

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Meeting**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 106, Sedona, Arizona**  
**Monday, July 11, 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., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

**Roll Call:**

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

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

**2. Commission and Staff announcements**

Audree Juhlin announced that on July 11<sup>th</sup> the City had an open house on the Midgely Bridge suicide prevention barrier and a few people attended that. It will go for formal action of a resolution supporting some kind of suicide prevention on July 26<sup>th</sup>. SHPO, as the acting authority, has signed off on the design. It is not in the City limits; otherwise, we would be bringing it to the Commission.

Warren Campbell stated that in response to an email from Vice Chair Jarmusch regarding his update on the Ranger Station, she asked who had been selected to do this next phase of the park design, and it is a group called Norris Design out of Flagstaff, and the Project Manager is Aaron Haynes, who lives in the VOC; we have not selected a demo contractor yet. The Vice Chair also asked about future consultants for restoration, etc., but we haven't gotten that far yet. Audree Juhlin added that when we get to restoration, it will come before the Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness, so the Commission will be heavily involved at that point.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked how they can get notified about the Midgely Bridge meetings; she is on the City's email list. Audree explained that, since it is not agendaized for discussion, she can talk with the Vice Chair after the meeting about it.

**3. Approval of the June 13, 2016 minutes**

**MOTION: Vice Chair Jarmusch moved to approve the minutes of the June 13, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Segner seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioners Harry Danilevics, Kurt Gehlbach and Jane Grams were excused.**

**4. Discussion/direction on Article 15 Amendments**

Warren Campbell explained that we all thought this was put to bed last time, but based on the three items he was asked to research, one of the items caused him to talk with the counterpart, Mabry, out of Tucson, and he included some of the stuff they discussed in the packet, but it raised the question that staff believes what we have in the packet is probably appropriate to put into our Article 15, and if the Commission agrees, he would like that direction, and then he will notice the Article 15 Amendments again and let the Commission take action on some proposed language to include that, so we can all make sure we have language we like before going to P&Z.

Warren stated that one item to follow-up on was the possibility of recording a document on all landmarked properties to make it clear that they are designated and that there are regulations to be followed in a Title Report, and that already happens, so everyone should be aware of what they are buying.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked to see a copy of that and Warren indicated he could email one to them. The Vice Chair explained that she wanted to know if it says that the property is subject to regulations.

Warren then indicated that the next item was to incorporate some of the language that Mr. Mabry discussed regarding some of their documentation requirements, including proof of funding and financing for some properties, to follow through on a project if you take a project down. What he found was included in the memo, and they do have something that was included before Prop 207, which is part of their determination as to whether or not it is still a viable property, in that before you demo, you have to provide all of that documentation about what you are going to do and what will be financed, etc. While that piece might not be something we could put in place here, there is a piece that they put in place in 2011 that staff thinks would be quite appropriate to include, and it would be very helpful in a situation like Mr. Baney's where he wanted to demo the house, and thankfully allowed us to document, etc., but he didn't have to do that. Their regulation from 2011 is shown in the copy of the ordinance dated April 13, 2010 that says if you have a property that is 50 years or older, as a part of any demolition permit that our Building Department would see, you have to provide either Proof of Minor Documentation or Full Documentation, and those are described in detail.

Warren explained that essentially it is a process by which you write up a narrative, take some photographs, and for minor, there are more extensive requirements with a checklist shown on pages 3 and 4 of the ordinance, and they also are shown with the actual application that has a full checklist. If it is a full architectural documentation, there are things like writing up a history of it, who lived there and what it was used for, etc. Tucson adopted this in 2011, because it became clear to them that they can't prohibit demolition of a property that is owned by somebody, especially if that property is not designated, like the Baney house that had been surveyed, but not designated.

Warren indicated that Tucson's legal counsel said this is fine and we are working with our legal counsel to see if they agree that it would become an additional submittal requirement like others you have to do, and they wanted to make it as simple as they could, so a layperson could do it and it wouldn't seem like a financial burden that needed a professional, so if you were a homeowner and tearing down a property, you could sketch out the floorplan, and it didn't have to be per scale per se, photographs and a written narrative. There is an example of a full documentation by Rick Engineering to provide some historic documentation of the property before it is gone. If there are some special features about a house, include some really detailed photographs of them, etc., so it is not lost in time.

Commissioner Segner asked where that record would go and Warren indicated that he had the impression that they put it into their files. Audree added that we would attach it to the Springbrook parcel file. The Commissioner then asked if somebody could find it 20 years later, and Audree explained that everything we do is map-based, so you go to a parcel number; we all connect to that, so you can pull up any notes, attachments, etc.

Warren Campbell noted that the final Article 15 that was adopted at the last hearing was attached, and staff thinks there is validity to adding this, and this is the best time to do that. For the most part, it may be a copy and paste in the proper place in Article 15, and then we would bring it back before the Commission. If you agree, you just need to say that you want staff to do that.

Vice Chair Jarmusch asked about adding a plan for recycling building materials; however, Commissioner Segner stated that we can't force them to do it. The Vice Chair noted that we can't force them to do any of this. Commissioner Segner then commented that a plan means that they are going to recycle it, and Vice Chair Jarmusch pointed out that we ask for a plan for redevelopment. Commissioner Segner explained that if you say give us a plan to recycle it and they say they aren't going to recycle it . . . Warren Campbell suggested making it a checklist item and it could be optional, but it would put them on notice that it would be a great thing if they did it. Commissioner Holmes indicated it could be a like a suggestion.

The Vice Chair indicated that she is not sure how the Tucson review process works, but she would like to know how ours would work. It doesn't say that this comes to the Commission. Warren indicated that in Tucson it all goes to their HPO, which is John Mabry. Commissioner Segner then noted that the Commission would have no oversight or say. The Vice Chair then asked if it wouldn't be smart if the Commission was informed just like the survey notifies the Commission of potential . . . , Audree Juhlin stated that staff could be responsible for, like we did with the Baney property, saying that we have a situation occurring, but policies don't need to be included in the ordinance.

Commissioner Segner gave an example of a guy who is going to tear it down in two weeks and, for us to be notified, it would have to be on the agenda and we would have a meeting in six weeks. Audree then explained that it would just be an informational notice that we have a property and they are going to submit for a demo. Warren Campbell pointed out that as in the case with Baney, by the time more than just Brynn was aware, it was coming down as we talked. This would allow us to do what we did with Mr. Baney's house, but he didn't have to and this would allow us to get that information, and they would have to do it instead of us paying Nancy Burgess a couple thousand dollars to do this for us, so it at least preserves something for posterity sake.

Chair Unger added that we would at least have a history of it and that is what we are driving for, because unless we landmark it, we don't have the authority to stop anything. Warren noted that this also would be for every house that is 50 years or older, so it could be one we have never surveyed. Commissioner Segner indicated that what is good about this is it won't save a house from coming down, but he had a house and paid a firm to do a study, and they went back to the '20s in county records and put a whole kit together about the house as to who built it, who owned it, etc., so by putting that information in the public record, it is there and somebody can look it up if they want to. Audree Juhlin noted that if it is open-ended, Harmony is at that age, so every mobile home in this area could be subject to this too.

Warren Campbell asked if there should be some sort of an exemption for manufactured or mobile homes and Commissioner Segner stated yes, and then indicated that they are not really mobile homes; they were brought in and dropped down. Commissioner Holmes noted that they are manufactured homes. Commissioner Segner then indicated that all of a sudden we could open up a can of worms, so just keep it simple. All they are going to do is draw a little thing; otherwise, what defines a mobile home, etc., so just leave it. Commissioner Holmes commented that it should be a historic district there.

Vice Chair Jarmusch then pointed out that in one paragraph it says any property in excess of 50 years old, but as you stated, it is 50 years or older, and Warren explained that it would be written like it is in the ordinance. The Vice Chair also pointed out the reference on the first page to the Historic Planning Commission under background, and she thinks it should say the Historic Preservation Commission. She then asked if the Planning & Zoning Commission had changed its name to Planning & Environmental, and Warren stated no. The Vice Chair then asked about the word "leveraging" and how it would work when staff feels it may be appropriate in the last paragraph of point #2. Warren explained that talks about how it plays into the rezoning process, and the thought was that there may be added language to say that if the redevelopment of a site is going to need a rezoning, maybe you don't get the demo right away. Maybe they have to hold off until we have a full conversation. Commissioner Segner stated that in other words, instead of knocking down a house, because he is going to build a hotel, he would have to wait until he has his hotel approved; however, Warren added or as part of that review process.

Chair Unger indicated that it means that the property is not zoned for what they want to use if for, and we then have the leverage to say that if you want it done, then you need to . . . Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that they go through the same process. A guy is going to say he wants a tear down permit. You knock down the building before you even start the process, so they don't hit the radar and hold you up. If all you have to do is get a permit, stamp this thing and go do it, who is going to say you can't do it, because you haven't filed yet? Warren Campbell explained it was just a thought on paper that if you send staff back to do this, we will explore whether or not . . . Audree

added that these are concepts. If this is something the Commission is interested in, staff will explore more to find out if there is a way we can do this.

Chair Unger stated that she thinks it is worth a shot; the reality is that we don't want to spend a lot of staff's time doing that, but it is worth the thought. This has been something we have thought about a long time, because we want to make sure there is something in there to . . . , and it's leverage for people to actually make a little different decision, and that is what staff is trying to come up with here. Obviously, if they have decided to knock it down, the only thing this will really be able to allow us to do is to go in and take photographs and get a record of what it is. The rest is probably a little theoretical. Warren agreed and stated that staff is hopeful that Legal will go along with our belief that we can do it for the same reasons as Tucson's lawyer. It is just another submittal requirement and it is not onerous; therefore, do it. Basically, Mr. Mabry told him how they convinced theirs to do it without much fanfare. Commissioner Segner stated that he doesn't have any problem if staff can get it in there. Warren acknowledged that it is right in how does it play out in a situation when someone buys a property and has something older than 50 years on it or maybe it is something that has been surveyed, because we will have to work through those details, but maybe they don't know what they want to do 20 years from now, so let staff think about it.

Chair Unger asked if a vote is needed and Audree indicated just direction. Commissioner Segner stated do your thing, and Warren said if they all agree, he will work on it and determine when it is ready to bring back to the Commission. The Chair stated it is better to do it now, and there was consensus among the Commissioners.

Audree distributed a copy of the document that is recorded with the county once the Commission takes action to landmark a property, and it pretty much says no person shall do anything without approval. Chair Unger stated that is good and Vice Chair Jarmusch thanked Audree and thanked Warren for all of his work. Warren apologized for not having all of this before, but explained that the conference opened up a new world of insight. Commissioner Segner stated that cutting and pasting is much better than writing and Audree agreed. The Commissioner then noted that if somebody else has figured it out, let's look at it. The Chair added that she is sure Tucson tested it legally, and she doesn't know if anybody remembers in the 1960's or early '70's, when they knocked down most of the barrios in Tucson, so they are so aware of this and sensitive, because of that. A bunch of the real barrios that were built in the early 1800's were knocked down. Commissioner Holmes asked if that is the area that was used to rebuild downtown and the Chair stated yes.

Warren Campbell mentioned that he hadn't realized how much history Tucson has. They have all of these districts, etc., and Mr. Mabry stated that he reviews one these minor or major documentations at least once a week. They take down something that is at least 50 years old at least once a week in terms of their review. Commissioner Segner commented that in 50 years this Commission will be saying can you image that they let them knock down those trailers in Harmony Hills. Commissioner Holmes stated that is right; it should be a historical district. Chair Unger thanked Warren for all of his work; it is making it better and we only want to do this once, so we all appreciate it very much.

## **5. Discussion/possible action regarding the Historic Preservation Program Budget and Work Program**

Audree Juhlin explained that the way we budget starting this year is completely different than we have in the last 25 years, so it is a brand new process and we are still learning it, and it still will be developed over the next few years and refined. Each department now has to budget by program with performance by programs, so even if it is a \$20 program item, you have to have some performance measure that justifies that public expense. Commissioner Holmes commented that it sounds like the school districts.

Audree continued to say that it is a performance-based budget and explained that the handout is Community Development's first attempt at it and this is what was approved by the City Council. We

have six different program areas, one of which is Historic Preservation. On the first page, the budget for HPC is minimal, given the \$1.6 million total. You are at \$45,000, so it is not a lot of the budget that goes to historic preservation. Most of the expense in that \$1.6 million is staff; we have 13 staff members, because we do most of everything in-house and the biggest expense is paper.

Audree pointed out that the next page is the revenues in our department and the different revenue sources, but really nothing is being contributed from historic preservation. The third page shows the employees and their time designations for each work program, and this is one of the areas that Council is looking at heavily in terms of what staff is doing and if we are managing our staff resources appropriately. In the time allocations, these are our best guess estimates, because we don't actually know and will do a better job starting July 1<sup>st</sup> this year, but right now 40% of one full-time staff member equivalent is dedicated to the Historic Preservation Commission. For Planning, it is 215%, so that is 2.15 full-time staff members doing that.

Audree explained that the next few pages go over the Planning Program and the performance measures for everything we do for Planning and all the things we are now going to have to track and measure for Planning. The same thing for Building Safety; we will have to measure a bunch of different areas. Code Enforcement is the same thing. Our cases are going to be tracked a little differently. Then, we get to the Historic Preservation Commission and \$45,000 is the total cost for historic preservation. Almost \$39,000 of that is personnel cost for your \$6,400 budget to do what you are doing now, which is basically training and Commission Support. You have .4 of an FTE based on past years, but when the Commission was originally formed in 1998 as a working Commission, the Commission had to be its own secretary, do its own minutes, own agendas, etc., and that is the way it got approved with .2 or 20% of a staff member's time dedicated to it, and that hasn't changed, so we have to go back and work in that realm; that was a Council direction to go back to 20%, but we're never going to go back to being your own secretary and minute-taker, etc.

Audree indicated that we have to then determine what our performance measures are and how we work to achieve those measures while staying within the allocation of 20% of one staff person. You have several different staff people, but you will see her fading out a lot to help manage the time, so it will be primarily Warren and Donna, but we are going to try to keep it at that 20% and we will talk about how we can do that. One suggestion from the City Council was to go back to the CLG that says you have to have a minimum of four meetings per year, and anything above that can be planned for Certificates of Appropriateness or Article 15 updates, etc. You will see the purpose in a number of bullets that is taken right from the ordinance, so if you want to change your purpose, this is the time to do it, so we can amend this to reflect that.

Chair Unger asked if there are suggestions that need to be made now, because "foster civic pride and accomplishments of the past", she doesn't see the Commission as important in that, but maybe everybody else on the Commission does. She sees the Commission making sure that we have the past here and preserve it, but . . . Commissioner Holmes indicated that appreciating the landmark owners is fostering civic pride; however, the Chair commented that is a little bit different.

Commissioner Segner stated that when Janeen ran it, it was proactive; she was looking for work and they were looking for projects. They did the historic week, gave away cookies and did a lot of stuff that we didn't need to do. Now, we are going to be more proactive, so if you met four official times a year for one-half day, not two hours, but from noon to five and got the hard work out, that can work, but what happens when you need a decision on the new park and it is two months until the next meeting? That is where the problem is going to pop up; however, Audree explained that is when you call a special meeting. Commissioner Segner agreed but stated that is going to screw up your budget. Audree explained that we just document that and provide it to Council explaining that based on this year and the things that happened, we are requesting that the allocation be upped.

Commissioner Holmes pointed out that then you will have data to prove what you need. Commissioner Segner stated that he doesn't have any problem getting together four or five times a year, if it is organized and longer, because when you only have 40 minutes to go, you make bad

decisions. He would rather have a plunk of time and if we all leave early, we leave early, but get all of your work in there.

Audree indicated that it is to demonstrate the measures, so are we meeting just to meet or are we meeting to get things accomplished? Commissioner Segner stated that we don't meet if we don't have something; he agrees. Audree pointed out that this also, not specific to this Commission and our staff time too, it really focuses on our meetings, so if we only have an hour, we have to get our objectives accomplished in that hour, rather than having a two hour meeting and taking the two hours to talk, but having our time also measured, we're now being more concise and more efficient in how we use our time, and she is hoping that will help with the Commissions and Board of Adjustment too.

Commissioner Segner stated that this year was tedious, because we were working with words. Normally, we don't do that; normally, you come in and make a presentation and we discuss it and make a decision, but when you are wordsmithing, it is tedious and time-consuming. Audree Juhlin stated that when we have a project that we know the Commission is going to be doing, we put that in the budget request to Council and say .2 or 20% of a staff member is not sufficient to accomplish this project.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he doesn't see anything on the horizon as far as documenting houses, but we should be involved with the Brewer Road Park and not just because they are going to fix up the building. It is a historic park and everybody here wants input; he wants input on how it looks, the trees and the planting, so he is going to be a pain in the ass – he is telling you upfront. His point is we are going to have to cite how far we are going to be involved with that or are we going to do it outside of the Commission, and we should we be working in another function? Should we be in another meeting working on those things?

Commissioner Holmes noted that there might be a power struggle between the work group and the Commission; however, Audree Juhlin explained that we have staff-appointed teams and that doesn't take away from the time. Chair Unger added that she and Audree had discussed a task force, because if we start putting this together ourselves, we have to have the meetings, the secretary, etc., so the staff puts together a task force, and it can't have a quorum of the Commission, but they can have a task force they direct to do something, and then they bring it back to the Commission. Commissioner Segner stated that is fine, but when Audree says it has to come back to the Commission, because we have to have the decision made here, that is going to be more meetings. Audree again explained that staff would document that and put it in the accomplishments and say this is what happened that caused us to go over the allocation. Commissioner Segner then stated that is fine; as long as you are okay with it, he is okay with it.

Chair Unger indicated that she likes the idea; we can be more efficient this way, by not being forced into a meeting every time, if we have these task forces that can get things done and bring them back. It is easier to do that anyway, so she doesn't object to this, it clearly will be a better way to handle things. Commissioner Segner again stated he has no problem being efficient and saving money; that is just being responsible, but from the other side, he doesn't like hearing you guys blew your budget; you had seven meetings instead of four.

Audree again explained that it is performance-based. If we just met for nine meetings and talked about one thing and never got anything done, that is not a good use of time, but if we had two meetings and got something accomplished, that is a really good use of time. The Chair then restated that it is a better way of handling it, so she has no objections. She understands that fostering civic pride and accomplishments of the past is such an open-ended thing, but if we decided to have a task force to write articles for the paper, she is not against that, but it shouldn't consume us by trying to figure out things to do that aren't core things.

Commissioner Segner stated that we shouldn't have a meeting over historic week and Chair Unger agreed that doesn't make any sense. In fact, we did that this year where we had three or four

meetings and discussed it, and we didn't need to do that. A task force could have taken it on and brought it back when it was done. She also wanted to say that we have to, as a CLG, keep looking for places that need to be landmarked. We have some in town like the Babbitt residence. Commissioner Segner stated that we did the 50-year maps four or five years ago, so we know the homes that are 50 years old this year, and it is easy for someone to drive by and look at them.

Chair Unger indicated that on the Commission's radar there are a couple that are, for many more reasons like the Babbitt's home, because of the history and people who lived there, . . . Commissioner Segner stated, but that is not staff. Somebody goes out and writes it up, puts it all together and at the next meeting, they bring it up in the meeting. Chair Unger agreed that is what we are talking about by having these task forces and Audree can decide which of us can contribute and do it as a task force, rather than being driven by a meeting every time, because we do waste more than a bit of time with these meetings.

Commissioner Segner asked what staff is asking the Commission to do on this and Audree explained again that we need to ensure that the purpose is correct, because if not, we need to change it in Article 15. The accomplishments next year will be very important, so the objectives this year are critical.

Vice Chair Jarmusch referenced the accomplishments under Article 15 where it says evaluate and propose amendments, and she then asked if that could be changed to created and evaluated proposed amendments or generated, because this sounds like we reacted to proposed amendments. Audree explained that it is too late for that, because Council has already acted on it and it was for your information, but in the future you will be much more involved. We literally had no time to put this together. We were told in a week you have to have charts and performance measures, so we had no time and this is a work in progress.

Warren Campbell noted that when we get to that Council level with Article 15, there will be a description of the history of where we have been, so it won't go unnoticed as to the hands-on approach. Audree then added that it will say that you had this number of meetings. Commissioner Segner stated that being efficient with meetings makes sense, even if we can't pull it off, the idea that we are trying to is good.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that the target of zero new landmarked properties is self-defeating and Audree Juhlin added that it is also counter to your CLG agreement. Commissioner Segner then indicated that one or two Commissioners are going to review eligible homes and at one meeting will bring it up. Somebody should be looking at the 50-year-old houses; someone can drive around with him one day. He then discussed how he went to both county recorders for a map of those 50 years old, and before we were driving around and looking them up wasting a lot of time.

Chair Unger explained that all Audree was doing today was making us aware of what the City Council asked staff and the Commission to do. Audree then added to also make the Commission aware that we have to have the performance measures and live up to them, so going forward from this point is going to be critical, because in December we are going to talk about our objectives, goals and what we have accomplished for the next year. Chair Unger indicated that as we get this year out, staff will be able to see more clearly if there is a hiccup in the way it was thought out, because it hasn't been done this way before, so you are going to have some corrections that need to be made, but we want to try our best to fit within the confines of what you thought.

Audree explained that for the objectives, we said that for the next twelve months, the Commission will be working on finishing Article 15, updating the historic landmark information, creating a historic resource recognition program, and the last bullet is for staff. It is for all Commissions that we need a formalized academy for new Commissioners. The performance measures are if we had any new landmarks, number of meetings, and civic events that we might hold and can add to this, so if you have any ideas of what you want to measure, like how many articles we get to the newspaper . . .

Commissioner Segner stated that anything should just be bullet points; we should have three or four bullet points that we accomplish, and anything underneath a bullet point should be a sub, but when you come up with a list of 28 things. . . Audree indicated that is why we kept it to three and that is completely doable in a year. Chair Unger noted that we always have additional things that we have to do anyway, and Commissioner Segner added that this flies in the face of the City throwing money away and wasting money, just taking the taxpayers money and wasting it, this just goes in the face of that; it's excellent. Audree commented that for \$45,000 you got a whole lot for very little.

Chair Unger thanked staff for explaining it so well, and Audree stated that she would like to form a staff working group in the late fall to create the next year. We have to have it done in January. Chair Unger noted that another thing we have to do is she doesn't think we have voted on the Chair and Vice Chair; however, Audree said Ann is still the Vice Chair and Chair Unger indicated that she is still the Chair, so we are okay, but she doesn't know if we need to do that.

#### **6. Discussion regarding the City Council FY 2016/2017 funded small grant program for existing historic landmarks**

Audree Juhlin stated that we have not funded this program for a number of years. It started in 2009 with \$20,000 and we had a large grant program at that time, but it slowly started going down to \$15,000 to \$10,000 to \$4,000. When it became \$4,000, it really wasn't an effective program and we ran into problems, then we had discussions on how we wanted to use the program, such as for incentives or what it was for and we weren't able to resolve what that grant was meant to be, as far as the Commission was concerned, so we didn't budget for it. We have not budgeted for it the last two years, including this year, we did not put money in, and last year Council basically said until you figure out what the grant program is, we're not going to budget for it either.

Audree explained that this year, much to staff's surprise, we're the only department that didn't ask for money that got money, so we did not ask for any money for this grant program, and she explained when they asked that question that the Commission still was discussing the program and how to utilize those funds, because we have some differing opinions among the Commissioners. The Council then said that it is a really good program; we're going to give you \$20,000 for this program to only assist existing owners of landmark properties, not new people coming in like we did in the past as an incentive program, but only for existing, to do any kind of repair and maintenance to their landmark. It really took out a lot of the subjectivity and we got our direction; we have to do this program for \$20,000 and it is a 50/50 matching grant program for any kind of repair and maintenance.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he wanted to go on record and challenge their decision. We didn't have any input. They said they want this and he thinks that for \$20,000 we should go back and say that this is not a good program and not a good use of \$20,000, because he has been here a long time and we spent tons of meetings talking about \$300 and \$500 and doing paperwork, and if we are trying to go another direction and get work tight – this is not. It becomes well how do we write it up, what's the definition? He doesn't like the idea that anybody gets money to keep their house up, and he doesn't think anybody on the City Council has really heard the discussions on either side. Audree Juhlin explained that they have not heard that, but she did explain exactly what you are talking about to the Council and shared Commissioners' concerns, and they basically said they disagree. We, the Council, feel that the property owners are willing to step up and landmark their property without any incentive to do so, and it is the least we can do by saying thank you, and here is a small token of appreciation through some assistance in your repair and maintenance, and that was their comment. They want to thank the property owners and this is the way to do it.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he still disagrees. Audree stated that if the Commission disagrees a memo can be sent forward. Commissioner Segner then stated that we are a Commission of experts in theory, and they are a Commission of leaders, so we should have the right to say that we beg to differ, because it opens up so many doors that don't need to be opened.



Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that she thoroughly disagreed with Commissioner Segner; she does not want Commissioner Segner's opinion to be carrying the weight that he wants it to, and she says that only because she talked to a Council member in a social situation, and her impression was that the Commission didn't want this fund, and she said yes we do. Commissioner Segner doesn't, but she does. Commissioner Segner then stated that last year, we voted not to do it; however, the Vice Chair indicated that the Commission is split, and Commissioner Segner stated that he understands that, but you weren't here when we were doing this and wasting enormous amounts of time.

Audree Juhlin explained that the process has changed; it is not coming to the Commission anymore, which the Chair repeated. The Chair then indicated that she lands a little bit more in-between Commissioner Segner and Vice Chair Jarmusch. Her philosophy is that if we are going to do a grant, it should be that if you are going to do work on your home, you need to pay for the majority of the work. The reality is that if your windows have to have wooden mullions and the difference between doing the repairs that we expect and the kind that you would do otherwise is when the City could step in. She doesn't see it as being something where we just step in if there is anything that needs to be done. If you need a new roof, we'll help you even if the roof doesn't have any contributing factors – she has a problem with that, but whether or not we send something back to the City Council saying these are the things that need to be done, Commissioner Segner's comments have to be there, because at the end of the day, when you buy a house, you are going to have to do repairs on it anyway, whether it is landmarked or not; however, we put pressure on those people, because we are asking them to do things above and beyond what a regular homeowner would have to do, and that is why if we write the grant and box it to say that these are the things you say you have to do, so if the outside stucco has to be a certain kind and you could stucco it for \$20,000, but if you have to do this other kind, it will be \$25,000, then maybe the City could help with the amount that is above and beyond.

Commissioner Segner stated that is so subjective; however, the Chair stated not really. Audree Juhlin pointed out that it is also to compensate for the red tape that goes along with the landmark; you are no longer free to do whatever it is you want to do. You have to go through all sorts of additional approvals over what an un-landmarked property does.

Commissioner Holmes agreed that we should only subsidize the stuff that is historically related, like we can't pay the plumber. We need to make sure that is clear and it is 50/50; that is important, and also, what if we reach a point where we run out of the designated money within a year and there are three more people lined up that want money. That is what is going to cause the frustration and misunderstanding that happened and caused the fracas for somebody to pull their property; however, Audree Juhlin clarified that is not the case. Commissioner Holmes then indicated that it causes hard feelings.

Audree Juhlin explained that the last few years, we couldn't get anybody to take the money and she told Council that. We gave back the \$4,000 the last two years. Commissioner Segner asked why the money couldn't be used on the new property on Brewer Road or a historic monument or plaque. Audree stated that the Commission would need to direct staff through a formal motion to send a memo to Council, and we would agendaize it for discussion that you don't agree and you don't want to spend that money, and stop staff from going forward.

Chair Unger indicated that she doesn't think the Commission wants to do that. There is a difference of opinion, and given there are only four of us here, we might be split right down the middle if a decision is made today. Her feeling is that it was a problem when the Commission had to make these determinations, and she doesn't envy anyone who has to make those decisions. Her decision would be for the staff to make those decisions, because after all of the time the Commission put in, we had levels and it was a lot of work, so if staff is willing to take it on . . . Audree pointed out that it is not if staff is willing; staff has been directed by the City Council.

Commissioner Holmes asked if staff would be making the determination and not the Commission, and Audree explained if it required a Certificate of Appropriateness, then the Commission would get

the Certificate of Appropriateness, but you would not look at how it is being paid for. You would just see if it is appropriate or not.

Chair Unger stated that her caveat is that staff is going to do it on the Commission's time; however, Audree stated no, that was the other beauty of it, because it does not count for your time. The Chair then stated that she didn't want the Commission to have to concentrate on what those monies go to, because of the amount of hours the Commission spent trying to figure out who we should give it to, when this one asked last year and that one didn't, but he really needs it, etc.

Commissioner Segner indicated that if staff came to the Commission and said that we have \$20,000, so think about the best use of it, then we would discuss it, but to say we are going to give it to people who really don't need it, as a way to say thank you – we don't need to say thank you. He has owned a lot of historic buildings and you do it because of the pride of owning it and keeping it up, and not coming to the City when you need a new roof and want \$10,000 – and we say no, we'll give you \$1,000, but that is not enough. He has been down that road.

Audree Juhlin stated that she thinks where Council is coming from is – let's take the Small Grant Program out of the picture altogether, because that came out of how do we then administer this money, and we want to give existing landmark owners some assistance. That is what they said. Oh, didn't we have a grant program, let's give them that \$20,000, because we already have somewhat of a process to go forward, so it was kind of through that route and not we need a small grant program.

Commissioner Segner stated that he would have said thank you for asking us; however, Audree explained that staff can't do that. Council gives staff our direction; they set the policy and they have heard from property owners that they would like some assistance, because it does get expensive. That is where it came from, so we are left with that direction and, at a staff level, we can't challenge it; we have to implement it.

Chair Unger stated that the Commission can say that we worry a little bit about it too; the \$20,000 still isn't a lot of money if people come in with big things. In her opinion, it is admirable that they want to do it, and over the last couple of years there have been some rough spots where everybody thinks that we're not being as understanding of the owners as we should be, and that is why we are talking about Article 15 and the Certificate of No Effect. The City Council is sort of aware of that too and that is why they are coming up with things, because they want to make sure we don't lose this program and people are thinking there is not a commitment from the City.

Audree Juhlin stated that the Commission can go back to Council and disagree with the direction provided, but she would recommend evaluating this program and see what happens. We will have to do a Decision Package if we want to continue it into the next year, and that is when we will get with the Commission and share everything. We will be keeping you in the loop, and then the Commission can take a stand and say this is where it is appropriate and not appropriate or we don't think it is appropriate at all.

Commissioner Segner stated that we had a party to thank the people and very few showed up. You could get the same effect with a letter from the Mayor each year thanking them for designating their home; you have done a great service. It is not always about the money and instead of coming back to if we will pay to put up a new light on their porch, so we have to decide if it is the right light, a historic light, etc., it just opens up such a bag of worms. Audree indicated that the Commissioner can put that in a memo saying that you thank them for the money, but no thank you.

Chair Unger asked how many Commissioners feel that way, but Commissioner Segner stated that we needed more members here. The Chair then indicated that she would be in favor of the City doing this and see how it works, and she really doesn't envy staff. Most owners know there are certain things we have to do when we buy a house, whether it is landmarked or not, but she understands the philosophy of the City Council wanting to do this.

Donna Puckett stated that in the meeting, her impression was that the Council fully understood the difference of opinion that you are hearing today, and the fact that we have heard it for over two years and there has been no consensus, because we couldn't come to a common understanding, so we hadn't even requested the funds, and as Audree said, they gave direction and the Commission is not involved. It was their directive . . . Commissioner Segner then stated, well let's just stay out of it then and don't even come to us, just say it is yours and it has nothing to do with the Commission; you just do all the bad things you want with that money – we don't care.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she wants to keep the Commission informed and Chair Unger indicated that she thinks the reason it has been brought in front of us is it will probably bring more people who would now have money to do some of the things that we're going to have to then make decisions on. Donna Puckett pointed out that once we go through this and have feedback to provide for the next budget, which will start around January, it may migrate back to where they say this part is working and that part isn't, and in that next cycle it may come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Segner stated that the trouble with the whole program is, for someone who fixes up old buildings, it is subjective. There is no right or wrong thing and whatever you do will be taken by somebody as right and by somebody as wrong, and it just leads to disputes, so you are better off to back off of that and find some other uses for that money, and then we know it will be used. When it comes to somebody's house, you are going to fight over the roof, the molding, the mullions, etc.

Audree Juhlin indicated that regardless of the funding, we would still have that same discussion; you are going to talk about the molding, etc., and the Chair agreed that the Commission is going to be doing that anyway, whether the City is paying for it or not, because we are going to have to make those determinations. It is not going to help us in that case.

Donna Puckett indicated that as she recalled, the Commission had the program for three or four years, and she doesn't remember there being disputes or arguments; it was labor intensive and Kathy spent a lot of time working on it, but she doesn't remember any disagreements until the Gunning issue came up. Commissioner Segner interrupted to say that we painted molding at somebody's house and paid \$800 and it was a multi-million dollar house – the Doodlebug. It was there so why not use it, and he has a hard time . . . this was a multi-million dollar house and they have more money than God and we're paying \$800 to paint the molding, not even counting staff's time, so that is where he is coming from. The minute you open the door for funding, someone comes in and says they went to the City Council and they have a historic house; they need a \$12,000 roof and all they could get was \$2,000, because the money was gone.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that one of the items under the purpose that Audree just asked the Commission to approve was, "Provide incentives for restoration by owners of landmarked historic properties". If she was an owner and heard a few years ago that there was \$4,000, she would think that was not a lot of support, but if she then heard that there is now \$20,000. The City is serious about this and they want to help us and share the pride we have in our home. That is the psychological effect as an incentive, and the reality of the incentive is something like we're looking a gift horse in the mouth if we say no.

Commissioner Holmes stated that even though she might agree with everything Commissioner Segner is saying, you are dealing with a new group of people and they are going to have to relearn it; they are going to have to see it themselves, and in fact, it may have changed a little bit too, and to have real data to refer to. . . Commissioner Segner interjected that he is not going to fight you on this, but what he saw was the City got intimidated by someone saying I didn't get the money to fix my roof, so I want to be undesignated, you are all idiots, and they all overreacted, and then it came back with how much money do you have and how do you hand it out.

Audree Juhlin stated that was not the case and clarified that Mr. Gunning never asked us for money. What happened is he had an emergency situation where a monsoon hit and lightning hit the electrical pole that ran to the wiring to his roof, blew out his window and made a hole in his roof.

His house is all wood; the ceilings are the most gorgeous wood ceilings, amazingly beautiful, and he contacted Kathy and said he had this situation and needed to get some emergency work done, is that okay? She basically said you need to take care of #1 priority, which is preserving your historic landmark, so we looked at the Certificate of Appropriateness process and it didn't work in this case. He just did the work, and Kathy had two items on the agenda when this was brought up, and one was how can we improve our process for emergency situations, and then there was another item that talked about the small grant program, and somehow they got intertwined. Kathy had asked him to come in and say how it didn't work for him; these were his experiences and his problems . . . (audio unclear with multiple speakers), and he wasn't asking for money.

Chair Unger stated that the other reality that made it even more complicated was that we were asked to replace a heater for a house, and it had never been on our list of things that we would do, and she had told the homeowner that it wasn't going to happen, but she insisted in coming before the Commission, thinking that if the Commission understood what it means to her to do this, then maybe you would give them the money, so the two of them got wrapped into each other, and she knows what Commissioner Segner was saying, because at that point, we were all . . . Commissioner Segner interjected, fed up. Audree Juhlin added that there were other Commissioners that said, what happened is horrible and asked how we could fund him, and he never asked for the money, so some Commissioners asked if the small grant program could be changed to talk about after-the-fact repairs. Chair Unger then stated that it took off from there and we couldn't catch up with it. Audree Juhlin stated it was a misunderstanding all the way around.

Chair Unger stated that she can't say it may not happen that somebody sees there is \$20,000 and thinks that isn't enough to satisfy everybody, but she doesn't know. She understands where the City Council is coming from and what Vice Chair Jarmusch is saying. Personally when she was told about this, she said that as long as the City staff is doing it and not the Commission, she is fine with it, but she doesn't want the Commission to be responsible for it. She doesn't want the Commission to go through what we did before and all the time it took us, so this is fine, but if they need a Certificate of Appropriateness, it definitely has to come to us.

Commissioner Segner stated that in normal circumstances, people who designate their house usually get a tax abatement, but we don't have that, and they don't write direct checks; that is just opening up a bag of worms. He is upset that the City Council acted without asking, so why do we have these meetings, and he would be more than happy to tell them how he feels. We are supposed to be the experts; we didn't have a program for three years, because we didn't want one. If it had been on our agenda and we thought it was important, we would have come to you and said we need more money. Audree explained that she was very clear about the disagreement on that, and the Chair stated that there is really no need for more conversation and Commissioner Segner agreed and stated that you have got to do what you have to do. Chair Unger then added that we don't have a property tax and can't do anything that way, so the City Council may be thinking that maybe this is something, and she is not sure that in December everybody is going to say that we really don't want to do this again; she could see that happening. Audree Juhlin indicated that it could be in the recommendation not to fund it, but as Vice Chair Jarmusch pointed out, the Commission has been charged since 1998 to find ways to incentivize and there aren't any ways – this is the only thing you've got.

Commissioner Segner stated that if the City owns historic buildings, then why doesn't the City use this, instead of the Park Department doing all the work or whoever is doing the new park? Maybe they should say whoever is doing the park should ask for a grant to replace the windows on the Brewer Road property with dual pane, etc. Chair Unger then asked if it is possible for the City to ask for money and Audree indicated no, because we have a Facilities Maintenance budget, like Jordan Park has been in that budget for as long as we have owned it since the early '90s, so it would go through the normal budgeting process, and as the next step, we have to have a total assessment of that building, so we can start budgeting for the restoration, but it has to come through this Commission first.

Commissioner Segner then wanted to give the flip-side of the coin and stated that if somebody puts a piece in the paper saying that the City has \$20,000 for historic rehabilitation, so apply to the City. What are the rules? Audree stated that we have the guidelines and the Chair agreed. Commissioner Holmes added that it is out of the Commission's hands now, so Commissioner Segner stated, so let's move on. Audree added like no water heaters, and the Chair added that we wish no roofs; however, Audree pointed out that SHPO recommends that the program cover roofs. When she talked with them recently, they said roofs are one of the most important things you can do to protect, and if you are going to fund money, roofs should be one of the things you are doing.

Commissioner Segner commented that \$20,000 won't cover . . . Chair Unger acknowledged Commissioner Segner's opinion and indicated that if he wants to write to the City Council to let them know, but Commissioner Segner stated no, he is being personal. His point is go for it; you win some and you lose some.

Audree Juhlin complimented everyone for having disagreements in a professional way. We still get along and can disagree, and she wants to thank them for that and for respecting others' opinions.

**7. Discussion of details regarding the Commission and staff's participation in the State Historic Preservation Conference in Phoenix June 8<sup>th</sup> through the 10<sup>th</sup>.**

The Chair suggested delaying item 7 until more members are present; however, Commissioner Holmes asked what the advantage would be, because the longer we wait, the more she is going to forget, and the other people didn't show much interest in the conference anyway. Audree Juhlin pointed out that Kurt Gehlbach was there the whole time and attended quite a few of the sessions she attended. Commissioner Holmes indicated that she had missed that, but asked what the purpose is in discussing it. Chair Unger stated that part of it is that we were able to use our learning more this time than almost any other time.

Audree Juhlin added that in part, she thinks it was the way they restructured the conference; we had real live people presenting and that really made the difference. Before you just had people talk at you and this time we had people who were in the field, like the Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer speaking; the people who were actually doing these things. Chair Unger added that the CLG was always by a lawyer and it was all technical and totally boring, but this time they used actual examples. Setting it up with the different components was a little different too, so you could get into the tracks. The only one she was disappointed that we didn't have was the one on the bridges, but it was canceled, so she ended up in one on grants, and that was the only one she sort of fell asleep in, although there were things in there that she learned, possibly more for Chamber Music than us, but there was one out there. Audree agreed and added, for the Brewer property. The Chair then explained that they would come in and do all of the testing, etc., which would get paid for, so we should apply for that; she will send the information to Warren.

Chair Unger added that she goes for the refreshers and you learn new things from everybody. Commissioner Holmes stated that the thing that she liked the most was the presentation that emphasized the financial advantage to historic preservation and what it does not only for the feeling in the community, but the documentation of how you get more tax money out of a refurbished area, etc., which probably is not news to anyone in the profession, but for her it was great news and provided data for something she had always felt, but couldn't prove, and it was a theme that ran throughout many of the workshops. It was really invigorating for her to hear that it wasn't just art or hobbyists; it was actually a financial gain for the community and the connection to place, which allows people to vote, volunteer, give and pay taxes willingly. It is something that every City Councilor and Mayor could love.

Chair Unger stated that it is amazing how, for example the historic neighborhoods in Phoenix, when everybody was crashing; they actually floated and hardly lost anything. Those owners were selling them at the same price as before, whereas, the neighborhoods around there were dropping thousands of dollars. It is something we don't always think or talk about, and in a sense, that is

something we could use as an incentive for people landmarking their homes, because it is something people actually look for to purchase now.

Commissioner Holmes indicated that she could go on and on, but that was the most important thing she learned, and also for the Brewer Road Park, she made the note that kids that plant trees come back to see them. We need kids in that park planting things. Commissioner Segner stated that we should not buy a tree for that park; half of that park should be donated, planted and community work. Audree Juhlin indicated that can be part of the partnership, and Commissioner Segner added that when you plant that tree and see it grow every year; we could find the money and the trees, but having the community get those things instead of getting a turnkey park, that is where community involvement helps. Chair Unger noted that is part of a lot of things they talk about in historic preservation and what has been interesting in the last couple of years is some of the people putting restaurants and businesses in older buildings. They aren't landmarked, but they have decided that the buildings have a value and they want to bring them back.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she went to the Uptown Plaza to check it out and they did a bang-up job; she loved everything they had done. One of the sessions was talking about revitalizing that and they did an amazing job. Chair Unger stated that they also have the big downtown hotel that they were getting ready to knock down a couple of years ago, but they actually redid it and it is amazing looking, and it is regenerating that whole downtown area. They are also talking about per square mile what you need to do to have public transportation, etc. Everyone is moving back into the City and regenerating it; downtown Phoenix is so different than it was five years ago.

Commissioner Holmes referenced the architect, Lorenzo, who was inspiring, because he grew up in that neighborhood and talked about . . . Audree Juhlin added that sums up so much. That inspiration they you came out with was worth every penny by being re-inspired in what you do. Chair Unger stated that some years have been better than others, but it is always interesting. Since it was going to be in a downtown Phoenix airport hotel, she wasn't as sure about it, but it was great. Commissioner Holmes noted that she came away feeling that she missed so much; there was so much she missed that she wanted to see, although she was there as long as she could be.

Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that she came away feeling like she was back in college and it was so great. Everywhere she turned there were interesting people and new ideas. The Chair indicated that she met the historical person from Cottonwood and she is brilliant and told her all sorts of stories between sessions, and Commissioner Holmes added that she was related to founders of Cottonwood. Donna Puckett asked if they all got a follow-up survey and Chair Unger stated yes and she sent hers in. Donna indicated that it would be good for them to reinforce what they found to be better this time, and the Chair stated that she would get in touch with Dave Ryder.

Vice Chair Jarmusch then commented that she was struck by the people and their passions. She went to a session about Al Beadle, a late architect in Phoenix, and his widow and daughter were present. Alison King put it together and to have them there and hear stories of them knocking on doors saying this is an Al Beadle, did you know that? It was so exciting, and then she sat at the luncheon and this very friendly woman was talking and she asked if the Commissioner was related to any award winners and was told no. Vice Chair Jarmusch then asked her the same question, and her husband was the Archeologist of the Year.

Chair Unger stated that the archeology part has grown in the last three or four years, and we don't participate in that as much, but given the fact that the City is sending her to these, it is amazing to see how many more of those there are and how many American Indians show up that never used to come. Commissioner Holmes noted that the whole program has really grown in the state, and the day before we even showed up, they had sessions all day long. One was an all-day session on linear resources – railroads, trails, fences, etc. -- how obscure.

Commissioner Segner stated that he was just thinking he was going to have to go, so next year he will go, even though he has always stayed away from things that were like school. The Chair

explained this is different; it is interaction. Audree Juhlin noted that she had stopped going, because she found them very boring, but Chair Unger indicated that they have upped the ante a lot. Eric Vondy became a lot more involved, because Garrison was a little bit stiff, and Audree noted that he and Frankenberger were responsible for it the last few years, but now they are getting these things in there and they spend a little bit of time talking, and then everybody feeds into it.

Commissioner Segner indicated that he would probably enjoy it, because he was involved in Pasadena a lot, but historic districts are different; you get the whole community. In Pasadena, they would see bungalow heaven, but you needed a gun in the '70s to walk in the neighborhood, and now they have street parties and everybody became a specialist. He was a refinishing specialist and there were paint specialists, wallpaper specialists, etc., and everybody took an area, so everybody helped everybody with their home to keep it in character.

Audree Juhlin noted that was a key point of the last conference, because some of the most valuable information she got was the dialogue, when we introduced a topic and had a conversation about that and everyone was contributing – it was fascinating. Commissioner Segner added that he found door knob geeks, lighting fixture geeks, etc., and they knew more than you would ever want to know, so it is a hoot when you get in that group. The Chair indicated that every year they have something about what you are doing; like they were discussing how you restore some of the old adobes. Vice Chair Jarmusch stated that this was the best conference she had ever been to.

Warren Campbell noted that that he didn't understand the CLG and what we had agreed to, and he thought sitting in that meeting all afternoon would be awful, but it went by fast, and Bob Frankenberger was sitting in front of him and kept walking out answering his phone in the middle of that session, and his thought was stiff; this guy is supposed to excite me? The Chair noted again that they used to have lawyers with a PowerPoint, and at the end you just sort of glazed over.

#### **8. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items *[Bring your Calendars]***

- **August 8, 2016**
- **September 12, 2016**

Audree Juhlin indicated that we don't have enough to bring back the Article 15 for the August meeting, so she would recommend that we cancel that meeting. Commissioner Holmes asked if they were going to pick four dates in a year, and then meet as things come up.

Commissioner Segner stated that they need a training date to put people in the vans and drive to the historic properties and actually go through the process; we haven't done that in five or six years. We have new people and we are going to lose them if we don't train them, so we need a half-day for training. Audree added, when it is not hot.

Chair Unger suggested just canceling the meeting in August, and Audree stated that staff will be ready to do the ordinance on September 12<sup>th</sup>. Warren Campbell indicated that staff would send out an email to see if there will be a quorum, and Commissioner Segner stated that he would not be here. Audree Juhlin noted that we need to ask the question now, because of the noticing requirements and getting it in the paper.

Commissioner Segner indicated it would be easier to set the calendar for the next year, because then people can work around it when they know in advance. Audree asked Commissioner Segner if he would be here on September 19<sup>th</sup> and he stated yes. Audree Juhlin noted that would definitely give us a quorum, so we will shoot for that, because she would prefer that you be part of the quorum, since you were part of the discussion today.

Vice Chair Jarmusch noted that she is a question mark for September 19<sup>th</sup>. Donna Puckett asked about the 12<sup>th</sup>, and the Vice Chair indicated that it is more likely that she could make the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Holmes asked if anybody got any feedback on the Homeowner Expo and no one had any feedback.

**9. Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:44 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 July 11, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date