

Draft Action/Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Monday, October 12, 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 4:01 p.m.

Roll Call:

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

Staff: Kathy Levin and Donna Puckett

Council Liaison: Vice Mayor John Bradshaw

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 public present, closed the public forum.

3. **Consent agenda:**
 - a. **Approval of minutes of September 14, 2009 meeting.**
 - b. **Approval of minutes of October 8, 2009 meeting.**

MOTION: *Vice Chairman Ruland moved to approve the Consent Agenda as it is. Commissioner Wienges seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed.*

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

Kathy Levin indicated the Commission vacancies have been re-advertised in the Red Rock News and they are posted on the website. She and the Chairman will be addressing the Sedona-Verde Valley Realtors on the 22nd before their home tour, and Helen Snyder, who is on the Housing Commission, is considering applying for this Commission.

Chairman Unger indicated that she and Kathy are working on updating the website; we need to have better access. She is also suggesting that we have a calendar of the things we are doing, and she sent an email to Roz Boxer who said that she was going to be working with the City. Roz gave a presentation on websites at the conference this summer, and she had said she would send me the layout. She designs web pages for lots of different cities around the state. The Chairman provided Kathy the contact information and indicated she would like for Commissioner Wienges to attend the next meeting on it.

Kathy explained we have a couple of weeks to make significant changes to the new internal website, and then we can continue to update it. She and Donna and attended the training and Donna prepared "how to" notes. Kathy added that she and the Chairman will try to update the HPC site as much as possible before it goes live.

The Chairman indicated that she looked at the City of Phoenix and City of Florence sites, and when it is put together she will bring it to the Commission to see. They are doing some interesting things that are more conducive to having people landmark their houses. Additionally, we will wait to do the Doodlebug Ranch dedication until former Commissioner Miller can join us.

Vice Chairman Ruland announced that tomorrow night the Cottonwood City Council will be discussing the formation of a Cottonwood Historic Preservation Commission, and they have apparently done a survey of their area.

The Chairman displayed a copy of the Nogales Civic Planning Division's plan and indicated that they are going for a more comfortable look.

5. Discussion/possible action on applications for the 2009-10 Small Grant Program.

Kathy indicated that the Commission received copies of two applications and the deadline was August 28th. The first one is for the Bela Horvath building, which is being used by the Unity Church and has been for maybe 40 years. Their project is to power wash and paint the siding, windows and entry door, the red rock veneer, and repaint the cupola, and we will need to determine the color with them. They are requesting \$1,324 and they are overmatching with 60%. In your packet, a staff summary sheet was provided on their point score and how they satisfied the requirements of the grant.

The second grant application is for the Bennett-Purtymun Cabin, an historic Landmark located on the Sedona Charter School property, and they are proposing to remove six old layers of asphalt shingles and restore the roof with a fire-safety rated Class A fiberglass shingle, so they are requesting \$2,567.10 and have met the minimum 50-50 matching requirement.

Both requests satisfy our requirements and both are matching grant applications; the City Council appropriated \$12,000 for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, and these two applications, if fully funded, would total some \$4,000. She asked that the Commission consider each application on its own and make a recommendation as to funding.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that it was previously mentioned that the Unity Church building is not landmarked, and they received a grant a few years ago. There was some discussion about continuing to give grants to something that is not landmarked and that we possibly should change the requirements. She wondered if this is the time to discuss that. Kathy explained it is probably time to talk about whether or not we want to discuss modifying the requirements at a future meeting. In the application process, there is a question about prior funding, "Has this property received grant funding in the last year, and in this case, the answer is no, but they have in prior years. They were awarded a grant in the first cycle 2006-2007 and in the second cycle of that same fiscal year. They did not receive a grant in 2008 or 2009. Since this is to be an incentive for landmarking, it is worth rethinking it, because if we continue to fund them, we are certainly preserving the structure, but how many more times do we want to use this as an incentive and not see it actually doing that, so it is an appropriate question. We can't change our guidelines right now, in the course of reviewing this application, but we might want to look at that again.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that from the photographs, it certainly looks like they need the work they requested; she doesn't question that, and it would seem strange if we delayed

a decision on this; that would not be fair to them. She is in favor of approving the grant, but can we make a point to put it on the agenda to discuss changing that regulation?

Chairman Unger indicated that they meet all of the grant requirements, so to deny them would be an awkward situation, but she is unhappy with the fact that we gave them two grants, and now they are coming back, when landmarking doesn't even seem to be a consideration. Commissioner Mayer suggested denying it without giving a reason and Kathy explained that we would have to say that it didn't meet our requirements or the criteria for evaluating it, and it has met those criteria. Kathy also pointed out that she had provided a checklist with all of the points, so we would have to say it didn't meet those to deny it. She did have some questions, but other than that, all criteria were met.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated it is like an application for something that has been zoned properly; if they meet all of the criteria, we have no grounds to deny it. Kathy added that she doesn't know that you could grant it conditionally, but if you were to choose to fund this, either with the amount requested or some other amount, the letter awarding that grant might underscore your concern that this program hasn't met your expectations of providing an incentive to landmark.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that if our ultimate goal is to get it landmarked, we don't want to create negative feelings by denying an application that met all of the criteria. Chairman Unger asked if there is a way to draw attention to it by granting less than the full amount requested; she agrees with Commissioner Wienges, because she doesn't want to have them back out of it, thinking they did everything asked, so what could they expect in the future? She doesn't know if we granted \$1,000, but that might have the same effect as just not granting it at all. Commissioner Wienges pointed out it is a small amount in terms of grants, so that would seem kind of picky to knock off a couple of hundred dollars.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if it is not appropriate to condition it upon landmarking and Kathy explained that we can't do that based on the way our program's requirements are set up; it is laid out clearly that you get points here, here and here, etc. It is meant to be an incentive, and when applicants have applied for substantially more, it has been quite persuasive, and accumulatively they are getting close to some of those amounts. When she met with the applicant who was on the board, he was very sympathetic and she thought he was going to carry that message forward, but they are not penalized in the application, they are given additional points for landmarking, but there were two and they scored nearly equally. If there had been more applicants, they might have fallen to the bottom, in which case, they wouldn't have been funded, against the funds that are available.

Councilor Bradshaw referenced the question about being funded in the last year, and asked if there is anything about if they have been funded before, you can wait until the end of the cycle to see if anyone else applies, or why is that question included? Kathy explained it is tied to points, so if they were funded last year, they wouldn't receive the additional 10 points, but it doesn't apply beyond the last year. Chairman Unger pointed out that we may want to look at that too; a lot of grant programs say it is within the last five years, and then it steps up. Kathy indicated that we can bring it back for discussion at another meeting.

Commissioner Mayer suggested limiting it to a one-time grant for somebody that is not landmarked; we already gave them two incentives, and he didn't think they were interested, when we talked to them. Kathy read, "Is an application for local landmark designation attached?" and that is for 10 points.

Chairman Unger explained that originally this program was done to not only incentivize possible landmarking, but also to save buildings. The landmarking certainly does more; however, we were looking at buildings being demolished and we thought the incentive would bring some people to the table, so we decided not to make landmarking a necessity, but we may feel that we are now at a point that we can do a little more.

Kathy pointed out that we have been successful at that, and we can point to the Da Voss home, the Pushmataha, the Madole home, the Bennett-Purtymun Cabin, the U.S. Forest Service's pumphouse and Dr. Nininger's home.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved to recommend the approval of the grant accompanied by a letter saying failure to register the property and landmark may weigh against you in future grant applications, as we are considering changes to the criteria. (Note: There was no second to the motion prior to staff asking the following question.)

Kathy asked if he wanted to amend that to include the amount and Vice Chairman Ruland stated yes. Kathy indicated the amount would be \$1,324.00. The Vice Chairman stated that he would amend his motion to specify the amount of \$1,324.00.

AMENDED MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved to recommend the approval of the grant for \$1,324.00 accompanied by a letter saying failure to register the property and landmark may weigh against you in future grant applications, as we are considering changes to the criteria. Commissioner Wienges seconded the amended motion. VOTE: Amended motion carried three (3) for and one (1) opposed. (Mayer opposed)

Chairman Unger asked if there were any comments regarding the Bennett-Purtymun Cabin and Commissioner Mayer pointed out that we need to view the materials. The Chairman noted that she thinks that is already in the program, so that will be brought to us. Kathy clarified that it is in the award letter that says you have been awarded this amount, pending approval of the materials. Chairman Unger indicated that they have had asphalt on there for a long time, so we won't be able to say they have to go back to the original roof, but we will certainly have the opportunity to look at it.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved that the Commission recommend the application for the Purtymun House folks in the amount of \$2,567.10. Commissioner Mayer seconded the motion.

Councilor Bradshaw asked if he wanted to include pending approval of materials, and Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he understood that was standard and Kathy confirmed that it was; however, Vice Chairman Ruland stated to say, "pending approval of materials by the Commission", so it is clear.

AMENDED MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved that the Commission recommend the application for the Purtymun House folks in the amount of \$2,567.10, pending approval of materials by the Commission. (Note: The second did not state acceptance of the amended motion prior to his question that follows.)

Commissioner Mayer asked if approval of the contractor should also be included; Chairman Unger explained that the contractor has to be noted and registered and bonded and Kathy noted that was shown on the application. The Chairman indicated that they could get the grant, and then decide not to use the contractor who did the bid, so we could

say that we need to know if they change the contractor and Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he would amend the motion to say that.

SECOND AMENDED MOTION: Vice Chairman Ruland moved that the Commission recommend the application for the Purtymun House folks in the amount of \$2,567.10, pending approval of materials by the Commission and we are notified in the event a different contractor is used than the one stated on the application. Commissioner Mayer seconded the Second Amended Motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed.

The Chairman confirmed with Kathy that we don't have anything for the Hart Store.

6. Discussion/possible action on new member recruitment for Historic Preservation Commission.

The Chairman indicated that Kathy had already provided the status and asked the Commissioners if they have anything to add. Vice Chairman Ruland asked if we had considered cash signing bonuses. The Chairman encouraged Commissioners to ask anyone they know that might be interested.

No legal action was taken.

7. Discussion/possible action on application for FFY 2010 CLG Pass-Through Grant.

Kathy Levin indicated that the state notified us that \$70,000 is available for the Certified Local Government Pass-Through Grants, but it may vary, because the federal budget hasn't been approved; however, they are willing to set aside \$50,000 for grant awards that can be as much as \$10,000. These can be used for scholarship assistance to the annual conference and the grant application is due November 13th. The Commission may want to consider reinstating the national nomination for Saddlerock Ranch, since that was shifted to the Hart Store on an emergency basis. Applications may be written for the following categories, Context Development; Survey and Inventory, which we just updated; Preservation Plan; Design Guidelines, and the City already has the Character District Guidelines and the Design Review Manual; Ordinance Development, and we do have the proposed revisions to Article 15 on Council's agenda; Nomination Preparation, which would be Saddlerock Ranch; Historic District Plan, which we have discussed for Uptown; Local Workshop; Ordinance Update; Nomination Update; Design Guidelines, and Scholarships for the annual conference. She can write more than one; this year the conference will be in Flagstaff, so it will be very reasonable.

Chairman Unger indicated that we basically would only need the registration, and she would like to see everybody go if possible. She was willing to pay this year, but it would be nice not to pay next year. Kathy suggested writing one for three or four members to attend and one to resubmit the Saddlerock Ranch, and the Chairman indicated that would be fine; those are the only two we would have right now. Kathy explained that when you receive funding, you go to the bottom of the list, so we are probably at the bottom of that list, but you never know when funds might be returned, so she will write those two applications, and then Council has to approve all grants. Councilor Bradshaw asked if she wrote one for the Hart Store and Kathy explained that \$2,400 previously awarded for the Saddlerock Ranch national nomination was switched to the Hart Store for materials to help with its restoration, and SHPO also provided another \$1,500, so we were able to get it up to about \$3,900, and then she requested estimates on the restoration work, so they could apply

to the Small Grant Program, which could provide up to \$8,000, so they could receive between \$8,000 and \$12,000 in combined resources. There is new fencing and trees going up, so they are working hard.

No legal action was taken.

8. Discussion/possible action on update to Community Plan and commission review of Element 16 - Historic Preservation.

Kathy Levin explained that Mike Raber in long-range planning will be initiating the update to the Community Plan, which is required every 10 years, and she reviewed that section and just wanted the Commission to know that the update will be officially kicked-off at some point, and the Commission will be reviewing its own work. She made some suggestions about areas that might need some change and some new text, etc. The key piece is the goals and objectives; it becomes important when we review new development projects. For example, she looks at Special Planning Areas to see if it is consistent, and then she turns to Historic Preservation to see what was said about the goals and objectives, so it is vital in making that linkage back to the Community Plan and making the case for historic preservation, retention and reuse. This was written when the Commission was very new, so you are now in a better position to beef it up, and she will bring it back to the Commission so we can start crafting language together, and it will be tied to the way in which the new update is going to take place. Mike is working on a framework for that, and it will be smaller than the current one, but there is a tremendous amount of information in it.

Chairman Unger indicated that she has used it, and asked when we will start looking at it; Kathy explained that Mike is working on a timetable now, but she just wanted to let the Commission know that you will have an integral part in it. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that the Community Plan is like the Bible, you can find something to support any argument you want to make, because it is so broadly worded, so he is glad to hear that Mike Raber is going to focus on condensing it. The Vice Chairman then asked if all of the elements have to be there and Kathy indicated they are pretty much statutorily required under Smart Growth, and the citizens will vote on it, but there are reasons to either broadly or narrowly define things. The Vice Chairman confirmed that the Commission's goal is to firm up Section 16, so it is clear and supportive of the ordinances, etc.

Kathy explained that the Commission will receive guidelines and she doesn't know if it will be more strategic and broad, like the U.S. Forest Service's approach, but we will have guidelines, and if we tighten up the language, we will have what the City needs as the goal statement, benefits and recommendations for historic preservation.

Councilor Bradshaw indicated that he needed to leave and explained this will probably be his last meeting for a while; he loves you guys . . . the Vice Chairman responded, "We love you too man". The Councilor explained that he wanted to say goodbye; his last Council meeting will be October 27th, but he would be more than happy to provide any assistance to the Commission in the future that he can.

The Chairman summarized that Kathy will bring this item back to us in the future.

No legal action was taken.

9. Discussion/possible action on 2009-10 Commission Work Plan and commissioner involvement in Work Plan tasks:

a. Education and Public Outreach

Chairman Unger indicated that Janeen Trevillyan provided her some information on a webpage for the Historic Market Database homepage that lists all historic landmarks, and Nancy Burgess had asked Janeen if the Uptown project wanted to do it, but Janeen thought that we might be interested. Kathy indicated that is something that staff can follow-up on, if you think it is valuable. The Chairman indicated it might be good to have; each Landmark has a little history included like what is on our plaques. Commissioner Wienges confirmed with the Chairman that this is a nationwide database and our data could be added to it. The Chairman explained that she is recommending that we send in the information on all of our plaques. It is free and the more we put information out there, the better off we are. The Commissioners agreed, so the Chairman passed that information on to Kathy.

Kathy stated that staff is available to speak to local groups and she has the PowerPoint presentation that she can show. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that Serge Wright is their Program Chairman, so he will get him in touch with Kathy. Kathy explained that it is designed to educate and recruit members. The Chairman suggested that Kathy make that presentation to the Commission, since the new Commissioners haven't seen it, Kathy indicated she can show it at the next meeting. The Chairman pointed out that the Commission may also have some input for it, because Janeen did it some time ago and Kathy updated it, but there may be things that we are discussing for the webpage that could be included too. Kathy indicated it is about 18 to 20 slides, so it is pretty quick and very visual with bullet points, and she runs through all of the Landmarks at the end. The last slide indicates that HPC needs you.

No legal action was taken.

b. Survey Field Work

There was no discussion on this item.

c. Madole Home landmark prospects

Commissioner Mayer reported that Mr. Eilenberg is on the fence now and they talked with Jill Sands and Susan Hawley; they will be in town this week, so he is going to try to talk with them again.

Kathy Levin reported that she and the Chairman visited the 160 Tranquil home, because a staff member thought it was a Madole home, but they couldn't find the basic check-off features of a Madole home, and they thought it was maybe a Van Ess, but they do not think it is a Madole home. The Chairman indicated it is too different from Madole's work.

No legal action was taken.

10. Discussion/possible action on:

a. Prospects for designation of landmarks or historic districts

Chairman Unger indicated that we want to discuss Don Woods's early works and Commissioner Mayer stated that he identified the locations in Sedona West and Kathy has one in Broken Arrow Heights. The Chairman noted that she is looking for the one in the Village of Oak Creek; we don't have a lot to do with that one, but it would be nice to know where it is. Kathy indicated that she photographed the one in Broken Arrow Heights and checked the County website and it has been sold, but it hasn't been touched on the outside; it is very clean and in very good shape. It was built in 1970, which matches the date that Don Woods put down.

Chairman Unger indicated that Commissioner Wienges is working with Commissioner Mayer to become familiar with Don Woods's early homes; Commissioner Wienges explained that they haven't really done anything on it, because they were waiting for this meeting to clarify what they are doing. Kathy Levin recommended that the Commission collectively do surveys or have a smaller group, if you wish, but we all have to share the same understanding. Chairman Unger agreed that it would be good for all of the Commission to go out on these, to understand what they look and feel like. One of her recommendations today is that we move this item to #9 on our future agendas and list it after Howard Madole, so we have a continuing discussion on these houses. She is going to be contacting someone to discuss landmarking houses of architects that are still alive, because it is a very contentious thing right now. There was a discussion on it at our conference, and nationally, they will not landmark a building as an architectural building for an architect who is still alive, but there is a group fighting to make that possible under the architectural portion of the qualifications for landmarking. Locally, we could probably look at it, but if we are going to consider these for national landmarking, we will need to be aware of what is going on with that.

Commissioner Mayer suggested starting with the owners of the first five Don Woods's properties and just say that we want to want to honor him, to set a form of community, and then pursue the landmarking idea, so there is no pressure. We could just send them a picture of the first five homes. Kathy indicated it could lead to a really fine event for next May by showcasing his work with a little tour. Chairman Unger pointed out that we have also discussed non-contiguous districts. Scottsdale has done that, which means that you collect certain buildings and then form an extended neighborhood, but that is something to think about in the future, once we have the properties. It is a good idea to start generating that energy; it was difficult with the Madole homes, because most owners didn't live here, but hopefully, this will be a different story.

Commissioner Wienges asked what the communication has been with the homeowners at this point, and Commissioner Mayer indicated he has communicated with one and they were interested in landmarking; they also may be willing to host an event. Kathy asked if we should start with the surveys and Commissioner Mayer indicated he would first like to take a few pictures and he doesn't know that we should survey them before contacting the people and expressing interest in surveying the house, possibly through a newsletter. Chairman Unger indicated that if he takes the photographs, she can possibly do that notice, but calling them first is a great idea. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he will call them. Kathy summarized that the photos would come back to the Commission, and then we would ask if we could survey. The Chairman suggested before doing the survey, we may want to discuss what we are thinking about first, and then survey. Commissioner Mayer suggested not mentioning landmarking at all and the Chairman agreed; historically, we are interested in these homes. Commissioner Mayer indicated he will also talk with Mr. Woods about including a photograph of him.

Chairman Unger indicated that the City of Phoenix's website is very welcoming. Sometimes the way we have been doing it sounds nice, because we are enthusiastic about it, but people have no idea about what we are really doing and their first reaction is to back-up a bit, so if we can involve them in a friendlier way, that is good.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that Jill Sands is repainting the house back to its original color and asked if we would like to have Nancy shoot it. If you go in the backyard and shoot down at dusk, with the lights on inside the house to show the sunken living room, it would be a different representation of the house, but he didn't know if we had the money to do that. Kathy indicated she would check the budget.

Kathy summarized that we have a strategy, which is good and there is a lot of participation from the whole Commission; Commissioner Mayer can take the lead. The Commissioner reiterated that he will call the homeowners first, and if allowed, he will take the pictures, but if people aren't interested, he will stop there. Kathy agreed, but added that we will still want a survey to add to our resource document.

Commissioner Wienges asked if we do not need a homeowner's permission to survey and the Chairman explained that you can't really go onto their property, but you can do it from the street; however, Kathy pointed out that you can't really answer all of the questions that way. You really have to do a walk-around and you want to include notable interior features as well. If we are serious about Don Woods's work, we have to survey the homes. Chairman Unger suggested approaching the owners on the basis that we are very interested, because they are beautiful homes and it is better for one person to contact them. Commissioner Mayer can tell them that he brought this to the Commission's attention and has generated this interest. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he is going to say that we are recognizing Don Woods's work, and two of us want to come out to get a closer look at the outside of their house. Chairman Unger added that this will be included in agenda item #9 as d. in future agendas.

No legal action was taken.

b. Certificates of Appropriateness

There was no discussion on this item.

c. Updates to Historic Resource Survey

Chairman Unger asked where we are with SAC; it was asked if we should be approaching some members of the Arts & Culture Commission. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he is going to go there and start some of the research for the survey taking an approach similar to what we discussed for Mr. Woods's properties. Kathy clarified that we have the survey; but getting the history together would be great. The Vice Chairman indicated that his approach would be to see if they can help him and get them involved in the research. The Chairman indicated that it will be placed on the Endangered Places List and we are discussing updating that twice a year, so sometimes we will have the same ones, but sometimes they will be different. Commissioner Mayer agreed that the Vice Chairman is taking the right approach; it is going to be difficult, because he previously heard that they didn't know much about the history. The Chairman asked that the Vice Chairman give them an update at the next meeting.

The Chairman indicated the Benny Gonzales building is now owned by ILX and it is the former library. She is going to do some research on that, because that is the only building by him in this area and possibly Northern Arizona. He was the first Hispanic architect in Arizona, so it would be good to recognize that, so she wants to see what we can do to possibly guide it toward landmarking. She thinks ILX is putting it back on the market, but she would like for the City to be aware of it. A lot of people would say it is an ugly building, but it is historical and some things deserve to be recognized, even though we may not like the way they look. Kathy pointed out that has to be surveyed. The Chairman suggested that she and Commissioner Wienges try to survey that.

No legal action was taken.

9. Discussion/possible action on 2009-10 Commission Work Plan and commissioner involvement in Work Plan tasks:

a. Education and Public Outreach (continued)

Commissioner Mayer wanted to add that we own the photographs that Nancy shot for us, and Chairman Unger indicated that they definitely should be on the website.

No legal action was taken.

10. Discussion/possible action on: (continued)

d. Condition of Landmarks or other historic properties

There was no discussion on this item.

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

Chairman Unger indicated that the next meeting is November 2nd, because we have a joint meeting with City Council on November 9th in the Vultee Conference Room at 4:00 p.m. Kathy Levin added that the November 2nd meeting at 4:00 p.m. is in Council Chambers for a public hearing on the Ralph Block House. She has done the Staff Report and is still researching a couple of items, plus the revisions to Article 15 will be considered by the City Council tomorrow night, so hopefully, those can be carried through to your deliberations. Kathy will setting up a site visit for the Commissioners that can attend and Vice Chairman Ruland will arrange to do that through Kathy on his own schedule; it is located at 355 Arroyo Piñon. We will also be discussing what we want to discuss in the joint meeting.

The Chairman suggested that if any Commissioner has agenda items for December, they can contact Kathy or her. Kathy noted that December will include the election of officers.

12. Adjournment.

The Chairman called for adjournment at 5:16 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on October 12, 2009.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date