. Kathy indicated that if we left it alone, you would have that same discretion. Chairman Unger suggested that for the public's interpretation . . . , and she also had that barrier, because she didn't understand that it was "or". Her first reaction was how could we find anything that has all of those. Her concern with the "and" is that we are limited to the number of buildings that are old enough or historic enough to have all three of those grouped into one. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that to resolve the concern about having it be too loose, all of those criteria A through E are all appropriate as "or", but after E there is a big "and", so you could have A, B, C, D or E, but you must have F.

The Chairman agreed, but asked if we are going to lose too many properties. The reality is that we have the option of deciding if a property still possesses integrity, but having that as a separate one, maybe we would put that at the top of the list. One of her issues is to have historical tourism, we need to make sure we are being honest about whether or not something is historical, and by having that already set up as our bellwether helps us do that.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated the appropriate way to handle it is "or, or, or, or, or", and then after E, "and". Chairman Unger indicated that it has to be separate. Commissioner Wienges agreed; otherwise it just looks like you are linking it. The Chairman suggested not labeling it as F, just say "and", and put it there; it doesn't need a letter. Kathy indicated

she is following your logic, so we would have "or" all the way through E, and at the end of E, we would put "and"; we would still want to keep F, so we would put "and" after the last sentence in E.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated it would be "semi-colon or" after each; "and" could be at the beginning of F. Chairman Unger suggested it could also have "and" in the center of the page and then F. It can't be tied to E or those two (E and F) become linked together. Vice Chairman Ruland restated that it is a "semi-colon or" at the end of each of those clauses for A through E, and then for F you could say "and comma". Commissioner Wienges suggested leaving a blank line and type "and" and leave another blank line. The Chairman agreed and indicated that she guesses that we will have to vote.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved that we adopt the draft language as proposed by City staff, with the exception that after each of the paragraphs A, B, C, D and E, the word "or" be inserted, that after E a blank line, then the word "and", then a blank line, then F. Commissioner Wienges seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed.

9. Discussion/possible action on revisions to the 2009 Sedona's Most Endangered Places list.

Chairman Unger explained that Kathy Levin and Commissioner Mayer brought to her attention that there is a concern about the Art Barn, and our feeling is that given the fact that National only runs this once a year, she thinks it would be appropriate to keep the Madole-Rigby home, but we may want to include the Art Barn.

Kathy indicated that in February the Commission approved the four properties on that 2009 list, so we are bringing it back for the addition of the George Jordan Packing Shed, also known as the Art Barn or Sedona Arts Center. There has been consistent Commission interest in designating the Art Barn as a local historic landmark given its twin history, which is tied to the Jordan family and Sedona's agricultural history, plus the emergence of artists in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Several years ago and also more recently, the board has discussed potential renovations with staff, remodeling and possible expansion plans that could entail modifications to, additions or even removal of what is perceived by some as a dangerous, hazardous and difficult to use space. Staff feels strongly that the George Jordan Packing Shed should be added to the 2009 Most Endangered Places List to draw attention to this property. Using the criteria in that brochure for inclusion on the list, which is significance, which it clearly has; urgency, which may be playing out; and a potential solution, which would be to possibly integrate it with any new remodeling plans and/or landmark the property if it meets the criteria. We also need to prepare a Statement of Significance for this building, so we can press our case before any plans come through for review. If and when they do, you won't see them in any formal way, because it wouldn't be a zone change or a Community Plan Amendment; it would be Development Review before the Planning & Zoning Commission, so that is why it is important to take this measure and prepare ourselves to have that Statement of Significance ready.

Chairman Unger agreed, but she is going to be occupied for the next couple of weeks, so she doesn't know who might be willing to; Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that he would. The Chairman indicated okay, and she guesses that we have to vote about putting it on the

endangered list. She would be happy to do that, once she has some wording that she can compress, she will put it in our flyer too. Kathy explained that consensus would be fine.

Commissioner Mayer asked if all members are aware that SAC has approached the City with plans to renovate or change the structure. Kathy indicated that we had an informal meeting with the new Executive Director, a Board member and architect. Commissioner Mayer indicated there is some urgency.

The consensus of the Commission was to go ahead, and Vice Chairman Ruland will work with Kathy in doing the significance statement. When they get the information, the Chairman will work on the brochure. The Chairman indicated that we might want to do this every 6 months, because we have the flexibility of doing that, even though National doesn't. The information that National requests is really extensive, but we don't have to do that as long as it fits the criteria.

No legal action was taken.

10. Discussion/possible action on 2008-09 Commission Work Plan and commissioner involvement in Work Plan tasks:

a. Education and Public Outreach

There was no discussion on this item.

b. Survey Field Work

Kathy indicated that she previously brought some properties to the Commission's attention, but we can just fold those into the existing project, rather than discuss them separately.

c. Madole Home landmark prospects

Commissioner Mayer asked if there was money in the budget to shoot Jill Sands' house and Kathy explained that wasn't contemplated in the budget, but we can cost it out to see if we can do that. Chairman Unger suggested putting it on the next agenda. Commissioner Mayer pointed out it would be the only Madole we have landmarked and photographed. We have the Eilenberg's home, if they ever landmark that.

11. Discussion/possible action on:

a. Prospects for designation of landmarks or historic districts

Kathy Levin indicated that Joe DeSalvo expressed interest in possibly landmarking the Relic's property. The historic restaurant was built in 1943 and the dancehall in 1948, and in May, she Commissioner Miller and Commissioner Wienges toured the property to determine its integrity and note changes, and to provide some feedback to the owner on its potential eligibility as a landmark property. The dancehall has had alterations; its shape, siding and windows appear to be intact; the restaurant was historically an apartment dwelling and a tavern, and the original house section is mostly intact. The front porch openings have been filled in with windows and additions, and the bar added to the west of the original residence was an historic addition. The entry received major renovations in 2005; a detached BBQ area was created with a roofed breezeway. There are many features such as the visible interiors and exterior walls of the former buildings

that make this property a significant historic resource. Its owner celebrates its history with photos and memorabilia, and they have retained significant features, such as the Alligator Juniper bar, although it has been relocated. All the old and new uses have been hitched together, obscuring some of the old and leaving other features visible. It has been modified for expanded purposes; the question is have the changes altered it in so many ways as to have lost its integrity?

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he would like to hear from the people who toured the property as to its integrity, and Commissioner Wienges indicated she was very impressed by the history of it. It is something she would love to save, but she saw so many changes in it, that she questioned the integrity. The Vice Chairman asked what changes caused her the most concern, and Commissioner Wienges indicated the central part. Looking at old pictures, it doesn't look the same.

Commissioner Miller agreed; she treasured the pieces that Joe has been able to save and build upon with that structure, but if she were to stand in front of the building and look at it, she would not identify it as the same structure, and that makes her hesitate to consider landmarking. Vice Chairman Ruland asked if that is how she would distinguish it from the Doodlebug; you could say it looked the same? Commissioner Miller indicated that is exactly like in the field; if she were to stand on 89A, she would not recognize it as a building that would have been identifiable in its earlier stages, as much as she would applaud what he has done.

The Chairman indicated that says a lot, and the Commission has been impressed by what he has been able to save. It is probably because they are seeing it from the front, and that generally is the way the determination is made, although she is assuming there are other areas that do look like the original building.

Chairman Unger opened the public comment period.

Joe DeSalvo, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that if you look at the original home structure; it is exactly what those photos showed it to be, including the front porch area, so he doesn't know what you were looking at when you say it doesn't appear to match the photos; which photos of what? There is a photo of the original house and that original house is still right there. It hasn't been changed.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that many elements remained the same, but there are so many that have changed . . .; Mr. DeSalvo stated, but not to the house. If you look at the house as the original structure; the rest was added to it, but the house structure is still the same. It is the same four walls, the same porch, and as Kathy said, the openings for the porch have been filled in with a window, but that structure is identical. There have been no alterations to that, so that is his only question in you suggesting the front look might not match up, because you can look at that photo and the front of the building and it is the same building.

Commissioner Miller indicated that as she understands it, we would be landmarking the entire structure. Mr. DeSalvo asked why you would need to, and the Commissioners explained that we can't divide it. Mr. DeSalvo pointed out that the structure was built in different stages.

Chairman Unger explained that one of the issues that falls on the shoulders of historic preservation, and certainly it has been added to over time, and those time additions could be considered appropriate, in terms of landmarking it, but it would have go back to one of the historic times of that building, and one of the ways they have answered your question is, would somebody from 20 or 30 years ago recognize it as being that building? That is the issue that these Commissioners are discussing; it has to have that integrity. If everything else was not around it and you just saw the building, would you recognize it as the building that was there in that timeframe, and they don't see that.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if he has made the application and Mr. DeSalvo said no. The Vice Chairman indicated he would like for Mr. DeSalvo to have the opportunity to make the application and to appear at a more formal setting where he is prepared, and now he understands some of the concerns, because he appreciates the history of his building and he cherishes his history, so he would like to give him a chance to express that before our Commission and make his best case, understanding the issues. The Vice Chairman added that he personally thinks just that maybe there is a way to finesse this; but for a more historic commercial part of Sedona, he can't think of one.

Chairman Unger agreed, but indicated that Mr. DeSalvo should know what he might be up against, because she doesn't want him to think there might not be an issue, and we always try to give the homeowner that understanding, as in the case of the Doodlebug, when we did the same thing. You should certainly make your argument, if you don't feel these arguments are going to be too difficult. We can't vote on it at this point, so we are telling you just what the Commissioners that came out saw, and beyond that, we can't discuss whether we will or will not landmark. We can only do that in the course of a public hearing, and you would have the right to also bring in other people.

Mr. DeSalvo indicated that he would rather flip it around and basically say that should you become interested in the historical significance of that property and wish to take an initiative on your end to make it so, then we would support that. He is not pushing. To his partner and himself, to preserve this structure for the future would be a good thing, and who knows what time will do to property ownership. If the town doesn't want to do that, and they don't consider it historically significant, because of some integrity issue, which he personally doesn't believe, at least for certain aspects of it, then that is fine. It is up to the town to decide what they want to do. We are the first owners that would go along with it.

Chairman Unger indicated that the Commission really appreciates the fact that you have put this much effort into it and appreciate that building as much as you do. It is the technical things that we are talking about; we can't vote on it, but we could possibly put it on a future agenda and discuss it in that sense.

Commissioner Miller asked if Mr. DeSalvo is under any immediate threat to have us consider this immediately or any form of action where he is feeling pressured, and Mr. DeSalvo said no. Chairman Unger indicated that we will put it on the agenda and let him know. Mr. DeSalvo stated fine.

No legal action was taken.

b. Certificates of Appropriateness

Chairman Unger indicated that she climbed on Doris Banks' roof, and they did a very good job of roofing that house; that is the other thing we need to do, and they did wonderful work on this house. The issue was the fiberglass that was there, and whether or not he could buy that fiberglass, and she ran down a place in Phoenix that said she could probably get it from them, but the issue was how much we would have to buy. It is still leaking around the edge, but it doesn't do any damage to the house; we shouldn't have that, but the fiberglass has deteriorated far too much. We need to decide what we will accept; they were going to put clear fiberglass, but that is not acceptable, then they were going to put green and that is not good. They can put in fiberglass that has a different shape, but she is still working on getting the old style, which is available, but they are only selling it to huge commercial projects. These are going to be issues with houses built in this timeframe. The problem is that these are manmade materials, which have changed so much, you can't always find them. In the future, we should work on sourcing of materials from that timeframe, to see if we could offer the contractors and homeowners some list, so we may put that on next month's agenda or the month after.

Kathy Levin reported that the Sedona Historical Society is working with the Parks & Rec. Department to do a major rehabilitation on all three buildings at the Jordan Historical Park, and while the State Parks Department was unable to fund any heritage grants this fiscal year, the City continued to allocate and commit funding of \$70,000, which \$60,000 was in its former match, and that is a city-owned property, so bid documents are being prepared, and they will submit a Certificate of Appropriateness for your consideration. Ron Maassen is the SHS lead who is a former Commissioner and is very knowledgeable about construction. This work will require careful joint oversight between the SHS and the HPC, so we will need a designated Commissioner to do that.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the proposed addition to the apple-packing barn, and Kathy indicated she didn't think it was funded, but she will check. Commissioner Mayer indicated that if they start any work while he is still on the Commission, he will be glad to oversee it. Chairman Unger indicated it may be in this package. Kathy pointed out that it was approved, so you wouldn't see another one on that. Chairman Unger pointed out that we want to do the same thing with Certificates of Appropriateness as we do with small grants.

No legal action was taken.

c. Updates to Historic Resource Survey

There was no discussion on this item.

d. Condition of Landmarks or other historic properties

Kathy Levin indicated she received a call from a woman who lives above the Gassaway House, and it is a designated Landmark and included in the Red Rock Creek subdivision. The woman said there was a big hole in the roof, so we got in

touch with the developer and they were up in a couple of weeks; the roof vent had blown off, so it was reinstalled.

No legal action was taken.

12. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items.

Chairman Unger indicated several items have been put on the agenda already this evening, and we will go over them. The next meeting is August 10th at 4:00 p.m.; we have a plaque for Doris Banks; we don't want to make a big deal out of this, because she doesn't want that, but we do want to place that plaque, so we were thinking we would just gather early to do the dedication. The Chairman asked Kathy to send a note to the Commission members asking about availability. Kathy stated sure, and she will talk to Doris. The Chairman asked if we also have a plaque for the ILX Forest Service building, and Kathy explained that we are just sitting on those until they are ready to have a public event. Kathy asked if they would prefer to do the Nininger property before the meeting or after. The Commissioners indicated at 3:00 p.m. Commissioner Miller confirmed that we are not serving refreshments or inviting a group of people. Kathy indicated that we will ask the Mayor, and the Chairman indicated that Howard Madole also will be invited. Commissioner Mayer asked about installing the plaque beforehand and the consensus was that was a great idea. Kathy will contact Doris, and then he can meet with her to mount it.

The Chairman indicated that the following meeting will be September 14th, and Kathy indicated that Audree Juhlin will staff that meeting. She also reminded the Commission of the joint meeting with Council on November 9th from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the Vultee. The Chairman indicated that Kathy will send out notification of these meetings to the Commissioners, and we are hoping to have somebody else on the Commission by the second meeting; Kathy indicated that she had received a call from a design person.

13. Adjournment.

The Chairman called for adjournment at 6:15 p.m., without objection.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*