

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Historic Preservation Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona
Monday, March 14, 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 4:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

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

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

The Chair then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Commission and Staff announcements

Donna Puckett reminded the Commissioners of the need to look at the sessions for the conference.

3. Approval of the February 8, 2016 minutes

Chair Unger asked for a motion to approve the minutes of February 8th.

MOTION: *Commissioner Segner moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Commissioner Danilevics seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Vice Chair Jarmusch abstained, because she was not present for the meeting, and Commissioner Holmes was excused.*

4. 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 requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to add a memorial bench to the Jordan Historic Park located at 735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336. A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to Jordan Road between Orchard Lane and W. Park Ridge Drive.

Applicant:	City of Sedona
Property Address:	735 Jordan Road, Sedona, Arizona 86336
Property Owner:	City of Sedona
Landmarks:	1, 2, 3
Case Number:	CA 16-01

Chair Unger reviewed the steps of the public hearing process for a Certificate of Appropriateness request. She then asked Warren Campbell to present staff's report.

Presentation, Warren Campbell: Warren explained that the request is to place a memorial bench at the Jordan Historical Park that would be donated by a group of private donors represented by Ann Pearson. The bench would be in memoriam of Patty Fox who was an

active member of the Sedona Historical Society Board of Trustees, the author of the Ranch Wife's Cookbook, and she did quite a bit of volunteering.

Warren stated that the City has tentatively agreed to place the bench and is the applicant; therefore, staff will not be making a formal recommendation as you have seen before in several previous applications, such as for the roof, cowboy sculpture and telegraph office at Jordan Park.

As history, it is considered an intact example of a pioneer ranching, farming homestead of approximately 3½ acres, and there are three landmarks on the site – the Jordan House, the fruit packing shed and the tractor shed. In Section 3 are a number of previously-approved applications with the most recent being the Telegraph Station and the Jordan House roof in 2014 – 2015.

Staff reviewed the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, completed searches, etc., and when it comes to sites structures, it talks about if a site had historic benches, water fountains, etc. at the time it was constructed, but it doesn't speak too well to adding a bench to a historic property. Therefore based on previous memorandums, staff found some discussion with the HPC regarding the cowboy sculpture that said, "A narrow and strict interpretation of the language contained in the City's Land Development Code and the U.S. Department of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation will lead us to conclude that the bronze sculpture of a cowboy may not be compatible with nor relate to the Jordan building and the Jordan family story. It also would not complement the context of the landscape, including the remnants of the fruit orchards that exist today." Then, it goes on further to discuss how it might be appropriate by exhibiting certain aspects of our community's history and heritage, and in conclusion, the HPC made a finding that it was appropriate and that it was all about location on the park and how to make that work.

Warren pointed out that the same conversation occurred around the Telegraph Office, which is a reconstruction designed to look historic and not necessarily historic at the site at the time it was a farming ranch. The Commission used the same concept and placed a condition upon that approval that it be designed so it could be moved in the future if necessary for whatever reason.

Warren then indicated that staff is suggesting that it might be appropriate to have that same kind of discussion when considering this bench, since we are not making a recommendation and the same logic might apply. Warren then showed some photographs and stated that it is about 30 ft. to the west of the Jordan House's garage, and you can see the retaining wall. The star with the red circle in it is the bench's location. The bench will be of a terra cotta color made of concrete with the bronze inlay plaque. Warren then referenced the dimensions given and explained the approximate location of the bench and with the garage off to the right. He pointed out the gravel area and showed the picture of an existing bench on site that was installed in 2010; however, he did not find any history on that bench or its location. It is a concrete bench and there was some steel ornamental decoration on top. He then showed a picture of the location of the existing bench that is to the left and in close proximity to the proposed bench, with the packing shed in the background. Warren also noted that the application is attached with some applicable sections of Section 1509 in the Code

Commission's Questions of Staff:

Commissioner Segner stated that he has to recuse himself, because he just realized that he donated some money for the plaque, and the Commissioner left the table.

Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that she had some questions about the design, materials and what the plaque would say, and Warren Campbell suggested allowing Ann Pearson, a resident of Sedona, to respond. The Vice Chair then asked what the bronze plaque would say, and Ann stated "In Memory of Patty Fox". She then explained that it is concrete, so it will match the one on the opposite side of the back garden. We have the bronze plaque and the Fox Ranch brand on the two legs; we have permission to use those symbols.

The Vice Chair then asked if they might be able to explain on the plaque that she was a rancher, as well as a community leader and active in . . . Ms. Pearson stated that there will be more than enough information inside the museum concerning Patty Fox; otherwise, it would be too much. Vice Chair Jarmusch explained that she was not familiar with the brand and she looked it up and found that there was a Fox Ranch and figured it out, so to pay tribute to her – she was a remarkable woman. Ms. Pearson agreed and added as was her husband. She then asked other audience members if they felt more could be added to the plaque; we have a lot of information inside the museum about the Fox family.

Warren Campbell suggested that if the Commission felt the plaque in the bench was not appropriate, there is a plaque next to the existing one that could be considered; however, Ms. Pearson explained that it has faded in the sunshine and the Excalibur people have assured her that they can inset the plaque into the concrete, so it won't be rough on your back. The Chair asked why the one in the bench would not fade, and Ms. Pearson stated that it is going to be bronze and the other one is not.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that if there were even three words to describe her under her name . . .; it was remarkable that she worked the cattle drive into the mountains and back, so she was more than a rancher's wife, she was a real cowgirl. Ms. Pearson agreed and indicated that if you come to the museum, you can buy the book they published shortly before she passed away, the Ranch Wife's Cookbook with a lot of her stories.

The Vice Chair then stated that the bench is not very expressive of the rustic ranch homestead, but it matches the other bench, so that is in its favor. Ms. Pearson added that it will be a counterpoint. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked if the budget would allow, could they add an element like they did with the rusted metal or add a wood seat, so it is not a monolithic concrete bench that could be anywhere, to just make it a little bit more about the history of the homestead and the buildings around it. Ms. Pearson stated that she didn't know; she wanted it simple and sweet actually with not too awfully much busy-ness. The quail metal is lovely, but she didn't want to copy it. Chair Unger pointed out that there is also an element that it will stand out as something that was put here currently, because we need there to be a differentiation between the existing and what we are adding, so in a sense maybe that is something to think about too.

Commissioner Grams agreed that it should have no more than three words or something to define her, because many people will walk through and not dig deep into the museum's history and what is available there. If there could be something that is very definitive of her character, it would be nice. The Chair suggested discussing that further when we get to the roundtable discussion. Chair Unger then thanked Ms. Pearson, who thanked Warren for giving a good presentation.

Chair Unger opened the public comment period and commented that we have members of the public present in support of this, but no one is requesting to speak, so the Chair closed the public comment period.

Summary Discussion:

Commissioner Grams indicated that she already stated her feelings and if that could be in the minutes that would be fine with her. Vice Chair Jarmusch wondered if they might want to give the dates of her life on the plaque and Chair Unger indicated that perhaps the Commission should be discussing exactly what is on the plaque; however, Warren pointed out that there was no indication of the text for the plaque.

Audree Juhlin explained that the Commission can make recommendations and let the applicant decide if they want to do anything with those recommendations, but the Commission should keep the concentration on the historical context, setting and location. The Chair agreed that the Commission can make a recommendation that the applicant do those things, but our detail is not really the verbiage, but whether or not it is in context and whether or not we will allow the bench to

be there. Everybody appreciates the desire to say more about the woman, but she understands that is something they probably considered already.

Vice Chair Jarmusch explained that she is not trying to interfere or dictate or be inappropriately commenting, but what she is trying to get at in expanding the text on the plaque is to place Patty Fox in history, and she thinks that is within the Commission's realm. Commissioner Grams agreed and indicated that is what she would say also. Chair Unger then stated that if the bench is to be there, they would like for it in memoriam of her to state something so people would understand her importance, but that is probably in the wheelhouse of the applicants.

Commissioner Danilevics also indicated that some historical perspective and context of Ms. Fox's life would be great for anyone who doesn't know. The park definitely needs a matching bench, but context for why the bench was put in would help people know how important she was. Kurt Gehlbach then noted that he was thinking here is our first cowgirl and a real cowgirl that did the things that a real cowgirl would do. Looking at the bench, his thought was that it would be great to have a visual or something like that to attract the attention of those passing by, if that is possible and within budget.

Chair Unger explained that what has been brought in front of the Commission is what we are going to have to consider, and since those things weren't brought by the applicant, it is something we can recommend, but we really have to look at the fact that it is free-cast concrete garden bench, then the size and location of it and how it interacts with the environment around it. Those are the things when we make a decision to approve or deny that we are going to consider. The conversation and allowing them to understand some of the thoughts is good, but we are really limiting ourselves in terms of the approval to whether or not this piece of furniture or garden equipment is logical.

Commissioner Danilevics asked if the color of the pre-cast concrete would remain pinkish, and Ann Pearson stated that it would be the same as the first one that was placed. It is called Terra Cotta and it is sandstone pink. The Chair noted that it sort of blends with the color of the surrounding gravel and a little with the red rocks, but luckily, it is not so dark that it is going to fade.

Chair Unger indicated that she would entertain a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Danilevics moved to approve case number CA16-01 (CofA) to install a memorial bench at the Jordan Historical Park as presented by City of Sedona staff based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the findings and applicable Sedona Land Development Code requirements and also keeping in mind Patty Fox's historical cowgirl contributions toward Sedona history. Vice Chair Jarmusch seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Segner was recused and Commissioner Holmes was excused.

Chair Unger thanked the applicant and commented that the Commission made a few recommendations and hopes that they will be taken into consideration, but it is really not going to deter from the look of the property. One bench is already there, and it gives people another place to sit, so that is a wonderful idea. Ms. Pearson thanked the Commission and staff and expressed appreciation for their cooperation. She indicated that the bench should be up in a month or so and encouraged the Commissioners to come and see the museum and landscaping.

Commissioner Segner rejoined the Commission at the table for the remainder of the meeting at this time.

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

Presentation, Warren Campbell: Warren indicated that in 2014, Council directed HPC and staff to review Article 15 of the Land Development Code to reexamine the City's philosophy regarding

historic preservation and recommend changes where appropriate. The objectives or goals were to clarify the regulations, streamline and simplify the process, and create a sense of partnership between the property owners and City within the historic landmark process.

Warren stated that some proposed solutions that have been adopted to date include adding a number of definitions and text for clarification and adding a Certificate of No Effect process to address certain types of alterations, repairs or maintenance that would have no effect on the historic characteristics of a historic resource. We have had large agreement on 95% of all the changes we have proposed, but staff brought up a concern at the last meeting that maybe we weren't accomplishing some of the goals to recognize that we are in a partnership with the owners of historic properties. There are some property rights regulations in Arizona, and if we don't have partnerships in this process, several things could present some potential threats to our program.

Warren indicated that, as examples, in administering the Land Development Code, it entails a lot of the regulations that the City follows and he wanted to show that staff is given quite a list that he has reduced to those most applicable, but staff is responsible for interpreting, administering and approving all of the processes, in addition to providing support to all of the Commissions and Boards, and then enforcing the provisions of the Code. On a daily basis, staff receives questions, comments and applications which don't fit in the black and white letter of the Code, so staff is using judgment daily to figure out how to proceed. You also see it in Subsection 401.02 that falls under the Planning & Zoning Commission, but again, staff is given quite a bit of responsibility to use judgment in reviewing and processing various types of applications, including new building construction, land uses, expansions of buildings, homes, accessory buildings, and interior tenant finishes. Most notably is that for structures of less than 2,000 sq. ft., staff has quite a bit of purview to make administrative reviews and approvals where appropriate.

Warren then explained that there is a section in the Code that says whenever the Director, which is defined in the Land Development Code as the Director or designee and in this case that would be him, feel anything is going on with a particular application that would be more impactful, etc., we can forward that on to the Commission, so staff's intent is to discuss similar language perhaps with different parameters and thresholds.

Warren indicated that he included the definition for the Certificate of No Effect that was largely agreed to and is specifically addressing applications that will have no detrimental effect on the historic character of the resource, and therefore may fall within this new defined category, and staff built from this some suggestions based on our last conversation, as to how to possibly work some administrative review back in for things that might be appropriate.

Warren pointed out that staff brought back the definition of "routine maintenance and repair", and there was a lot of conversation about 100 sq. ft. possibly being a lot in some situations and some conversation about using percentages, so we want open dialogue about what those thresholds should be. Maybe it is a percentage with a maximum square footage in tandem, so don't get hung up on the numbers, but let's discuss them. Staff's intent is to provide some ability for staff to say yes or no and move it on, and if we feel uncomfortable about it or if there is any question, we would involve members of the Commission. There also is a number of things that fall under this as a continuation of that definition.

Warren indicated that staff then added two sentences in two other locations within the regulations. In Subsection 1509, the sentence added states, "Applications deemed by the Director as meeting the definition of routine maintenance and repair, as defined herein, may be issued administratively." In Subsection 1509.01 a sentence was added to say, "If an application is found to qualify for a Certificate of No Effect and is deemed to meet the definition of routine maintenance and repair, the Director shall issue a Certificate of No Effect within seven working days of receipt of the complete application".

Warren summarized that the three areas of change were adding the routine maintenance and repair back in and adding the two sentences. The reason that staff is pushing a little bit to have this conversation again and possibly work through some of the differences on the thresholds is that it has become clear that this is a voluntary participation program, and our fear is that participants may choose to perform work not following the process, if they believe it is too cumbersome and there is a little thing they want to do, and worst of all, participants may request to have the landmark designation removed and leave the program all together, so staff is trying to seek a balance.

Warren explained that the balance is preserving our past for future generations and trying to maintain a limited ability for property owners to utilize, maintain and update their property within the bounds of the landmark designation as we might find a way to codify a process. In the long-term, his understanding is that we are going to work through the language so it can be presented in May at the Open House, and if everything goes as planned, we plan to take action on this in June.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked at what point the City Attorney reviews this, and Warren indicated that he has sent them certain versions, but he has not sent this most recent one, so he will make a note to do that. He then asked if there is a particular concern to let him know and he will make sure they focus on that.

Chair Unger stated that she is still concerned about 100 sq. ft. We discussed doing a percentage instead, like 5% or 10% and not to exceed some square footage. With 100 sq. ft., that is 10'x10' and that is a fairly big piece. For example, the log cabin for the charter school, a 10'x10' of that would cover a majority of that, and if we did a percentage up to 100 sq. ft., then that is something that they have done in other certificates.

Commissioner Segner stated that he didn't like 100 sq. ft. at all, but it is not the 100 sq. ft., he doesn't like the words "repair and maintenance", because people don't bring repair and maintenance to the City. They bring things to the City that are for permits, so he doesn't know that this is even an issue with the City as much as the owners in what they are allowed to do with their property. You are allowed to do maintenance and repair as long as it is exactly the same on the exterior as the existing. Somebody could say they are just going to paint, but they could paint with the wrong kind of paint like a high gloss instead of a low gloss. Repair and maintenance means he could do whatever he wants to keep it up and running; he could caulk with a latex caulking, but no you can't. It needs to be defined that you can do repair and maintenance as long as it is in the same type and texture. He can't understand if somebody wants to do something why they can't put on a piece of paper what they want to do, it comes in and is reviewed, and we give an answer within 48 hours; things can go wrong.

Chair Unger asked about certain homeowners' associations where buildings have been there for a long time, and then the association changes the requirements to include a color requirement. For the most part if it is grandfathered, then it is considered fine and you don't have to go to them. What if we somehow spoke to the fact that if they were not altering the original and going to go with the same original application of materials, etc., that would mean that it was maintenance and repair done within the confines of it being historic? Commissioner Segner indicated he understood, but what is confusing is use of the words "maintenance and repair", it says to the client that they need to go to the City and the City will probably sign off on it, but they don't need to come to the City for maintenance and repair. They have to understand when they sign up is that they are going to maintain it in the same fashion.

Chair Unger added that one of the difficulties is for somebody who buys one of these homes and might not understand the difference between the air coming through the walls of the building, so they are going to go out and caulk every one of those cracks so it is solid, and then they will paint it, and that is going to be fine, because that is maintenance and repair and making it more safe, so do they really need to go to the City, and that is what Commissioner Segner's concern is.

Commissioner Segner stated that his problem is that we are an advisory organization, but we are not being advised. We are here to help, not hinder. We are here to say that we have some expertise that can help them maintain their house, so if they are going to do something, how do they use our resource? We go out and say here is how they could do it. We aren't doing that; we are pushing that aside and saying that we are this huge obstacle and we want to make things really simple. He gets that, but really it is an old historic building and if you are going to do something on the exterior, there ought to be a cursory conversation.

Chair Unger indicated that she and Audree Juhlin had discussed that the Commission could be going forward with something that staff would not recommend to the City Council, and she wants to make sure that what we are doing is something we can all stand behind, and she thinks that she understands Commissioner Segner's concern and she understands that we are trying to make this simpler, so people don't feel it is a big obstruction.

Warren stated that before responding to that, he wanted to ask Commissioner Segner if he is suggesting that there is something called "repair and maintenance" that people could do without even coming in and asking. Commissioner Segner stated absolutely, but we need to define it somehow. Warren then asked if these items would fall within that category, and Commissioner Segner indicated yes, if you added that as long as you used same for same or something along that line, as you are replacing same for same paint, color, texture, etc., and if you have a question you could come to the City and ask. They also have to have some idea of what they are allowed to do.

Chair Unger then confirmed that Commissioner Segner is saying same for same, but her question is what if they think same for same is doing the latex and filling in those cracks every little inch, so the air doesn't get through. Commissioner Segner indicated that he understands that anytime you leave it open, it is open for interpretation.

Audree Juhlin explained that what Commissioner Segner is trying to describe is you have guidelines in districts on what your maintenance and repair entails, and they are very specific and talk about architecture, color, texture, materials, etc., but they apply to a district. When you have a landmark, the landmark documents themselves, which we have discussed in the past, have to define those characteristics in the approved landmark, so that individual landmark sets up the parameters and the property owners know what is minor and major. In most other cities that have historic preservation, they have a Certificate of No Effect that is basically an over-the-counter approval process for anything that requires a building permit. For anything that does not require a building permit, they could ask for advice from staff or the Commission or they could do it based on the property's district guidelines or the landmark's document itself.

Chair Unger then asked if from Audree's standpoint, we really don't need to add anything to this, we could just leave it as is, but Commissioner Segner is saying that we need to add something to this. Commissioner Segner then stated that they shouldn't have to come to the City unless it is a major thing. Unless they need a permit, they don't come to the City; however, Audree then explained that currently, we are basically saying that we want see it. For example, they don't need a permit for that bench, but is this something that you would be comfortable allowing staff to do if it doesn't take away from the historical context, etc.? The roof doesn't require a permit if it is just a roof replacement, so you need to think about how you want to do it. Most communities say that if it requires a permit, it requires an approval from at least staff if it is minor; if it is major, then from the Commission.

Chair Unger indicated that in certain instances, it depends on how much we really feel. She thinks that the percentage of size makes sense instead of 100 sq. ft. Audree Juhlin then asked how that would work with something like the bench, and Commissioner Segner added or a light by the front door; he goes to Home Depot and buys a new light. He doesn't know if it should be in the Code, but somehow the owners have to have an understanding that the exterior must remain the same. If there are any questions on how to maintain, paint or repair, then they can come to the City for direction.

Chair Unger indicated that her question, that may be a fault, is that we haven't really delineated for the people who have bought these homes from someone who had it landmarked what that means, and this is one of the reasons we are doing this thing in May, and maybe on a regular basis, we need to let each homeowner know what the things are. She has been on the side of that for a long time, and Audree has the right idea about what is important to that house in terms of what it looks like. Maybe we need to be more attentive to the fact that we have these owners that don't understand that. We only have 24 of them, and what is sort of funny is that Phoenix has thousands of them and she wouldn't want to have to think of it in those terms; some of them are neighborhoods, but others are outside of neighborhoods. Here we only have 24, and if we can make everyone aware of what it is about their home that is important to bring to us, then we could do that.

Commissioner Segner stated that we can do things the hard way or the easy way, and the hard way is the City way of writing everything down and hoping you covered everything, but finding out you didn't, so you write some more. We know we can do it that hard way, but why don't we take the easy way and just say if you have a landmark home and you are going to do any exterior improvement over \$500, we ask that you notify the City. We are trying to stop them from making a mistake that they didn't know they were going to make. The City will listen to what they have to say and you can make a recommendation, but if you think they are really going down the wrong track, then staff would bring it to the Commission. He doesn't want them to say they had no idea, because then it is too late. We want to make it simple for them and we can just give them a nice letter that says to remember that you have a historic home and if you are going to make any major decisions or any work over \$500, just get pre-approval from the City, or something to that effect.

Chair Unger stated that she is funny about the \$500 as much as he is about the 100 sq. ft., because they could replace a window and there we are with a window that is not suitable. Commissioner Segner indicated that he understood . . . just have a logical statement that if you were an owner, you would say you had better go to the City and talk with them about this, and if they talk to the counter people, that would be fine. Audree clarified that the counter people wouldn't be doing that.

Commissioner Grams suggested that Commissioner Segner add to the \$500 a statement about original windows, doors, fixtures, etc. cannot be replaced without approval. Audree Juhlin explained that other communities have two possible things you can do. One is a Certificate of No Effect and one is the Certificate of Appropriateness. Any exterior work requires one of the two and that way you don't have a percentage, square footage, dollar amount, etc.

Commissioner Segner then stated that they just apply for a certificate of compliance or whatever, and the counter people would look at it and say . . . staff stated no and again clarified that it would be Audree or Warren. Chair Unger indicated that she still worries that people don't really understand what the maintenance is and to have the Certificate of No Effect. The way staff constructed this is really good, and yes, unfortunately she hates a lot of words and she wishes we could just do this and not have to think about it, but she doesn't want us to lose something in a detail. For example, they could decide that the gutters don't look good, so they are going to just pull them down as maintenance and put up another gutter, when the gutter was actually part of the construction of when the home was built. Commissioner Segner explained that he was speaking to not so much this document as to the probable need for another document to review what we are trying to do, and we would say that we have rewritten this so you understand this is what you need to do, because that makes the two sides come together. Chair Unger agreed that made sense.

Warren Campbell stated that he doesn't know that this is the ultimate language that should be approved, but in the proposed language, it says in the second paragraph of 1509, "Requests for exterior improvements, including alterations, restoration, renovation, reconstruction, or new construction for exterior work on landmarks that are deemed to be of "no effect" by the Chairperson and Director may be eligible for a Certificate of No Effect", so that is a critical point where two people are deciding if it is of no effect or not. If so, and if the Director finds that it is routine

maintenance and repair, we can then do it administratively. So, there is a touchpoint that may alleviate some of the concern of naivety.

Commissioner Segner stated that is fine. We need to pull that out and put it into a form that they can understand. Warren Campbell indicated that the question is that we have the check-in, the touchpoint with the Chair or designee, and if that is determined to be routine maintenance as ultimately defined, we could do it administratively, because there is a touchpoint to determine CofA or CNE. He then explained that we have tried to suggest in the definition that anything that is changing a contributing factor is not routine maintenance, even if it is one of these things, and although we didn't say "same for same", we said matches the existing in terms of material, dimension, color, texture, reflectivity and overall appearance, so we tried to cover that more broadly, because same for same could be that it is red paint, although it is a different kind. With the threshold of money, he has seen them break their project into five phases, so it is under \$500 each time. No matter what you do, people get creative, but we are trying to find a way to make a few things move along, and what is really telling here is a roof doesn't need a building permit.

Commissioner Segner indicated that we want them to come to us voluntarily. If they had a metal roof and want to put on a new roof, we can't stop them with a permit, but if they came to us, we would talk to them. Chair Unger stated that what has been constructed as wording for the article is great and what Commissioner Segner is saying is very important. We need to make each of the 23 landmark owners aware, and three of those are owned by the City, so we can cut that to 20; however, Audree clarified that the City owns five of them. Commissioner Segner agreed and stated that Warren indicated that they didn't need one for a roof, but they do. They can't touch anything on the exterior of that building without coming to us; he doesn't care what it is, so they have to come in and say that they are going to put in new windows and we say, "Whoa, let's talk about that"; we can't put all of those things in writing. Warren Campbell noted that the Commissioner made a statement that was pretty hard and fast, "No exterior changes without coming in and completing an application." Commissioner Segner stated that all they have to do is fill out that application; you are protecting your building, so why is it so hard to fill out an application saying what you are going to do on the exterior of the building. Then, it goes to staff and you look at it and say it is fine; he doesn't have a problem with that.

Warren Campbell then asked if Commissioner Segner is suggesting that everything should require an application, but not everything needs to go through . . . Commissioner Segner interjected that was right. An application process makes people think about what they are going to do and it gives an opportunity for someone to say you might be out of line, so let's check on it. Warren Campbell explained that is what staff was suggesting. All things submit an application and once staff receives it, there is a decision-making touchpoint where the Chair and Director or their appointees will decide if that will get a checkmark for a Certificate of No Effect or Certificate of Appropriateness.

Commissioner Segner explained that where he is off is where it says repair of 100 sq. ft. by defining it before they even have to come in; however, Audree clarified that is not what it is saying. Chair Unger stated that only applies when it is a Certificate of No Effect or a Certificate of Appropriateness, and Audree then explained that it is setting the groundwork that anything over that threshold is going to go for a Certificate of Appropriateness and Warren Campbell added, no matter what.

Chair Unger indicated that is the only drawback she has; she would prefer for it to say 5% or under 100 sq. ft. She still thinks that is a good part to have in there; it just makes it easier for people to look at, but she also thinks that we aren't talking about having no application at all; we're just trying to make it easier and that still falls within that range, so she sees this as the way to go forward.

Warren Campbell then indicated that to say it differently, staff will not administratively approve and release an application unless it has been deemed to be a Certificate of No Effect and that will be a partnership decision, and secondarily, there is agreement that it falls under this definition. We can

work on the definition with percentages, square footages, roofs or no roofs, but there is going to be that conversation.

Commissioner Segner stated that all that is important to him is that you dedicated the building and you lost some freedom, and the only thing you lost is that you have to go to the City and let them know what you plan to do to the exterior of the building. That is the tradeoff, and then you have a system in place that he is comfortable with, but he still wants somebody to come and say that they are going to paint their house, and they fill out the application, so we have paperwork showing all of the things done to the old homes as time has passed . . . like they replaced windows in 2013. He likes the process that they have to come forward and it is not that hard. Warren Campbell noted that staff was not suggesting that they wouldn't have to do that.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff is basically saying that for any exterior work you have to get approval – either a Certificate of No Effect or a Certificate of Appropriateness, and then working out the details as to how the approval process will work is what we are trying to figure out now.

Chair Unger stated that one thing Audree was thinking was that if somebody comes in and a member of the Commission isn't available to speak to someone, her concern was that we then haul it down a rabbit hole for some length of time, so she is saying that there could be a number of things that don't need to go through the process of the Commission needing to be contacted. Audree Juhlin explained that we want to have that discussion, like she doesn't have to let the Planning & Zoning Commission know of a 2,000 sq. ft. development project – staff can do it, so is there some threshold with this Commission? It happens with all of the other Commissions in a community where staff has a certain level of having the ability to do something, but it is usually based on those very detailed specific guidelines for the area, so it pretty much tells you everything like the nails, colors, materials, etc., which we are lacking here. We don't have that, and that is the problem that we are all struggling with, because we haven't defined that.

Chair Unger agreed and said that the definition initially is the definition for each of the individual buildings; that is the one we go with for both, and Audree Juhlin agreed. The Chair then said if additionally you want to add the 100 sq. ft., she would rather do a percentage, but she doesn't know how critical that is going to be. The critical thing is for us to carefully spend time making a decision on each one of those.

Commissioner Segner stated that is the hard way and he really fights the hard way. He really would like to come back and let staff do it and say if in what you are going to do you cannot see any changes you made, then it is probably okay. He is trying to make it easier, not harder. Chair Unger then suggested making that the first step, but to make people understand that, we need the other. Commissioner Segner added that if you did a questionnaire and the first thing was will the change be noticeable at all? If it is no, then staff . . . , the Chair interjected that the problem is that someone might think they can take out all of those windows, because they are just putting in new windows and it won't be that noticeable. Audree Juhlin suggested using the caulking as the example; most people wouldn't notice a change except those people who know what they are talking about.

Donna Puckett noted that in the a. and c. in the proposed language where the 100 sq. ft. is mentioned, it clearly states that it matches the existing in terms of material, dimension, color, texture, reflectivity and overall appearance, so she is not sure what the real concern is on the square footage, when it has to be same for same. Chair Unger stated that she would just take the square footage out. Audree Juhlin pointed out that would open it up even bigger than what you were talking about and Chair Unger agreed it could make it bigger, but it would also . . .

Commissioner Segner stated that if you are using the matching materials and existing, and you take the square footage out, and they say they are going to do that, do they have to come to the City and get approval, and Chair Unger stated yes. Commissioner Segner then stated that 100 sq. ft. just throws him. Donna pointed out that the owners would probably think it was onerous if they had to wait and talk to the Commission when they were not changing anything.

Commissioner Segner said the language is pretty good and Chair Unger agreed, but indicated that the 100 sq. ft. says . . . Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that the 100 sq. ft. is too large and she would favor a percentage like 10%, and she has comments on some of the other wording of this definition, if we are ready to hear other comments.

Audree Juhlin explained that the 100 sq. ft. is to delineate the process; it is going to go to the full Commission or to the Chair and staff person, so staff is trying to figure out where that line is and where the Commission is comfortable with it, without having to go through a two-month process to get it before the Commission. Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that she would say 20 sq. ft. We have to make sure they are not ruining the whole thing and 100 sq. ft. is huge. The Chair agreed that 100 sq. ft. is huge, because it is 10'x10' and on a small building . . . Audree Juhlin added and it is like for like and nothing has changed, because it has to be the rest of that sentence too. If it is not like for like, she doesn't care if it is five square feet, it is coming before the Commission.

Chair Unger restated that she would change the 100 sq. ft. to a percentage and Vice Chair Jarmusch agreed. Commissioner Segner indicated that it also bothers him, but as long as it has to go to the staff and if they have any doubts they would bring it to the Commission . . . Audree Juhlin noted that it could be made looser by saying that, and you would have to trust us in working with the Chair, any exterior work has to come before the first review between the staff and the Chair or designee, and then we would determine if it goes to the Commission or not, but the bad thing about that is that it doesn't give the property owners any sense of timing in which they can do something. It is either going to be a week or two months.

Commissioner Segner stated that he liked that method the best, and if we say they would have an answer within 72 hours or they automatically get their permit, it puts the onus on the Commission to get our act together.

Warren Campbell noted that we don't mention "emergency repair" anywhere, but we are envisioning that would fall within a Certificate of No Effect, and we would try to even accelerate the whole seven days. The seven days was to give someone an expectation. Audree added that most notifications won't meet that criterion if it is 20 sq. ft. or whatever.

Chair Unger indicated that if somebody drives through the front of a house and they need to do something right away, they are probably going to board it up initially, and Commissioner Segner added that they aren't going to put a new roof on tomorrow; however, Audree pointed out that the reason for the one we had two years ago was that they contacted the roofer and it was done the next day.

Warren Campbell noted that he has seen water heaters burst and there was water damage, etc., so some things move surprisingly fast, but sometimes you have to stabilize. Commissioner Segner indicated that stabilizing for 72 hours or 48 hours is something we are going to run into, and he doesn't know that the way we were told was the way that situation exactly went down either. He has never found a roofer that could be there the next day and do the entire roof; it just doesn't happen that way. If somebody comes in and makes a change and you guys look at it, and if in your judgment it might be a little hinky, then you go to phase two, but he is a firm believer in some judgmental call by somebody at some point. Chair Unger agreed, but the 100 sq. ft. is more of a perception thing for her that throws her, and that is why she thinks the percentage would be better. It is more of a perception, not for us, but the public, like 5% of the house is this much, but with 100 sq. ft., people aren't going to really relate to it, except it sounds big.

Commissioner Segner stated that most people think in bullet points, and you are thinking in detail, but if he is talking to a customer what are the bullet points. If you do anything on the exterior, you have to go to the City and fill out a little form, and he will get an answer within X amount of time, so he does one, two and three. If it is going to be a big deal like putting on another wing, that is probably going to be a long process.

Chair Unger then noted that Vice Chair Jarmusch had some other comments; however, Donna Puckett asked if the Commission is looking at 10% of the square footage, and the Chair asked Warren for his thoughts. Warren explained that there is a lot of validity to removing the number and just saying repair and/or replacement of any wall material with new material that matches . . . Chair Unger agreed with just removing the number. Warren added that we are forgetting that there is going to be a touchpoint with the Chair, and staff is going to say we got this application and we think it is a Certificate of No Effect and it is routine maintenance, but what do you think? You will say yes, and then that is it.

Chair Unger stated that she is happy with that. Donna Puckett then asked if there was a consensus on that, Commissioner Segner stated yes, Commissioner Grams stated yes and Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if we were going to remove the 100 sq. ft. The Chair stated yes and the Vice Chair then stated yes. No objection was expressed. Warren stated that it was actually in there to give the Commission more comfort, but the Chair stated, "Let's get it out", and Commissioner Segner noted that the comfort comes from going through this whole process and talking it out.

Commissioner Grams noted that a change or repair is a change or repair, and if it is a window, you can't say it is 2% or 5% or 1% or square feet; it is just an issue of what it is. Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if we would also remove the 100 sq. ft. from c. and 25 linear feet from d. Chair Unger stated yes.

Vice Chair Jarmusch then indicated that she didn't understand c. under Routine Maintenance and Repair in 1503 in that it refers to interior wall cladding material or a protected material with new material that matches. Any interior wall cladding is not our business unless it is a designated interior. Audree Juhlin agreed and indicated that is why she wants to go back to having criteria for each landmark. Commissioner Segner indicated that we have never done interiors; however, Audree and the Chair stated that we have. The Chair gave the example of the Gassaway House fireplace tile.

Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked if we could remove "any interior wall cladding material", and Audree Juhlin indicated yes. The Vice Chair noted that would leave "a protected interior with new material that matches the existing . . .

Vice Chair Jarmusch referenced g. on page 5 and stated that she didn't understand the last clause where it is talking about paint or stain finishes. She thinks it is the word "identify" that is throwing her. She then read, ". . . finish does not change the existing texture of the cladding" and that is understandable, but she didn't understand the last clause that says, ". . . and does not identify any finish colors and/or finish locations specific to the designated historic resource.

Audree Juhlin confirmed that it was in there before and stated that it came out of Phoenix. Warren stated that he wondered if it meant that it is not a finish that the property is identified by like some house might be known as the red house, and they are saying that you can paint it unless that is the identifiable feature. Audree Juhlin stated that staff would relook at that one. Commissioner Segner suggested putting "historic" in front of color; it is the historic color that is identified . . .

Vice Chair Jarmusch then referenced page 2 in the Certification of Economic Hardship definition and indicated that she thinks it should say "A document issued by the Commission when a property owner demonstrates with clear and convincing evidence that a reasonable rate of return cannot be . . .", because we want to get that the property owner is . . . Warren interjected that is what it was trying to get at, and further in the document . . . Vice Chair Jarmusch then added that she took the language from another part; the word "demonstrating" bothers her, because we do not demonstrate it, it has to be proven. Chair Unger then referenced page 18 under Economic Hardship.

Vice Chair Jarmusch then suggested saying a document issued by the Commission after a hearing concluding that or that we have come to this conclusion, but we don't demonstrate it. We are evaluating evidence that comes to us. Chair Unger agreed and stated that the onus is not on the

Commission; the onus is on the homeowner; however, Commissioner Segner pointed out that kind of applies to commercial property. What bothers him about that clause is what happens if the state passes the regulation where you can rent your home out, and they say they have this historic home and they can't get a decent return on investment, so therefore it is a giant loophole and he doesn't like loopholes. If it is commercial, then say for commercial only or in a commercial district or define commercial. Audree Juhlin indicated that she doesn't think we would be able to get over that one. This will be a question for our attorney, but she doesn't think we will have any ability to regulate over that.

Commissioner Segner explained that he doesn't want somebody coming in and buying these, and then saying look at this clause that says they can get out of it. He wants to make sure the clause is tight. Audree Juhlin indicated that staff would ask that question, because that is a really good point. Commissioner Segner the suggested that we write it in such a way that that is not commercial; we don't want a house being able to get out of it, because they want to rent the house and they can't because it needs to be fixed up or needs two wings.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked if they want her suggested language or just delete the word "demonstrating" and put in a different word. The Chair indicated that she should put in her wording, but staff will talk to the attorney about it. Warren indicated that he didn't see a problem in saying, "When a property owner demonstrates . . ." and Vice Chair Jarmusch stated okay.

Audree Juhlin reminded the Commission that this is just a definition of process, but that is a great question. Chair Unger summarized that we would be removing "demonstrating" and putting in "when a property owner demonstrates . . ."

Vice Chair Jarmusch indicated that she could send Warren her grammatical things and the Chair agreed and indicated that the whole Commission didn't need to hear the grammatical things. The Vice Chair then referenced the definition of Protected Interior on page 4 and asked why we have to require it to be a publicly accessible interior space. Warren Campbell asked if it is a protected interior, how we ensure it is not being altered. The Vice Chair noted that we have designated interiors, and we have the ability to inspect; however, Commissioner Segner stated that we can't go into the house and look. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked what the point of designating an interior is then, and Warren explained that the change was to put people on notice that we might knock on the door to ensure that the tile floor is still there.

Chair Unger asked if we would be able to do that legally and Audree Juhlin indicated yes, if it is a designated landmark and they agreed to it, but you can remove "any publicly accessible interior space", so it just reads that it is customarily open for inspection; we can rewrite that.

Vice Chair Jarmusch referenced item 1513 on page 19 in the third line where the sentence begins with, "Certain requirements of the Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of No Effect shall be reviewed for compliance", and she asked about removing the word "certain", so it just says, "Requirements of the Certificate, such as signs and site development shall be reviewed for compliance. "Certain" could give them a loophole.

Commissioner Segner asked what would happen if the Gassaway House removed all of the tile and redid everything. Audree Juhlin indicated that there would be nothing we could do; there is enforcement, but you couldn't get the tile back.

Chair Unger noted that the Commission would like for staff to make these adjustments, so the Commission can present this at our meeting in May with the people who have landmarks, so they can see the changes and understand them, so we will move on to the next agenda item.

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

The Chair stated that what we have done has given us a sketch of what needs to be changed in that document as it was handed to us, and this is not an item that we have to actually vote on. Commissioner Segner then cautioned that we don't want to go to the meeting at his place and bring out this giant document and everybody starts asking what this means. We want to just say here are four bullet points, so if you are going to do something, just call and they will walk you through it.

Commissioner Grams stated that would absolutely ruin the whole thing. You get 30 people there going like we have done, and every one of them will have a different opinion. Commissioner Segner suggested handing them a packet when they leave, and Commissioner Grams agreed.

Chair Unger noted that the next meeting will be canceled, because she won't be present, but we were talking about a meeting before the event. She then indicated that Vice Chair Jarmusch might be able to help staff make a quick sketch of the changes made; however, Commissioner Segner indicated that all we have to do is say if you are going to make any exterior changes, please go to the City, because we are a resource to help you.

The Chair indicated that we also have to say that we have made changes to make it easier for them, and Audree Juhlin agreed that it could just be in bullet points to tell them where the complete document can be found, and if they have any comments or questions to contact Warren. The Chair added that we can also let them know that we are going to do another review of their homes, so we can give them a package that is individually crafted for them.

Commissioner Grams asked if the Commission is going to do that and the Chair stated yes; we have to do it if we are asking to look at it the way we are discussing it. Warren Campbell indicated that a suggestion to sell that is we have several new Commission members and staff members, so if they are willing, we would like to have some access so we can all learn and note the critical features, etc. We have to seek partnerships to access them; if they say no . . . Audree pointed out that we also need to check with Legal to ensure we are not overstepping bounds by requiring it.

Commissioner Segner suggested saying it has been several years and we have new members, so we are going to relook at all of the properties and we will give you a copy of the document showing what we feel is significant. Chair Unger explained that for the most part we have been able to see the pieces of the property from the road; however, Warren Campbell noted that some properties are hard to see from the road. Commissioner Segner added that if they say no, we will just stay outside.

Commissioner Grams asked if they could say that the Commission is required by new changes that are taking place to update, etc., so we will probably be contacting them to visit the property and update our information. You have to do it in a conversational way and not in a documentary type thing that scares them, but don't have the party if you are going to get into this.

Chair Unger then indicated that staff had contacted Allyson about a date for the event; however, Audree explained that we don't have a date. Commissioner Segner indicated that there were a couple of dates, but pick one and it is fine with him. Chair Unger noted that there were some dates that Commissioner Segner was going to be out of town, and Commissioner Segner stated indicated he would be unavailable the 18th of May, but between May 1st and 18th would be fine. He then suggested the 3rd, 4th, or 5th or the 10th, 11th, or 12th. Warren Campbell then mentioned that the Commission wanted another meeting on the document before that.

Chair Unger stated that the HPC meeting is on the 16th, so we need to move the meeting forward. Audree explained that the Commission's regular meeting date would be May 9th, and Donna Puckett explained that the Commission had discussed having the event on the 9th or 12th and you were going to move the meeting to the 16th, so the Commission could discuss the feedback from the event, so you wouldn't lose a whole month until the June meeting; however, Allyson indicated that she thought she had the 19th on her calendar and she wasn't sure that a firm date had been set.

Chair Unger then indicated that with the changes that have been made, we will have another chance to go over this, and Commissioner Grams stated that we don't want to go over it at the event. Commissioner Segner agreed that we don't have to go over the details with them.

Warren Campbell then stated that in June he will notice the document for final action; it is still a working document, so if there is some input from the public in May, we can evaluate that. He will make the changes we discussed, but we can still talk about it in June.

Commissioner Grams stated that she wouldn't hand out anything at that party. Commissioner Segner then indicated that we should just thank them and say that we are a resource to help them and if they have any questions about what to do with their homes . . . , then we could say that we will be sending them a packet in the next few months. Warren Campbell suggested asking for emails on the sign-in sheet.

Audree Juhlin stated that we have to let them know that we are making changes, but we don't have to discuss it as part of your party. Commissioner Grams agreed that you can say that we are updating the rules and regulations, but you don't need to get into the detail.

Kurt Gehlbach indicated that he liked the idea of getting their email addresses and Commissioner Grams agreed that the Commission should get their email addresses, phone numbers, etc. Chair Unger stated that we don't have to do a handout, but we do have to tell them that we are making changes so it will be an easier process.

Commissioner Segner then stated that while they are eating and drinking, we can say that they all have landmarked homes and we are putting a new process in place, so if you are going to do anything to your home and have any questions, you can go to the counter and get your questions answered, and we can expedite anything that you might do. You will be getting more information in the future. Thank you very much, the hors d'oeuvres are here.

Vice Chair Jarmusch suggested mentioning the public hearing date, and Warren Campbell indicated that we would do that, and we will be sending a letter to all of their addresses to let them know the date of the party, so that is why it is critical to get the date of the party. Donna Puckett then added that if they want the Mayor or Council to be invited, we need a date to get on their calendar.

Audree Juhlin noted that staff will not be available on the 12th, and Kurt Gehlbach noted that May 9th is Mother's Day weekend. The Chair then asked about having it on a Friday, and Audree pointed out that staff is off on Friday and the City Council is meeting on the 10th and 11th.

Audree Juhlin asked about Monday, May 16th, and it was then determined by the Commission and staff that the event would be on Monday, May 16th and the Commission's next meeting would be on May 9th.

Commissioner Danilevics indicated that he would like to schedule something to discuss on the 9th and Commissioner Segner suggested meeting on the 9th to plan for the 16th. The Chair then stated that the Commission will meet on the 9th at 4:00 p.m. and on the 16th we will have the event.

The Chair asked about a time for the event and the Commission determined that 5:30 p.m. would work best, because people work until 5:00 p.m. and an ending time would not be given. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked if there were any ideas for a speaker, and Audree Juhlin indicated that there are funds for a speaker and to pay for the food; however, Commissioner Segner stated that he didn't mind taking care of the food.

Chair Unger noted that the HP Conference is the following month and she wondered if they would consider sending a speaker. Audree Juhlin indicated that part of their CLG is to provide that kind of support. The Commission then agreed that it would be nice to have someone from SHPO there,

and Audree Juhlin indicated that staff will call them and ask. Vice Chair Jarmusch added that it would also add prestige to the event.

Commissioner Segner stated that we should have something for the people that says the home they own or their address or something to say they own a home. Audree Juhlin indicated that we will have photos of all of the homes up, and Chair Unger stated that it would be nice for the homeowners to meet someone from SHPO there. Commissioner Grams added that they could give an enthusiastic speech about what is happening throughout the state and nation, so they can feel that they are part of something very big and important, but don't get into these documents – you will ruin the party if you do.

8. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items

- **April 11, 2016**

Chair Unger stated that in the next meeting, we can discuss how we are going to approach all of these homeowners. Commissioner Danilevics proposed adding a conversation regarding the historical landmark property at 250 Brewer Rd. for a future date to discuss the proper use of this historic landmark property in accordance with its historic meaning in the upcoming Master Plan for the new Ranger Station Park. Audree Juhlin explained that the Commission can do that, but it is kind of premature at this stage, because we have the Conceptual done and we are in the process of doing the final. When the final is more in its form, we will be bringing it back to the Commission at that time.

Chair Unger asked if we could still make an objection to it, and Audree explained that the Commission is going to see the detailed Conceptual; we have what the Commission and Council said they wanted to see in it and we are putting that into specifics. Chair Unger noted that there are some things in there that we probably want to look at, so if that is the case, then she agrees with Commissioner Danilevics in that we really want to look at that. Audree Juhlin noted that staff's vision now is what the City Council approved, so whatever they said they want to see is what we have to bring forward. Commissioner Grams stated that there is one thing that is very definitely objectionable for her.

Donna Puckett asked, since there is no April meeting, and you will only have the May 9th meeting before your event, if there is anything else that needs to be underway or planned for May 9th. Commissioner Grams asked if staff would be doing the name tags and Audree stated yes. Commissioner Grams stated that she would be happy to help put them together.

Chair Unger noted that Commissioner Segner and Commissioner Holmes will continue to meet and indicated that if they need some visuals, she can do those. Commissioner Segner then indicated that he and Allyson will get it worked out, and if they need help, they will come back to staff. Audree Juhlin stated that we would then send out a request for volunteers.

Commissioner Segner stated that we are going to invite the 30 homeowners, the City Council, the press, and bring somebody up from Phoenix. Chair Unger asked about offering a room for SHPO; however, the Commissioner indicated that he didn't know that he would have any room available.

Vice Chair Jarmusch mentioned a previous discussion about her writing an article about preservation for publication in May, and she can't promise that she is going to do it, but she hasn't forgotten. The idea would be about the Williamson House and how adaptable a historic home could be. Chair Unger indicated that would be great and it would just need to be sent to Audree and Warren, because it has to go through Communications. Audree Juhlin added that Deborah Beck would love that.

9. Adjournment

Chair Unger asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Kurt Gehlbach moved to adjourn. Commissioner Danilevics seconded the motion.

Hearing no objection, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission held on March 14, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date