

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Monday, August 16, 2010 – 4:00 p.m.

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

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Roll Call:

Commissioners: Chairman Brynn Unger, Vice Chairman Greg Ruland and Commissioners Jane Grams, Michael Pierce, Helen Snyder and Noreen Wienges

Staff: Andy Dickey and Kathy Levin

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:

Approval of minutes of June 14, 2010 meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Wienges moved to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2010 meeting. Commissioner Ruland seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed.

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

Kathy Levin welcomed Jane Grams to the Commission and indicated she was appointed to fill a vacancy that expires in three months, so she is hopeful that she will reapply and be reappointed. Additionally, the latest advertisement for a vacancy expired Friday and there is one or more applicants for the remaining seat, so hopefully in the next few months we will have a full Commission.

Chairman Unger distributed a revised edition of the HPC Essentials, since there were a couple of mistakes. It also includes Commissioner Grams information, so the previous one can be replaced. Commissioner Grams was then asked to provide a little information about her background and interests.

Commissioner Grams indicated she came to Sedona in the spring of 2006, but had been coming to Sedona since the late 1960s. She previously lived in Tennessee and grew up in a house that was 100 years old. She has always had a love for old buildings and antiques, so she thought this would be a way to involve herself in the community and learn more about the community as well, while serving in some way that can hopefully make a difference.

5. PUBLIC HEARING: Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Walter and Ruth Jordan Residence, 1931-1947 and Walter and Ruth Jordan Packing Shed, 1946 at Jordan Historical Park to do major rehabilitation work on the exterior of both structures as on-going preservation and maintenance. The subject property is owned by the City of Sedona and is further identified as Assessor's Parcel 401-03-001F

Coconino County). Case No.: CA 10-01 (Historic Register Numbers 01 & 02), Applicant: City of Sedona, Address: 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336

Chairman Unger provided an overview of the public hearing proceeding and Kathy Levin introduced Andy Dickey, Assistant Engineer, who was responsible for putting the Request for Bid together that was in the attachments to the Staff Report. He will be overseeing the contract. Additionally, Andi Welsh is in the audience and she is the Director of Community Services for Sedona and is responsible for the oversight of all City parks and recreational facilities.

Kathy Levin indicated this request is for a Certificate of Appropriateness and the Staff Report provides the language that governs the Commission's deliberations. All legal requirements have been met and the property was posted; the notice of this public hearing was in the newspaper and all property owners within 300 ft. of the subject property were notified.

The framework for the Commission's review consists of three things; two are located in the Land Development Code, Section 1507.07, Effect of Designation, Subsections B and C, and Section 1509.03, Guidelines for Review, with the criteria to use for the Commission's decision. Also, there are the Department of Interior's Standards for the Review of Historic Buildings, which are national standards, and the germane points for the review of this property have been included.

On page 15-11, Article 15 of the Land Development Code, the reason for doing a certificate states, "Upon approval of a Landmark designation, the affected property shall be included in the Historic Property Register and on any other applicable document that is appropriate for its preservation." Subsection B states, "No person shall carry out an exterior alteration, restoration, renovation, reconstruction, new construction, demolition or removal, in whole or in part, on any Landmark without first obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission." Second is Section 1509.03, which contains the list of criteria upon which the Commission's decisions will be made and those are included in the Staff Report on pages 5 and 6. The most significant parts of the criteria are under Subsection B.1 as follows: "The proposed work does not detrimentally alter, destroy or adversely affect any architectural or landscape feature. B.2 states, "The proposed work will be compatible with the relevant historic, cultural, educational or architectural qualities characteristic of the structure or district and shall include, but not be limited to, elements of size, scale, massing, proportions, orientations, surface textures and patterns, details and embellishments, and the relationship of these elements to one another, and that the proposed work conforms with review guidelines or any other applicable criteria."

The next level of criteria is the Department of Interior's Standards and she selected seven of the ten, as shown in the Staff Report, to assist the Commission in making its decision. It is on that foundation that the Commission will review the proposed rehabilitation work.

The proposed work, workmanship and techniques have been outlined in the Request for Bid and summarized in the Staff Report. Regarding the residence, the proposed work includes a new gutter system on all sides of the building and the chosen material is an aluminum one-half round of 6 inches in diameter and circular downspouts with corresponding splash pads. A color chip is available and will be circulated. The second proposed work item is to repair, replace and refinish the crawl space vents and screening as needed. Third is to remove the roof-mounted swamp cooler and add new air conditioning with two condensing units located on the north side of the residence that will be ground-mounted about 3 ft. from the building. A drawing of the unit and the dimensions were included in the material and Andy Dickey can provide more detail if needed.

For both the residence and the barn, the proposed work suggested is to refinish all wood doors, frames and lintels by wire brushing and two coats of oil, to repair and refinish window screens and wood lintels, and to repair and refinish posts and post bases where necessary, and the wood gable ends, fascia and rafter tails.

Staff consulted with Andy Dickey on the Request for Bid and with Ron Maassen, the Sedona Historical Society's liaison to the City on matters pertaining to Jordan Historical Park. On the sizing and location of the gutter treatments, Mr. Maassen feels that adequate roof drainage could be achieved without the gutter on the east-facing side of the building and perhaps on other sides as well. His concern is about the aesthetics of the building, maintaining its historic integrity and to not gutter that section, while staff and Andy Dickey would lean more towards guttering the entire structure to preserve not only the building itself, but also the fascia and adjacent members. The majority of the damage that has occurred appears to be on the other side, not the east-facing side, so that is where the problem would be more directly remedied with gutters. There may or may not need to be any additional ground treatment to accommodate the lack of a gutter on the east side, but the Assistant Director feels that the soil treatment would take the runoff, and if that gutter were eliminated, it would not give rise to a concern about water drainage in that area.

Regarding public comments, Kathy indicated she received a call from a neighbor who intended to come to this public hearing, so she may be present today. She received no emails or other correspondence. Based on the Land Development Code, the Secretary of Interior Standards, the Request for Bid and the material specifications as of July 29th, the Staff Report contained a conditional recommendation to be supportive of the approval of the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness pending confirmation of the gutter material, the color, a review of the manufacturer's picture of the condensing units, confirmation of the distance between the condensing units and residence, which we now know to be 3 ft., their appearance and any possible use of natural screening material, if appropriate.

This is important work that has been put on hold for some time. Mr. Bill Otwell, a consultant retained by the City of Sedona, prepared a building assessment several years ago for this property and he called out the necessary rehabilitation for each building. Subsequently, the City prepared a Heritage Grant to underwrite a large portion of that work, but that application was ill-timed; the funds were no longer available, because of the collapse of the economy. Then, the City of Sedona budgeted for repairs and Mr. Otwell again submitted detailed specifications that formed the basis for the Request for Bid. Mr. Otwell is an Historic Preservation Specialist, who practices out of Phoenix and has a long résumé of historic and new buildings that he has built, remodeled or provided consultation services on with other jurisdictions.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF STAFF:

Commissioner Snyder confirmed there would be a later opportunity to ask questions, and then asked if not doing the east gutter would be a cost savings or be an additional cost. Andy Dickey explained it would be a cost savings at this point; we haven't advertised the project, so we could delete it from the scope of the project. Commissioner Snyder indicated if it were treated with wire brushing and oil there would be some cost. Andy explained that we are going to have to do wire brushing and sealant either way, so it wouldn't be an addition.

Chairman Unger asked if the gutters aren't put there what is going to be damaged; is it anything beyond the fascia? Andy explained that is the main thing it would be protecting, but you would probably have to maintain the fascia over time, although the maintenance recurrence would be less with the gutter in place. The Chairman then asked how often the fascia has had to be replaced and Andy indicated he didn't know. Chairman Unger asked if there was any other reason for the gutter

or if it was purely to save the fascia and Andy indicated he wasn't aware of any other reasons; someone with more history about the property may know. The Chairman asked if the cost to replace the fascia would be less than the gutter and Andy stated it could be, because it would just be some boards and resealing that.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked if there was a sample of the gutter and Andy circulated the color sample. Chairman Unger asked if it is 6 inches across with a depth of 3 inches. Andy explained it would be 6 inches in diameter and he circulated the detail that showed what it would look like. The Chairman indicated that the current fascia is probably about 4 inches and Andy indicated he thought it would be either 6 inches or 8 inches. The Chairman then asked if the gutter is 3 inches high or 6 inches high and Andy explained it would be 6 inches wide and the depth would be half of the circle or 3 inches. Chairman Unger indicated that we would be looking at the 6-inch fascia and asked if the gutter would be at the top of the fascia. Andy indicated it would be at the top, because the rain needs to go into the gutter. The Chairman then stated that you would see the bottom part of the fascia with the gutter at the top, which would cover about half of the fascia as you would see it and Andy replied right; they call it a 2x6, but it is really a 2x5½.

Commissioner Snyder asked if the future maintenance on the gutters is in the City's budget and Andy indicated he didn't know, but he thinks the City's maintenance crew maintains the park, so that would need to be part of their maintenance plan. The Commissioner noted that they aren't there now, but in the future they would have to be kept clean. Andy agreed that debris shouldn't be allowed to build up.

Vice Chairman Ruland asked Kathy if she is familiar with any historic properties that have a gutter and Kathy indicated she didn't think so. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated it seems that it would be very distinguishable from any other historic structure, because he doesn't think there is. The Chairman noted that we are really in the question mode now, but that is a good question. Vice Chairman Ruland noted that regarding the patching for the evaporative cooler, it just said to match materials of the existing wall, but he was confused by "wall". Andy explained that the cooler is mounted on the side of the residence and there is duct work that connects to the cooler. Once that is pulled out, a hole will be left there that will need to be patched. Greg clarified that he was getting at the material to be used for the patch and Andy stated that it will need to match what is there now and that is called out on the plan to match adjacent material.

The Vice Chairman indicated that there is only one item that addresses historic preservation on the Request for Bid and that says if there are any significant changes, it would come back to the Commission, but he wondered if it would be worthwhile to add that it is an historic structure and materials must be compatible. He is not sure what a "significant change" is, but it sounds like you will be onsite as a Project Manager. Andy indicated he will be there periodically and a staff member will be there. Vice Chairman Ruland explained there have been some past experiences that resulted in the use of materials that weren't compatible, so that is why he wondered if it could be addressed in the contract with some ability to withhold progress payments if we later find out they put something up that is not compatible. Kathy Levin indicated that staff discussed it and they felt it was important to import the language from the Land Development Code, and that language states on page 6 of the Staff Report, "No change shall be made in the approval plans of a project after issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness without resubmittal to the Commission and approval of the change in the matter as provided." Kathy Levin added that staff also discussed substantive versus non-substantive and came to the understanding that Andy would know if it was a substantive change versus some suitable minor adaptation. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that if Kathy is satisfied that it is addressed by that language that is fine with him. Kathy added that the contract will be monitored by the Public Works Department and it needs to be signed off in that the

liaison for HPC needs to be able to assure the Commission that the workmanship was carried out consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness. Chairman Unger asked if in other words the Commission has the right to follow-up and inspect the work done and Kathy indicated absolutely, especially with the scope of this project. Andy added that payment can be withheld for workmanship issues.

Chairman Unger indicated that she didn't notice any screening for the new units that will go in the back of the building and Kathy explained that is up for discussion. Commissioner Snyder referenced the gate at the back of the barn and indicated that Andy previously hadn't known if that was included in the scope of work, but if the Commission wanted that painted with the rustoleum-type paint, could it be added? Andy explained that he reviewed the contract and it is not in there. Doors are called out to be refurbished, but those are wooden doors, so the metal gate isn't addressed and he doesn't know if there is an adequate budget to add that, so he would feel more comfortable letting Parks & Rec. address that. Kathy noted that since that wasn't part of the original notification, we couldn't consider that today. The Chairman agreed, but indicated that might be something to discuss, but not in the context of this hearing. Kathy added that it was not included in the scope of work. Commissioner Snyder stated that if there was a cost savings from something that was not going to be done, she was asking if that could be added. Kathy repeated not in today's discussion. The Commissioner asked staff to make a note of it for the future, because it needs maintenance.

Kathy explained that in this case the applicant is the City, but Mr. Maassen might want to speak as the liaison to the City.

Ron Maassen, Sedona Historical Society's Liaison to the City, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that he wanted to chastise the City for taking so long to get this done and thanked Andi for pushing it through the budget process. Regarding the gutters, he looked at the proposal to ensure we had the half-round gutters and the circular cross section on the downspouts that would be consistent with the era of the building. He feels strongly that the gutters on the public side of the building are a detriment to the historic appearance and from a pure maintenance standpoint, they might do a little bit of good, but he would rather have the historic appearance and deal with the more frequent repairs or replacement at some point in time. As far as he knows, those are the original fascia boards that date from 1947. When the swamp cooler is replaced, they will make sure that material matches the existing material; the contractor is going to have to do that. The screening of the condensing units is something he thinks is a good idea. In most new construction, he believes that the City Code requires condensing units to be screened from neighboring views.

Regarding the old gate at the back, the historical society added that about the time the park opened. It is basically non-functional and we have been discussing either its removal or painting it, and he will commit the historical society to doing whatever has to be done to make it look better. On the supervision of the contractor, the poor guy is going to have more supervision than he will want, so you may want to warn him about that.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF THE SEDONA HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S LIAISON TO THE CITY:

Commissioner Snyder asked if he is suggesting the screening of the AC unit and Ron indicated that is what he would suggest; he thinks the City Code allows you to do either a vegetative screening or a fence. He thinks vegetation would look more appropriate for that location and it could be native material. The Commissioner asked if that is not in this proposal and Ron explained it is not in the specifications or the plans, so that would be something the Commission could require.

Andy Dickey pointed out that is something that the City's maintenance staff could do after the project rather than make it part of the contract. Chairman Unger indicated that given that the Commission has to ask for things to be appropriate for the historic look of the building, that may be something we might request, if we can do it within the context of this or at a later date.

The Chairman asked Ron if he feels the gutter is inappropriate on the visible portion of the building, even though this material is something that would have been used in those days. Ron explained that is his opinion. He believes the historic character of the building, as constructed by the Jordans, is more important to preserve on any sides viewed by the public. He personally would only install gutters on the back L-shaped piece and not anywhere else on the building, from an historic preservation standpoint -- although he might have a different opinion if he put on his Maintenance Manager hat.

Commissioner Snyder stated, so you wouldn't propose them over the AC unit on that side of the building and Ron explained that the AC units are on the gabled end of the building. The Chairman indicated that there is gutter shown on one side, on the short part of that, and Ron indicated he is not too concerned about the short one in that corner. Ron then pointed out the two he would install and possibly a third. He also pointed out where he would not install them. For the record, Kathy explained that Ron's suggestion would be to have gutters only remain on that section of the residence that runs east-west north facing and that runs north-south west facing. Chairman Unger added and possibly the one little piece by the proposed condensing unit and that might be appropriate for the working of those units too.

The Chairman opened the public comment period at this time and having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Wienges indicated that her primary concern is to maintain the historical integrity and agrees with keeping the gutter to the north-south west facing and the east-west north facing, and the small area around the condensing unit. Looking at the original proposal, the gutter was proposed in other areas, but her question is what damage would be done by not putting the gutters there and she hasn't heard that there is going to be terrible water damage, so she would prefer to cut back on the gutters as much as possible.

Commissioner Snyder stated that she is inclined to agree with Mr. Maassen's strong feelings on the public-facing fascia boards and not requiring that guttering for the preservation of the aesthetics of the historic building.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that the Commission should just do away with the gutters; if it is good enough for the front of the building, then it is good enough for the back of the building. Why put up gutters? It is not an architectural feature that you would see on historic structures in Sedona; he understands the maintenance aspect of it, but he thinks it destroys the exterior historic character.

Chairman Unger recalled that while at the property, Mr. Maassen indicated the gutter in the back of the building, because of the runoff that hit the ground and the splash back; she doesn't really see the importance of putting a gutter in the front of the building and it is going to alter the face of the building. It seems minor, but once it is there, it is going to have an effect. It was explained that the back of the building was more critical, because of the damage being caused by the runoff. She isn't sure that is the case, but given that they have that drain area back there, she is sure that was done because there was a problem, so that gutter in the back of the building might still be appropriate and it is not a part of the building generally seen by the public, although from the back of the barn they

probably will see it, so having it as appropriate as possible is probably correct, but she doesn't see that as a real problem.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated he has no issue with anything except the gutters. Kathy Levin asked if the Chairman would like for Andy Dickey to respond on the gutter situation, with respect to the Otwell report and his professional point-of-view, leaving the aesthetic issue aside. The Chairman indicated she would like to hear that information.

Andy Dickey indicated that regarding the gutter on the west side of the building, from a drainage perspective, it needs to get away from the building and that is one thing the gutter will help with on that west side. Kathy asked if the Commission decided to only partially gutter would that be professionally responsible and Andy indicated that drainage would be his main concern. He would say you could get away with doing only a portion of it. A lot of this will drain off of the roof onto a hard surface, which is fine. In the front, his first concern was if it drained onto the dirt and carried sediment away, but after a recent storm, you could see there wasn't much sediment transport, so as long as you address the west side of the building you should be okay.

Commissioner Snyder indicated that there was some water damage on the wood doors on the west side and gutters would preclude that continuing. It was like the water was splashing up off of the cement drainage ditch onto the wood doors and that could be detrimental to the structure, so she wouldn't be in favor of no gutters; she would be in favor of gutters on the west-facing side.

The Chairman indicated that at this point, she would entertain a motion and Kathy Levin repeated her description of the location of the proposed gutters as requested by Vice Chairman Ruland.

MOTION: Commissioner Ruland moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Walter and Ruth Jordan Residence CA10-02 (Historic Register No. 01) and the Walter and Ruth Jordan Packing Shed (Historic Register No. 02) based on consistency with the review procedures in the Land Development Code, Article 15, Section 1509.03, Subsections B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4, and C.1.b, except that the gutters shall be applied only to the east-west north facing side of the residence; the north-south west facing side of the residence, and a small portion of the north-south east facing portion of the residence adjacent to the condensing units. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion.

The Chairman asked if the Commissioners wanted any wording to be added about the screening and Kathy suggested asking if there is any discussion on the motion. There was no discussion and Kathy noted that the Commission will be silent on landscaping. The Chairman indicated that there is probably a City requirement for screening anyway, so it is probably not a necessity for the Commission to add that.

Vice Chairman Ruland called the question.

VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed.

- 6. PUBLIC HEARING: Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Historic Landmark Designation approval of the Van Ess House (ca. 1964) and property. The subject property is further identified as Assessor's Parcel 408-06-090 (Yavapai County). Case No.: HL 10-01 (Register Number 023), Applicant: Thomas E. and Kathryn A. Maguire, Trustees for Maguire Family Trust Address: 280 Zane Grey Drive, Sedona, Arizona 86336**

The Chairman reviewed the public hearing proceeding and Kathy Levin indicated that the home is in Yavapai County and it is Case Number HL 10-01. This was one of the first homes built in the Sedona West subdivision.

Kathy indicated that it was commissioned by Edith and Jim Geary who were early subdivision developers. They developed the Sedona West subdivision and the Rolling Hills subdivision; this was a commissioned home for them designed by Donald Theodore Van Ess. It was featured in the subdivision marketing brochure and there is also a Madole home in that brochure that is an historic landmark as well. It described Sedona West as "Arizona's Finest Subdivision in the West's Most Colorful Country".

According to Don Woods, Architect, Van Ess had an office in the Scottsdale area and worked as sole practitioner. This home is considered to be one of the most significant homes that Van Ess designed in Sedona. His other works include Papago Lanes in Scottsdale; Our Lady of Perpetual Help Convent in Scottsdale; the Prudential Insurance building in Phoenix; possibly Wilson Hall at Northern Arizona University, and the Casa Precision Plant in Scottsdale.

The condition of the home is excellent and there have been three changes over time. The first is a small addition in the late '70s or early '80s, but in staff's opinion it does not compromise the integrity of the home. The second change involved the extended beams on the north side of the home, which was unfortunate, because they were a very distinctive architectural feature and the owners have discussed possibly restoring those. The third is where a window opening was changed in the kitchen area and that faces south. In staff's opinion, these changes are not significant enough to compromise the integrity for your evaluation of this property as a potential historic landmark.

An adjoining lot was acquired by a prior property owner and it was combined into what you see today, a single parcel of approximately one-half acre. She received a number of phone calls and wanted to share those comments. One was from Gail West who wanted to confirm what was significant about this property and she reviewed the characteristics that make staff feel it is an extraordinary mid-century masterpiece. Doris Post wanted to know when the home was built, but did not leave a phone number. Susan Sorando wanted the history about the home, and she stated that she lives in the Don Woods home on Johnny Guitar that is a couple of houses down. A gentleman stated that he was handicapped and unable to attend today's meeting, but he wanted to know if it was 100 years old or just 50 years old. He didn't see that it was historic and the prior owner wanted to tear it down to build two houses, so he wanted to know what was historic about it, and she will get back to him.

Based on consistency with the Land Development Code's historic landmark evaluation criteria, staff is supportive of designating the Van Ess home as an historical landmark and recommends approval of Case No. 10-01 and what would be Historic Landmark Property No. 23.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF STAFF:

Commissioner Snyder asked if the Commission could work with the owners, if at some time in the future the owner is interested in replacing the beams, because that change was the most distinctive to the aesthetics of the house. Kathy indicated if the Commissioner is referring to the Small Grant Program, she will be getting that out in four to six weeks. We have a very small allocation of \$4,000 for a 50-50 matching grant program, and they could avail themselves of that if they wish to apply. She doesn't know how expensive it would be; she doesn't think the whole beam gets replaced, but she doesn't know how you add a little to the existing; however, Mrs. Maguire had mentioned that they could possibly look into that, but that is not part of your consideration today, except to the extent that you might have a concern about the loss of integrity.

Chairman Unger indicated that would be architecturally very difficult to do, but she thinks maybe Commissioner Snyder is asking if the Commission would consider it wrong for them to put it on, once we have landmarked it and that is not the case. Commissioner Snyder stated that wasn't her question; she was interested in knowing if it could be a candidate for the Small Grant Program if the owners applied. Kathy stated yes, but the larger question is the suitability of returning it to its prior condition and that is important preservation work, so if it could be done, it would be terrific to restore it, but we are not requiring that.

Chairman Unger indicated that she would have loved it if they had left those beams, but it did not destroy the integrity of the house to the extent that you wouldn't recognize it as the same house, although that was one of the things that stood out to her on that home. The integrity of the rest of the home is quite impressive.

Commissioner Wienges indicated that she thinks the home meets our criteria for landmarking as it is; the detail is wonderful. She would like to see the beams restored, but that is not the question today. The question is if we can landmark it as it is and she thinks the Commission can.

Applicant, Tom Maguire, Scottsdale, AZ: Indicated that he and his wife are totally enamored with the house and they have loved it from the first time they saw it. They would hate to see any change to the historical architectural character of the house; they would like to see it remain the way it is. They may do something with the beams at some point in the future; they are just going to have to see as time goes on as to whether or not that is feasible and what the cost would be. They are also interested in the architectural history from the standpoint of who was the architect, because it was a little unclear initially. He now understands it was Van Ess and it is interesting, because he moved to Phoenix in 1977 and apparently one of the architectural works of Don Van Ess was the Papago Lanes in Scottsdale and he remembers that. At the time, he thought it was a very distinctive mid-century modern style of architecture. It has since been torn down, and thinking of it now, he can see some similarities stylistically, so they would love to have this meet the criteria and be certified.

Applicant, Kathy Maguire, Scottsdale, AZ: Indicated that in the fall of 2007, she and Tom began their search for a second home in Sedona, and the Van Ess house was on the market. She loved the house, but one of them didn't really -- so they bought a home in Uptown and lived there for about two years, but she wasn't happy there, so they sold and started to look again, and this house was still on the market. She again said this is it and this time Tom became more of a convert. They really do want this to remain the way it is now; they aren't going to live forever and somebody else is going to own it one day. It could so quickly be compromised architecturally. The person who showed them the house indicated that if they took off the batten, they could stucco it and increase the value of the house. At the time, she didn't know it would qualify for historic preservation, but it is better to leave it the way it is. Then, a contractor from Scottsdale suggested redoing the exterior foyer area with some sort of new rock. Tom called her and she told him not to touch any of that, but it could happen so quickly, it is really important to protect it at this point.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF THE APPLICANTS:

Vice Chairman Ruland commented that it is a pleasure to work with people like the Maguires who recognize the importance of the structure and cherish it. Your passion and enthusiasm rubbed off on all of us while there with you, and it will be his pleasure to vote in favor of this.

Chairman Unger thanked them for bringing this to the Commission, because it is a magnificent house. She wishes they hadn't cut the beams off, but there was probably a physical problem with them and that is why they thought it had to be done, but thank you.

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

MOTION: *Commissioner Ruland moved to approve the landmark designation for Case Number HL 10-01 (Historic Register No. 023) to designate the Van Ess House located at 280 Zane Grey Drive as an historic landmark based upon the consistency with the historic landmark evaluation criteria outlined in the Sedona Land Development Code. Commissioner Wienges seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed.*

The Chairman then invited the Maguires to come forward to sign the deed restriction for their house and indicated they would be notified when their plaque is received.

7. Discussion/possible action on FY 2010-11 Commission Work Plan and commissioner involvement in Work Plan tasks:

a. Education and Public Outreach

The Chairman indicated that Kathy is revising some of the wording in the Endangered Places brochure and asked Commissioner Wienges to do an article for the paper to highlight the Art Barn. She and Kathy are going to try to meet with Mei Wei Wong about it too. They are working on getting a \$250,000 grant from Pepsi to work on it, and she hopes everyone is voting on that. As soon as we get the brochure done, she would like an article highlighting that, and we are going to get onto another property that may be knocked down. She has an article on the eleven endangered work places in the United States where we got our idea for doing that. It is getting to a point that we really need to get the brochure out. We are just tweaking the wording on it, leaving the general feeling. She will send a copy to everyone to review first. It is rather difficult, because it is in a legal format, but you can read it online and make any necessary changes. You won't be able to change the text on the document, if you don't have Publisher. Kathy suggested writing their edits on it and faxing it to her or giving her their hard copy. Chairman Unger indicated she would put the wording on Microsoft Word, and then the Commissioners can do it and return it.

Kathy Levin explained the purpose of the brochure for the new Commissioners and indicated there are five properties in the brochure this year.

No legal action was taken.

b. Survey Field Work

There was no discussion on this item.

c. Madole Home landmark prospects

There was no discussion on this item.

d. Early Don Woods-designed homes

The Chairman noted that it was interesting that one person got in touch with staff about the Van Ess home. Kathy added that it gave her an opportunity to discuss how strongly the Commission feels about that property too. The Chairman indicated that Don Woods probably started in the late '60s; he is a fairly well known architect here.

No legal action was taken.

e. Arizona Centennial 2012 (February 14, 2012)

Chairman Unger distributed copies of an article in the Arizona Republic that gave some background information and talked about some of the legacy projects; the state also has upped their ante on their website. She then distributed information on the school projects previously discussed and the educational sheet from Arizona100.org. The Chairman indicated that she talked with the school principals and the superintendent, and they are interested in talking with us; she then shared copies of her notes from that meeting with the Commissioners. She also shared notes of her meetings with Linda Goldenstein, the Superintendent of Schools, the Sedona Historical Society and Nancy Dunst. Information regarding the ideas on the arts was also shared.

The Chairman indicated that the schools, the historical society and Nancy Dunst all became one in their thinking. The historical society is more than willing to send their education person into the schools to work with them, and the schools are excited about that. She really would like for Vice Chairman Ruland to attend the next meeting with her; it was difficult because the schools were preparing to open the next Monday, but she wanted to introduce the idea. She later emailed all of them with more information and asked them to get back to her or Kathy; however, she is hoping that she and Vice Chairman Ruland can meet with them again in the near future and she possibly would like for someone else on the Commission to be involved. Commissioner Snyder would be good, because she has the ability to go into the schools, so she wants to discuss possibly having all three of them involved with that project.

Nancy Dunst indicated that she needed more money from the City if she was going to do anything, but she asked Nancy to come back with what she needed and what it would be for. Nancy also suggested that the Chairman talk with Zena McGregor who works on the after school programs and Jeannie Carroll who is a music teacher. The Sedona Historical Society mentioned that they are possibly looking at a legacy project of a sculpture of a cowboy teaching kids in front of the historical society, and they would like for us to landmark the Art Barn. They are going to try to landmark the Loy homestead for the Centennial, since it is in the county. They also discussed inviting the public to a picnic.

The Chairman indicated that Linda Goldenstein wants to help the Commission work on a possibility of the City placing this on a website that pops up and gets everywhere. She also suggested that the Commission needs to not only delegate amongst ourselves, but also recruit the public to do a lot, and Linda suggested recruiting some members of the Chamber of Commerce to help, which would be great. We used to have a powwow here and Linda thought it would be great if the Chamber of Commerce could bring that back and do it at the airport. Linda is going to describe this to the Chamber and ask if anyone would be interested, and if they have any ideas or things they are doing that would fit, and then she will get back to us.

The Chairman indicated that Yavapai County is going to launch theirs next September and Tucson will take over in October. February will be when Phoenix jumps in and the Arizona Centennial Committee decided we are going to celebrate all the way to the end of 2012. Linda recommended trying to launch Sedona's celebration in March, because that will tail into the state's celebration and people will be here to celebrate the whole month of February. There are also a lot of things going on in March of 2012 that could be designated as centennial celebrations, but it is not something that has to be decided now; however, we should start thinking about it.

Commissioner Snyder indicated she would like to contact the quilting people that do the show at the library, because that is an art form that we don't always think of as public art, but they do a display every year and if they could do a quilt for the Centennial, that would be a great idea. Kathy indicated she would work with the Commissioner on that, because it is a terrific idea. Commissioner Snyder indicated that she would like more information, so she could answer the basic questions. Chairman Unger indicated that the best way is to look at the state's website; however, we are constructing the timeframe for our events, but you can check Arizona100.org. Kathy indicated that she used to be a member of one quilting group, and the Quilt Shop might want to sponsor a quilt challenge where different groups get together and design the centennial or dig into their treasure chest and find their old ones. Commissioner Snyder indicated she would like to take that on as a project with Kathy. Kathy noted that it is time now to put the bug in the quilters' ears and to work with the local shops. Chairman Unger indicated that she thinks the state is doing something with quilting too, but it would be wonderful to do it here.

Chairman Unger indicated there is a State Centennial Committee meeting on September 2nd from 10:00 a.m. to noon, if anyone wants to go with her and Kathy. It will be interesting, because there will be people from the different communities and counties from Northern Arizona. It will be in Flagstaff and we will probably carpool up there, and if there will be a quorum, Kathy will have to prepare a public notice. Commissioner Wienges indicated that she is going to try to attend. The Chairman added that Bert Harclerode and possibly Linda Goldenstein are planning to attend also.

The Chairman indicated that Nancy Burgess stated that the county isn't talking as much about doing a cachet; however, Vice Chairman Ruland explained that cachet can be a stamp, but it can also just be a printed envelope and if you look at the minutes, that is what he discussed and they are just talking about changing cachet to commemorative envelope. A cachet would be a rubber stamp you could stamp onto the envelope, which would make it a commemorative envelope, and the difference now is just printing an envelope. He believes they are still going to have a state stamp and as a philatelist, he is thrilled about this idea to have a stack of printed envelopes with the state stamp, and if we can have an envelope that is unique to Sedona -- that is the idea. Chairman Unger indicated that is one of the things she talked to the schools about and we will push that in the next meeting with them. They are talking about having the fourth graders do this, so it is a matter of whether or not we want to do that or have something a little more sophisticated, so she and Vice Chairman Ruland will talk a little about how that should come together. The high school should probably be the one doing the logo.

Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that the idea of getting the fourth graders involved is to get them wrapped up in history, and he is less concerned about the look. Part of these projects is to get the people involved in the history of the state. The logo probably needs to be graphically picturesque. Chairman Unger indicated she thinks the county is thinking of the envelope for the fourth graders, so maybe we should just go that route, but we will discuss it.

Kathy Levin asked what role the post office has in that and Vice Chairman Ruland explained that the state is going to commission the creation of the commemorative stamp, and then the design is submitted to the U.S. Postal Service which approves it, although there is some question about whether or not that can happen by February 14th. Chairman Unger indicated that they may have already done that, but we need to be thinking about that. The Vice Chairman explained that the stamp is not ours, the creation of the envelope is all we have to worry about and we are on track; it is like creating your own envelope with a monogram on the back or something. There is an envelope with a picture that someone has created that is unique to Sedona, to which someone who has purchased the envelope can apply the stamp designed by

the state. The Chairman added that the envelope doesn't have to go through the postal service for approval.

Chairman Unger indicated at the next meeting the Commission needs to discuss how Commissioners can work into doing some of these projects or indicate that it is too overwhelming, so we can isolate what we can handle. Review the information to get a feel for what we are thinking about, and the next meeting is a joint meeting with the City Council and they are going to want to discuss this too. If you have something you want to take on, let Kathy know, so we have that information. Review the information and go on the website, because there 34 pages on there, although they are mostly talking about the arts and education. Get back to Kathy as soon as you can, because we won't have a chance to actually have another meeting before the joint meeting with the City Council.

Commissioner Snyder asked about the art in the roundabout project and the Chairman explained that we have written the wording for it and the Committee chose three pieces of artwork, and they will have a Listening Session before the Committee decides on the piece. It is difficult to ask for the Legacy Project to be approved by the state before we know which piece is selected. There are three different artists that came up with artwork for two roundabouts, and in her opinion, they did a brilliant job of choosing -- it was a tough thing. She has to commend Ginger, she did a brilliant job of writing the wording to have them make the decision, because they are probably the best ones and the range is very good. Kathy added that the three finalists are going to create maquettes and they will be on display in September so the public can give their comments, and in October the Art in Public Places Committee will make a recommendation to the Arts & Culture Commission, and the artist will have about a year after a contract is accepted by the City Council. It is for the roundabouts at the "Y" and Brewer Road, so the artwork is complementary. She prepared a draft nomination and Commissioner Wienges edited it masterfully, but we are going to wait until after the artist is identified to submit it. It is news that the historical society is considering a legacy project. Chairman Unger indicated that communities have several legacy projects -- it is not like each community can only submit one. Kathy indicated that it is submitted to the state and they will add it to their legacy projects that they promote. The Chairman added that those legacy projects that have already been selected are on the website.

Kathy Levin asked if the picnic being considered by the historical society should be something that is considered a community event on February 14th. Chairman Unger indicated that is a possibility; they were discussing doing it at the Sedona Historical Society grounds, but that is sort of limited in size and they didn't have a date yet. Kathy Levin suggested sharing all of the ideas at the joint meeting with Council, the ones that we are solidly pursuing and those that we are still investigating. As long as we supply them with information on the work in progress, she thinks they will be satisfied with the work, but she would like to see a bigger body help design the community event on the 14th. Chairman Unger indicated that it would be a good idea to ask for members of the public to help. The businesses are excited, because they think we can bring people in.

Commissioner Snyder asked if it is appropriate to get churches involved in the picnic; every congregation has an annual picnic, so if they could make it coincide and it was done on a larger scale, there might be people that could help with food, etc. Chairman Unger indicated that is a good idea, and if you have anything to bring to Kathy before our joint meeting that would be wonderful.

No legal action was taken.

8. Discussion/possible action on:

a. Prospects for designation of landmarks or historic districts

There was no discussion on this item.

b. Certificates of Appropriateness

There was no discussion on this item.

c. Updates to Historic Resource Survey

There was no discussion on this item.

d. Condition of Landmarks or other historic properties

The Chairman indicated that a very sad note was received. The Lomacasi Cabin has been on our endangered list for a while. We thought it had been saved in a project for that property, but it appears they are now asking to tear down everything on that property. Kathy explained it came to the Community Development Director's attention, so there is nothing in process, and she would like to bring this back in September for discussion, because she hasn't had an opportunity to talk to the Director about this matter, so she doesn't have any details.

Commissioner Snyder asked if you can go on the property and Kathy explained that it may be gated, because in the past, we had to ask permission to have the caretaker let us onto the property. It was built by Elmer Purtymun in the mid-1920s. Currently, the property is privately owned and at one time there was a lodging facility there plus the historic property, which is not protected. She doesn't know if it has changed hands. Chairman Unger indicated that if we do an article we need to touch on both this property and the Art Barn. Kathy indicated that the Director had sent an email indicating that if anyone asks for a demolition permit, they are to see him or Kathy and the permit is not to be issued.

Chairman Unger indicated that the five properties in the Endangered Places brochure are the Art Barn, this property, a Madole home, the ditch property and the old Post Office. Kathy added that the one is the adobe house built by Howard Madole.

Commissioner Snyder asked how one gets designation for a property that is being proposed for demolition; what can the Commission do to encourage them? Kathy Levin explained that the Commission consistently puts before them that Statement of Significance, and when a development is proposed, we consistently stand for landmarking the property, and we have consistently included it in the Endangered Places brochure. Regarding the question of demolition, there is no protection on this property. Vice Chairman Ruland explained that the property is most likely in the hands of a trustee, so it is to be liquidated to satisfy the debts, if it hasn't been foreclosed on, so maybe we should go to the bankruptcy trustee, because that is who makes these decisions. Kathy Levin indicated that she doesn't know what its status is, but when she gets some information, she will send an email to the Commission.

Commissioner Snyder indicated that this goes a way back -- it is a Centennial project. Kathy Levin recalled that it had both lodging and commercial zoning and they were putting equivalent uses on the property; the owners talked about re-siting it, and we said we didn't care just keep it and preserve it. It could be suggested as a Condition of Approval, but that old proposal wasn't a

rezoning request. Vice Chairman Ruland indicated that he will find out about the trustee and let Kathy know.

No legal action was taken.

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

The Chairman indicated that the joint meeting is going to be on September 13th from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Kathy Levin explained that the agenda is generally to tell the Council what the Commission is doing and what could be improved in communication. In the past, we have had PowerPoint presentations and each Commissioner has had an assigned speaking role, so it is an opportunity to educate the Council on our role. Chairman Unger indicated that she doesn't think there will be time for the PowerPoint. She indicated that she would email each Commissioner and give them a piece of what we do, so that Commissioner could explain it -- if the Commissioner is uncomfortable with it, let her know and she will reassign. Kathy indicated that is something she would like to see happen.

Vice Chairman Ruland thanked Kathy, Chairman Unger and Janeen Trevillyan, because we have great support from the Council. Kathy agreed it is not an adversarial meeting. Chairman Unger indicated she will prepare a list of the things to be discussed and give each Commissioner the item to be presented -- part of it is what you are personally enthusiastic about. Kathy Levin indicated that the list can be based on the work plans and Commissioner Snyder indicated she could talk about the Open House thing. The Chairman asked that she be told of anything she has left off of the list.

Kathy indicated that we are considering a scheduled Commission meeting on September 20th at 4:00 p.m., so the Commissioners should check their calendars. Commissioner Snyder noted that is when the Housing Commission meets. The consensus was the 27th as an alternative date.

10. Adjournment.

The Chairman called for adjournment at 6:18 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 August 16, 2010.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date