

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona**  
**Monday, February 8, 2016 – 4:00 p.m.**

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

Chair Unger confirmed the meeting was properly noticed, called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m., and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger and Commissioners Harry Danilevics, Kurt Gehlbach, Allyson Holmes, and Steve Segner. Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch and Commissioner Jane Grams were excused.

**Staff Members Present:** Warren Campbell, Audree Juhlin and Donna Puckett

**3. Approval of the January 11, 2016 minutes**

Chair Unger asked for a motion for approval of the minutes of January 11<sup>th</sup>.

**MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved for the motion. Kurt Gehlbach seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. Vice Chair Jarmusch and Commissioner Grams were excused.**

**2. Commission and Staff announcements**

Donna Puckett announced that the Commissioners attending the HP Conference should have received their registration receipts and lodging confirmation. Please go through the attached description of the sessions and select the other sessions that you wish to attend, but check the times and days because some overlap with those core sessions you were scheduled in. If you want to make any changes, including your meal preference, he is waiting for those responses, so please don't wait until June to do so and do not use the online registration process, just send an email to David Ryder with your session and meal preferences instead.

Audree Juhlin announced that Councilor Jablow was not present and explained that the City Council is looking at how to reduce their workload, and eliminating liaisons is one of the things they are discussing, so you may see no liaison to the Commission any longer. Chair Unger asked about joint meetings, and Audree indicated that they are working that out. They are trying to determine when they can bring the Planning & Zoning Commission in first, then budget will take precedence after that, and once that is approved, HPC will have a joint meeting. Audree then confirmed for the Chair that the communication will continue through staff.

Commissioner Segner asked about doing a thank you for people and the Chair pointed out that is agendized.

**3. PUBLIC FORUM (This is the time for the public to comment on matters not listed on the agenda. The Commission may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.)**

*Chair Unger opened the public forum and, having no public present, closed the public forum.*

**4. Discussion/possible direction regarding possible amendments to Article 15 (Historic Preservation Ordinance) of the Sedona Land Development Code**

Chair Unger noted that it seemed that all of Vice Chair Jarmusch's suggestions were incorporated, and Warren Campbell explained that he highlighted in yellow the changes he made based on the January 11<sup>th</sup> discussion. The only changes not shown in yellow are the complete deletions of any text, such as the definitions. The intent would be to have a final recommendation from this Commission on March 14<sup>th</sup> for the Planning & Zoning Commission's subsequent review. There were also a few changes that he made based on what made sense, but he highlighted those in yellow also.

Chair Unger indicated that Warren did a great job; there were only a couple of things that she saw. The Chair then asked if there were things the other Commissioners saw, and Commissioner Segner stated that he had one change, and basically it was that if you couldn't find Chair Unger, it would be a staff decision. Chair Unger indicated that was on page 14, and Commissioner Segner commented that sometimes Vice Chair Jarmusch could be the best one to make the decision, so the Chair should be able to designate whoever has the most expertise.

Chair Unger acknowledged that in one place it says or designee, but there are two places where it doesn't. One is on page 14 and one is on page 17. Warren Campbell explained that it doesn't say Director or designee, because it is in the definition, so anytime it says Director, it is anyone that Audree appoints. Audree Juhlin clarified that the Chair is bringing up that if the Chair is not available, they have to have a designee, and she believes it is in the last paragraph of 1510 on page 17, and that can say or designee or we can do that in the definitions.

Warren Campbell then read the definition of Chairperson as follows: "The Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission or his/her designee. Commissioner Segner stated that is okay; he was just worried that if the Chair was out of town, but that works. Warren Campbell stated that if the Chair was not in, his next thing would be to call the Vice Chair who could then name a designee. Chair Unger agreed that makes perfect sense. Donna Puckett then confirmed that the Commission didn't need it in the separate places.

Chair Unger referenced page 16 and read, "No change shall be made in the approved plans of a project after issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness without resubmittal to the Director and approval of the change at an Administrative level." That says if a change is made the Director could make the approval without going back to the Commission. She then asked if that is true and Audree Juhlin stated yes. The Chair then said that if a change is big enough, there could be a change that would need to go back to the Commission.

Warren Campbell explained that part of the reason we are here today was a direction by the Council to look at ways to make this feel as though it is an inclusive process, an expedited process, and some of the things that were removed last time are making this a bit more onerous in understanding the perception of why the Commission is asking to be a part of some of these processes, and we want to highlight that we are adding some layers of review that we typically don't have with the Planning & Zoning Commission. To the point just raised, staff is fairly conservative in terms of what we decide is a small change to a plan. Through years of experience, we make those decisions daily and have applications that frequently change in the field, and staff determines the appropriate process, so he understands what may be behind the comment, but recognize that staff does that daily with all of the processes around town.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff would make the point to the Planning & Zoning Commission that what you are proposing is in staff's opinion maybe a little too restrictive, and that there may be some need for flexibility for those easy cases that could be approved, such as flagstones being moved, so we don't need to get ahold of anybody – just like staff has the ability in-house to review square footage for new buildings up to 2,000 sq. ft. Having that flexibility and authority to do so in-house meets the City Council's direction of finding a balance between protecting the properties, the

City's investment in historic preservation and the need for property owners to want to be in this program, because they are no longer what was called "a prisoner of the program", but a partner in the program. So looking at ways where it could be a little more flexible as far as the minor things in not having to get the Commission's approval.

Commissioner Segner stated that is fine, but he may know what the word "substantive" is and you may not, and that is where the ambiguity falls, and we are never going to cover all of that. If it is a substantive change, then it ought to be a little more onerous, but if it really isn't, then it shouldn't be. Chair Unger then stated that if a contractor came to her and said this gravel was going to be changed to that gravel and it is not that substantive, but at the end of the day it could be. Her concern is where the level is and where you draw the line. It would be easier for nobody to have to come to the Commission at all, because then they would just come to you and get it done, but we don't want to do that. We also don't want to get it so hard that it makes it impossible for them; there has to be a central thing. She has difficulty when you start to say "substantive". In Phoenix, they don't have any restriction on color of buildings in an historic district. If somebody wants to paint them, they don't have to go through a whole rigmarole, and she would want that to happen here too; that is something they shouldn't have to come to the Commission for at all. They shouldn't even have to come to the City; however, Audree Juhlin clarified that the City has codes that require them to do that, and it is not for Planning & Zoning. Donna Puckett added that staff handles that.

Audree Juhlin indicated that the point is that the City Council directed that we have professional staff hired to do these certain jobs, and how do we build that trust, so you are okay with staff and City Council is okay with staff determining what is "substantive" and where we can put a new sewer line in without having to bring that to the Commission.

Commissioner Segner asked about doing an outline, not a regulation, that staff could use like a checklist. We might have a few flags on the checklist indicating that is one that the Commission has to do. Audree Juhlin explained that part of the problem is that this isn't addressing the very problem that got us into this in the first place – an emergency situation where there was monsoon storm and the lightening hit and went through the electricity lines, blew a hole in the roof and blew out windows, and he wasn't able to fix his property to secure it during the monsoon season without coming to the Commission, which is a two-month process. How can we fix those situations?

Chair Unger stated that the best idea was Audree's idea of the Commission having a checklist on each landmarked house. In a lot of them, the roofing doesn't mean that much, but for some it does, so instead of trying to make these general things, we could say these are the things that if changed would need to go to the Commission, or if the roof needed to be repaired, go ahead and repair it, and then we could discuss if an alteration had to be made. Audree Juhlin agreed that is a good starting point, because we would know what the significant contributing factors are for each property, but also, having some degree of flexibility at an administrative level is crucial to the success of this program; otherwise, you are never going to get another landmark.

Chair Unger stated that if lightening hit the house or somebody drove through the front of the house and broke all of the glass and the glass was very important, that would be something if they wanted to replace it with something very different. We could also say these are the substantive things and that would still give you the opportunity to do a lot.

Donna Puckett stated that she believed the Chair was referencing D on page 16, and as she reads that, this is where the proposed work has already come to the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness, and then they need to make a change, but if the Commission has had a public hearing, she would assume that in that hearing you have stated what is important to the Commission and what you expect them to preserve, so if they had a minor change that was not one of those items, you have already spoken to what was substantial in that case. Audree Juhlin explained that is as it relates to a Certificate of Appropriateness, not just general maintenance and repair. The Chair then added that what she is talking about is beyond that actually; she skipped out of that area, but obviously, it could pertain to almost any part of this, if for example, we really want

multi-pane glass, then staff knows that and you don't have to come to the Commission. If the roofing is metal and that is an important part, then it has to be metal and the Commission has said that, so staff can make that decision.

Commissioner Segner stated that we are over-thinking it a little bit. To use Audree's analogy, if that had happened to the historic museum, we wouldn't have let them put a new roof on it. We would have said no, it has to be the same roof, because that is important to it. He trusts staff for that; the Commission just has to call out that if they have a bad roof, they are going to have to fix it temporarily, until they put a like roof back on it, because if you went back and said that the historic building was leaking and they decided to put on green tile, because that is all they could get that weekend, that wouldn't be the right decision, so if we called out on the 27 homes some of the key points and somebody blows out their front window, it has to be put back the way it was.

Chair Unger indicated that the question is how to put that into Article 15, because that is a little bit of an alteration from what we had been discussing. We should be able to put a line in there, and we have pretty well documented the more important parts of each of the landmarks; however, Audree explained that everything would have to come back, because you haven't identified if the roof is a key feature and if the windows are unique, etc. Chair Unger then stated that what Audree is thinking is that we have to make this a simple process for staff by bringing each one of these in front of the Commission again, and we would already have that done for any future landmarks, but she thinks it is better for the Commission to do that to make it easier for everyone in the future.

Commissioner Holmes indicated that she is wondering how the owners of landmarks will react to making that list, and the Chair stated that they already own a landmark and bought into it as a landmark. We are trying to make it easier for them to come to the Commission; however, Commissioner Holmes asked if the owners would see it that way. Audree Juhlin commented that they would see it as a prison, which is why she wants to caution the Commission about what we do, because we will never get another landmark. We will get Mr. Gunning who loves his home and will preserve it without a landmark. Chair Unger noted that she is trying to make it as broad as possible for staff.

Commissioner Segner indicated that with a landmarked building, the day that it is landmarked is how it is supposed to be kept, and that is pretty simple. Then, if someone says they want to remove the big window, that is a big no. To him, it is really simple and he understands that in an emergency, it might be that they have to temporarily maintain the building until they can put it back to what it was. Audree Juhlin indicated that is exactly what staff is trying to say, because if they want to replace like with like, they can't under the current policy. They have to come to the Commission for approval first, and that is being the prisoner of the program. You are saying that you are okay with staff looking at it and saying this is what you have now, this is what was approved at the time of approval, and this is what you are replacing it with, and it is like for like, so the staff has the administrative ability to say that staff approves it. If staff says it is not like for like and it is changing it from this siding to that siding, then we are going to say no. Chair Unger agreed, but she wondered if it could be a little broader. If there is something that actually isn't contributing to it, they still have to come to the Commission, and she wondered if it could be made broader. Audree then explained that is one part of it; the other piece is the flexibility to look at a property and say if what they want to do is exactly the same thing, so it doesn't need to come through for approval, or does it? That flexibility is all staff is asking for.

Kurt Gehlbach indicated that there is one thing he is not hearing. We have a library with a roof and that is one issue, but we now have a man who has a hole in his roof and windows blown out, so we are dealing with someone whose well-being has been pulled into the situation, and he would think it would be appropriate to expedite whatever we need to do for them. Audree agreed, but explained that currently we don't have the ability to do that and the Chair agreed. Commissioner Segner stated that you should, and Audree then explained that we then need to modify it to allow that.

Warren Campbell pointed out that some of that language was removed in the last go-around. Commissioner Segner indicated that he agreed that if somebody is in trouble, you would say just go fix it, but put it back the way it was and show us that you are doing that. Audree explained that staff would want to document that upfront and take pictures to identify those key features, because sometimes we only have a street view and it doesn't show the details.

Chair Unger indicated that most of this is done for emergency purposes, but there will be some that aren't an emergency and they just want to do something fast; it doesn't always have to be an emergency situation. We have to make sure that we leave that in the equation, because as Audree was saying, beyond people feeling trapped in an emergency, it also is people feeling trapped when it is not an emergency. If we have pictures and know what it looks like, they can do the same thing with it as what she is trying to do. Audree pointed out that anytime staff feels uncomfortable with it, and we do it with the Planning & Zoning Commission too, staff would rather err on the side of caution and take it to the Commission. If it is time-sensitive, we would get the Chair or designee involved to help make that decision.

Kurt Gehlbach then asked if right now we have absolutely no photo library for any of the existing landmarks, and the Chair indicated that we have a general library, but not specifics. Commissioner Segner added that for the Commission's work next year, we should all go back and see all of these to refresh us and call out key points. It might just be a brick wall that is off to the left of the house, and we would just note it and take photos.

Audree Juhlin stated that the other issue the Commission should be aware of and we see it all the time, because you are creating a code that must be enforced, is if it becomes too difficult to work with, they just do it and ask for forgiveness if they get caught. We want them to work with us rather than ignore the code.

Donna Puckett asked if there is consensus regarding like for like and the color of the paint . . . Chair Unger stated that like for like and paint color . . ., she hates to get into specifics again, because that makes it harder. Like for like, but we do need what Audree said. If we had that history and photos, then it would be easy for staff to say that is what it looked like, and we should have been doing that a long time ago, because if the Commission didn't know what it looked like before, we can't make that decision either. Audree Juhlin pointed out that is what happened with the George Jordan Sales Building regarding what the porch overhang even looked like. Chair Unger indicated that the Commission needs to be much more aware of what all of these things are, and like if it is like for like, she can make the decision as the Chair of the ARC in her community, but that is why we need the photographs, etc. We have been basing our judgments on what we thought was there and we have to be much more aware.

Commissioner Segner stated that if we go with like for like and there is a question, then we go out and look at it. Audree Juhlin then explained that staff already looks at it and verifies, so when someone comes in and wants to make a change to an approved project, we go onsite and ask what they want to do and what they are going to replace and how they are going to do that? This would be no different. If someone wants to make a change, we are going to document it, because we want proof of what was there. The Chair indicated that what the Commission will have will be even easier, and there could be an instance where a place might have burned down and there was no roof left, so this might even be easier, because you wouldn't have that other step to take to go out and document it. We should have something in here to talk about that and say that it has to be like to like as per a document we make up. Audree indicated that perhaps it is an exemption to the maintenance clause and emergencies saying under this circumstance . . . Warren Campbell added that it was under repair and maintenance, and we can define that it is the same for same replacement and emergency replacement. Chair Unger added also indicating that there will be a list. Warren then suggested saying development of an inventory.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he doesn't think there is an emergency; that is a way of slipping underneath the door. He had to put new windows in, so he put double panes, but that is

not like to like. It is just like to like and if there is a question, we go out and look at it. Warren then asked if the Commissioner is suggesting a like for like would come down to the number of panes. If it is a divided-light window . . . and Commissioner Segner stated absolutely; if you go to Jerome, they make you rerun the molding and friends have had to have molding knives made to remake the molding. He errs on the side of like to like. Warren indicated that he has seen that and can understand that the trim work may be a contributing factor, but if the windows are in significant disrepair, they would still keep divided light, but they would go to a dual pane with maybe the mullions on the outside. Commissioner Segner stated that we would have to discuss it; that can probably be done, but it has to be discussed, because all of a sudden it is a metal clad and that is an easy mistake to make.

Chair Unger pointed out that the reason the Art Barn failed in being landmarked was because of the windows; they put in metal windows. The reality is that one of the big things is the windows, and in Phoenix, that is an issue they actually speak to, and if it is like to like, then it is the same thing. Commissioner Segner stated that if it normally was an odd-sized window, then it is going to have to be custom made. Chair Unger stated that the easier thing would be to frame it in a little smaller, and then it would fit with everything.

Audree Juhlin then asked at what level the Commission wants to get involved and what you expect to happen in an emergency situation. If a window busts out, should they board it up until we can get it to the Commission? Commissioner Segner stated no, someone goes out within 48 hours to look at it and make a decision; it is not holding them up for a Commission meeting, it is asking a Commissioner to go and look at it.

Chair Unger indicated that a lot of the buildings are going to be non-contributing; we have a lot of landmarked buildings where the details are going to be less onerous than with some of the really older buildings, because the older buildings are harder to find and a lot were custom made. As we move forward, a lot of stuff could be replaced with commercially made stuff, so if somebody drives through the front of the house, she would think it is an emergency and they rebuild it, but they have to get a proposal to rebuild it anyway, so if they propose to change the windows, etc., then it probably will have to come to the Commission. If it is going to look exactly the same and they are going to use the same materials, and we have that documented, why not let them start? In any big instances, they are going to have to have a contractor look at it and get a bid, so all of the details will be there. The bigger things right now are the roofs and those are emergencies that we can foresee happening more, but a lot of the roofs don't matter.

Commissioner Segner stated that he doesn't get the problem; it seems that this all started when someone wanted to get out of the program and felt trapped in the program, but if somebody has an emergency, all we say is as long as you put in the same windows, staff can sign off on it. Audree stated that is the direction we need from the Commission to write in the Code, because it doesn't say that right now. The Commissioner then stated that if they are putting in the exact same windows, doors, treatment, then there is no problem, staff can sign off on that. If it is not, then it has to come as an emergency and some Commissioner will go out there and look at it.

Audree Juhlin stated that she wanted to be sure the Commissioners are comfortable with that, because if several of you are out of town, she will call Harry Danilevics and say you need to make that determination. Harry Danilevics indicated yes. Chair Unger stated that we need to be careful that it is the exact same thing, and Warren Campbell stated that he is hearing it is the exact same thing. Commissioner Segner stated that if staff stays with that, it will be clean, but if they want an exception, it comes to the Commission. There isn't that much that can't be done the same way.

Donna Puckett asked if the Commission is willing to follow SHPO and the City of Phoenix and not require them to come to the Commission if they want to repaint their house a different color. Chair Unger stated it is not just SHPO; it is actually the Phoenix Historical Society, and Audree Juhlin pointed out that SHPO stated that roofs shouldn't even come before the Commission. Chair Unger then stated that they don't need to come before the Commission unless it is something like . . . , and

Audree added that thatched roof. Donna Puckett noted that they still have to follow the City Code and Sedona has some of the most restrictive.

Commissioner Segner stated that he is fine with staff looking at it and saying that is great; if there is a question, he would expect staff to question them. If it says like to like and staff needs to verify it, then staff would do that and if there is a question, they would come to the Commission.

Donna Puckett then asked if they are in agreement about like to like and they can change the paint color. Chair Unger stated yes and Commissioner Holmes said we should add "exactly". Warren Campbell indicated it is same for same and there are a couple of categories such as material, character, color, workmanship, etc.; however, Donna Puckett noted that the Commission is saying that the paint color could change. Chair Unger explained that she wouldn't mind the color changing, because you paint a house how many times. Commissioner Segner agreed people do paint their houses and it changes.

Chair Unger then spoke about a house she had in Bixby that was built in the late 1800s and she had about 50 colors on that house. Commissioner Segner then suggested going with those points and Kurt Gehlbach added keep it simple. Chair Unger then noted that it doesn't have to be an emergency either, because if the windows are deteriorating, it doesn't have to be done tomorrow, but if they want to replace them with the same thing, then let them do it. Warren Campbell noted that one example of what staff would not sign off on is if someone wanted to frame-in a window opening to make it match; we wouldn't sign off on that, but it would be plausible that the windows are somewhat operable and they want to make an energy-efficiency upgrade and try to pick a window that has historic character that matches, although it might be different. Chair Unger again said that we have to be really cautious with that; the windows and glass are really important in some of these places. Commissioner Segner stated that if it looked exactly the same after it was done, made with the same materials and it had double pane, so what? However, Chair Unger stated that it should come to the Commission to make sure we are comfortable with it.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she agrees, but the whole point is we want them to work with us and not just do whatever they want to do, and right now they haven't been working with us and a lot of the buildings are deteriorated. They aren't maintaining or repairing, and if they do, they are doing it on their own. Nobody is coming to us for any repair and maintenance, so we want to create an incentive for them to work with us. Commissioner Holmes asked if Audree feels that it is documented that things have disintegrated to that point, and Audree stated yes. The Commissioner commented that is really sad.

Commissioner Segner stated, but the buildings were historically designated, so they can let it deteriorate, but they can't change it substantially. Audree Juhlin noted that they can and they will. There isn't a lot that we can do to stop them. Warren Campbell asked if some of it could be attributed to new ownership, and Commissioner Segner added that they could be in their 90s, and then Warren commented that they might no longer have the economic means to keep it up. Commissioner Segner then stated that the hope is that the next people who buy the house realize it is designated, and Audree Juhlin added like the Nininger House.

Chair Unger indicated that if we are ever going to do a grant, she would like for it to be to help replace things that are actually more expensive, because they are older. For example, Taliesin is notorious for wanting everything to be custom made, so when the owners had somebody bid it, it was astronomical and somebody else dropped the price by almost \$100,000 by using standard-sized things, but Taliesin wouldn't let them build it. The reality would be to frame the window in and put in another one, which would be a lot less expensive, and if we want to maintain these as they were, we may have to come up with funds to help them, although that is beyond this conversation.

Commissioner Segner then asked what Warren has down that could be modified and Audree explained that staff will bring it back to the Commission. Warren added that it will be a revised version of the repair and maintenance section that was removed last time.

Chair Unger asked if it has to be sent to SHPO and Audree explained that we just have to give it to them as a reviewing agency during the process. You have to have your ordinance, but they don't have to approve your amendments, although it will be given to them as a reviewing agency. Once the final version is approved, we will give them a copy of it. Audree also indicated that when we did the first ordinance, they didn't even review it.

Chair Unger indicated that she didn't know what would be said in the Certificates of Appropriateness, and Audree Juhlin stated that staff will put something in there that just gives staff a little bit of latitude, so if they are just wanting to do something minor, like as Donna said, if it is already outlined in the Certificate of Appropriateness as to what the Commission finds to be appropriate . . . , the Chair then stated that the Certificate of No Effect basically is something we are also talking about making a bit easier, so will the Certificate of No Effect be reflected in the repairs? Audree Juhlin stated yes, if someone wants to replace windows, to get that approval, we would issue a Certificate of No Effect, because they are replacing like for like, and we are documenting what it is that they're doing through the Certificate of No Effect. The Chair then asked if we need to say that in the portion on the Certificate of No Effect or will covering it in the repair section do it. Audree Juhlin explained that staff needs to go back and look at it, because things were removed, so we need to see if something needs to be put back in or be rewritten based on the direction we are hearing today.

Warren stated that we are envisioning that there is one application, and we will make a determination as to if a Certificate of No Effect or a Certificate of Appropriateness process is needed. Then, we will go through whatever that process is. Chair Unger stated that if the Certificate of No Effect will be affected by our lists of things; however, Warren noted that if it is the same for same, staff would say it is of no effect.

The Chair then stated that we need to discuss getting out there and looking at all of these. Commissioner Segner noted that the Commission needs to go out with the new members anyway, so we can all go through the process of doing it, but you can take good pictures and say they are the standards that we want to hold them to. We don't need lots of verbiage; here is the picture from four sides and we want it to look like this. Chair Unger indicated that there may be some things that we want to measure, because the homeowner would want that too, since it makes it easier when a contractor bids on something. Commissioner Segner indicated that we could probably look at the pictures now and write what is significant on them, and if there is something we are worried about, we would go look at it.

Audree Juhlin indicated that Commissioner Holmes had a good point; we aren't going to do anything that makes it overly restrictive and upset the property owner. The Chair stated that they bought a home as it is and we want to keep the home as it is, but some owners don't understand that the windows are important to the landmark. They wanted plate-glass windows in the front of the George Jordan building, and we said no, so there is always the possibility that we are going to rub somebody wrong, but hopefully, we do that as little as possible and have all of the back-up.

Commissioner Segner asked if each homeowner has the paperwork that was put together on their properties, and Audree Juhlin stated if it is the owner from the time of designation, but if it was sold since then, she doubts it. The Commissioner then suggested making up a nice little book and have them come to a meeting to present it to them, answer their questions and tell them the process, and that should be done every four or five years to catch the new owners.

Donna Puckett stated that in the past, it seemed like we didn't have consensus or agreement that when you are evaluating them, you go back to the date it was landmarked. There was discussion about what it was in the early 1900s, so do we now have a consensus that going forward, we look at the date of landmark rather than going back to what the pioneer did. Chair Unger indicated that SHPO says that you landmark it as of the date of the landmark, but if the homeowner decides to take it farther back, there is that possibility, if the Commission allow them to do it. She would say just the date of landmark is fine.



Audree Juhlin stated that is typical, but when we ran into a problem was with two recent Certificates of Appropriateness where the Commission was trying to decide where you wanted it to go back to, and without proof of what that was at that time, it was difficult. Commissioner Segner stated that it makes more sense to do it at the time it was landmarked; otherwise, we are stretching and researching, and Donna Puckett recalled that the Commission was trying to guess what was used in that era. Commissioner Segner agreed and stated let's just stay with the date of landmark.

Chair Unger added that if the owner wanted to do the other, the Commission could look at it, but the owner would have to have the specific proof and the research.

Warren asked if there were any other comments and the Commissioners indicated they were fine. Warren then summarized that it is developing a process by which staff has the ability to make certain decisions to allow them to be expedited and move them along. Chair Unger indicated that Warren's idea of having a series of words that compose what that means is a good idea, but let the Commission look at it, because we might want to strike those words too.

Audree noted that the March meeting will be scheduled for possible action to recommend it, but if the Commission is not ready, it will be continued to the next meeting, so you don't have to make a decision, but it will be noticed in case you are ready. Commissioner Holmes asked if taking it to P&Z is HPC's meeting too or will there be two meetings, and Audree explained that HPC will make a recommendation when you are comfortable with this document, then staff takes it from that point and figures out the next available date to get it publically noticed with the Planning & Zoning Commission. We do a Staff Report and outline the Commission's concerns, Council's concerns, staff's concerns and recommendations, and then take it to Planning & Zoning. Commissioner Segner asked if staff would take it to them as staff is recommending it, and Audree clarified it would be as the Commission is recommending it, because the Commission is the body making the recommendation. Commissioner Segner noted that they know nothing about this and he is worried that it goes to P&Z and starts all over again, but that is the nature of the beast. Audree Juhlin added that it can also start all over again at the City Council.

## **5. Discussion/possible action regarding a May 2016 event for property owners of landmarked structures**

Chair Unger referenced the draft for an event in May and Commissioner Holmes explained it sort of outlines what we could do. She and Commissioner Segner thought at the beginning that it would be a given that this ordinance would be done, so she would like some input on whether that is true. Audree Juhlin stated that it will not be through the process by May; it will probably be at least another four months, as it is a matter of getting it on both of the agendas.

Commissioner Segner stated that it should be done, because we should give them a copy of the ordinance, a copy of their property, and give them the spiel on how it works if there are any questions. We could work that out ahead of time, so maybe we should do it in September. Audree noted that the Commission could do it in May and use it as an opportunity to introduce it to the owners and get their comments as we are moving it through the process, in case there is anything else to be changed. Commissioner Holmes noted that we could think of it as a public outreach, and let them come and visit staff if they have any specifics, and maybe not get into too much discussion as to develop arguments or something. Commissioner Segner added that May is a good time of the year to do it, and Chair Unger added that it is a good idea and May is Historic Preservation Month, so it would be nice to do it then. She also noted that we don't want forced input either; however, Commissioner Segner commented that when you open the door, it opens the door.

Audree Juhlin noted that the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council will ask if the property owners have seen this document, and the Chair added that it is better to have that under our belt. Commissioner Segner then stated that the Commission should go for May, and it was determined that May 9<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> would work.

Audree then suggested that HPC not take action on this until after that date. Commissioner Holmes asked if we should address who would be speaking, and Commissioner Segner stated that he would welcome them, and Chair Unger also indicated that she could talk to them. Commissioner Segner then added that they could put together a little song and dance about the Commission.

Chair Unger asked if Audree was suggesting to lay off of doing any more work on Article 15 until then, and Audree stated no, she was just recommending that the Commission not take formal action, but have it all ready to go and the Commission approve it through consensus, then staff will create a clean document for distribution. The Chair noted that will probably help, because the Council will know that we have actually talked to some of the homeowners.

Commissioner Segner asked if the Commission could get a resolution from the City Council thanking them in one of those scroll-like things that you give to employees. It would be nice to thank them for owning the property. You thank them, shake their hand and take their picture, give them a little packet, and then we put on a song and dance about here are some things that we are trying to do. Audree Juhlin stated that we could get the proclamation on Tuesday, May 10<sup>th</sup> and invite all of those property owners to the City Council meeting. Commissioner Segner added that we could also announce that there is an open house at El Portal, but will we get them to both? Chair Unger suggested giving them the paper on the other day, and Audree indicated yes or we could do it officially on Tuesday at the Council meeting and ask the Mayor to attend Thursday to hand them out. Commissioner Segner indicated that the entire City Council should be noticed and invited too, so whoever is there could do it, and Audree noted that they would be invited anyway. Chair Unger stated that handing them out at the event makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Segner then added that we then just have to decide what we are going to show. Warren then confirmed that action would not be taken in March, April or May, but get the document done that the Commission is prepared to make a recommendation on, so their input can be taken before going to P&Z.

Donna Puckett asked the date of HPC's May meeting and Audree indicated it would be the May 9<sup>th</sup>. Donna then asked about moving the date to the 16<sup>th</sup> and Audree agreed the May meeting could be moved to May 16<sup>th</sup>, and the Chair agreed, so we aren't losing another month. Audree indicated staff also would have that week to prepare something for the 16<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Holmes noted that as part of the HP Conference, there is a Historic Homeowners Expo on Saturday, June 11th that is free to the general public and no registration is required. Historic homeowners are welcome to attend this expo that offers outstanding resources and addresses many questions specific to historic ownership. Meet vendors who may assist you, like-minded owners, organizations that help, joint sessions and workshops, etc. Audree Juhlin noted that we should add that to the information for our landmark owners. Commissioner Segner agreed and indicated we should have a flier on that at our meeting.

Commissioner Segner asked if there is something that SHPO has as a 10-minute presentation or film, to talk about historic preservation. Chair Unger indicated that the question is how many times are we going to have SHPO come up and Audree noted that is part of the CLG agreement, but there is a limit – within reason. Donna Puckett asked who is hosting the expo, because they may have a list of the participating vendors that could be shared. Commissioner Holmes then read, Mobile Library of Resource Materials, which may be something we could also have here. Audree Juhlin noted that if the event becomes too large for El Portal, we perhaps could move it to the Ranger Station barn; however, Commissioner Segner stated that they can handle 70 people in the courtyard with the food on the inside, so it shouldn't be a problem

Chair Unger suggested that Audree or Warren contact SHPO and ask if they could do it on that date, and Commissioner Segner can bribe them with a room. Commissioner Segner stated that

either Monday, May 9<sup>th</sup> or Thursday, May 12<sup>th</sup> would work and the Chair asked them to check the dates. With the presentations, Audree suggested just saying 5:00 p.m. without an ending time.

Commissioner Segner asked if it would be from the Commission or the City and Audree indicated that it would be the City of Sedona Historic Preservation Commission. Commissioner Holmes then asked if staff would call SHPO and Audree stated yes.

Commissioner Holmes noted that she wants to attend the expo almost more than the other Conference sessions; however, the Chair noted that is after all of the sessions are over, so you could go if you have the room for that night.

Commissioner Segner asked if we have a photographer and the Chair noted that she wouldn't want to go to the expense, but she could do the handout. She has most of them in her computer. Commissioner Segner then stated that it would be nice to say here is a picture and a thing from the City thanking you, and the Mayor can shake their hand.

Audree Juhlin noted that this can be a standing item on every agenda, and Donna Puckett clarified that the hotel check-out day for the Conference is the 10<sup>th</sup>; the last day of the conference.

**6. Discussion/possible direction regarding the Historic Preservation Commission's web page**

*There was no discussion on this item.*

**7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items**

- **March 14, 2016**

The Chair noted that we are talking about moving our May meeting to the 16<sup>th</sup>. The March meeting is on the 14<sup>th</sup>, and she is not available in April. Audree indicated that we can determine if we want the April 11th meeting in March. The Chair indicated that she would like to have a brief discussion about the homes we would like to not landmark, but recognize, so it can be discussed at the event.

Commissioner Segner suggested doing an invitation ahead of time and firming up the date this week. Audree Juhlin stated that we can draft a flier or postcard, and plug in that date at the March meeting, although Chair Unger indicated that she could make up something for the City, just let her know; she could make them up and get them printed. Commissioner Segner then asked to also do the electronic e-vite. Chair Unger indicated that we might also want to invite some of the people who asked us to recognize them, although it would be outside of what they would be able to get. Commissioner Segner then mentioned Keep Sedona Beautiful and Commissioner Holmes mentioned Jennifer at the Chamber and the Red Rock News.

**9. Adjournment**

***MOTION: Commissioner Segner moved to adjourn. Commissioner Holmes seconded the motion.***

The Chair called for adjournment at 5:23 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 February 8, 2016.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date