Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

AGENDA

Date: THURSDAY, July 10, 2014

Location: Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street, Tempe (parking in City Hall Garage)

6:00 PM Call to Order; sign in, introductions (please mute cell phones)

Welcome: Kate Borders, Executive Director/President Downtown Tempe Community Inc.

1. Call to Audience: Persons wishing to address the commission on any matter may do so at the discretion of the Chair, however, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Other topics may be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

2. Approval of HPC Minutes
   May 8, 2014 Tempe HPC Monthly meeting

3. Discuss & Consider Ordinance No. O2014.22, amending Chapter 2, Article V, Tempe City Code
   The Historic Preservation Commission now has 9 permanent positions and 0 alternate positions

4. Introducing Urban & Environmental Planning Masters Student Kimmy Feldbauer
   Kimmy is a student in the ASU School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning

5. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Plan update
   General discussion of historic preservation planning

6. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Ordinance update
   General discussion of revising and updating Tempe City Code Chapter 14A

7. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Incentives update
   General discussion of economic benefits of historic designation

8. Discuss & Consider Graduate Student Intern Program Projects
   Billy Kiser Historic Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program update

9. Discuss and Consider Chair / Staff Updates:
   Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation Update
   Tempe HPO Social Media Project n=2945  http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPO
   Tempe HPF Social Media Project n=1352  http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPF

10. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
    - Member Announcements
    - Staff Announcements
    - THPF Candidate Forum: Friday 08/08/2014, 6:00 pm Community Room - Tempe History Museum
    - August HPC Meeting Date: Thursday 08/14/2014, 6:00 pm Hatton Hall

Adjourn

To date in 2014 commission members report donating 215 volunteer hours to the City of Tempe

The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Within 48 hours notice, special assistance can be provided for sight and/or hearing impaired persons at public meetings. Please call (480) 350-8007 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request accommodation.
Downtown Tempe Community Announces Kate Borders as New President & Executive Director

Tempe, AZ – The Mill Avenue District Board of Directors announced Kate Borders as the new President and Executive Director of the Downtown Tempe Community (DTC). Currently serving as President/CEO for the Downtown Fresno Partnership, Borders will begin her new position with the DTC on Tuesday, March 18th, 2014. In reaction to accepting her new role, Borders states, "I am eager to hit the ground running in Tempe as the new Executive Director/President. Nancy Hormann has done an excellent job leading the Downtown Tempe Community and it's a pleasure to take the reins of this well-established organization. I plan to build on the existing successes, work closely with the community at large, and challenge the staff and stakeholders to push Tempe into the next phase of growth and development."

The Downtown Fresno Partnership was started from the ground up with Borders as the first leader in September of 2011. Under her leadership, Downtown Fresno was revitalized with landscaping initiatives, a team of ambassadors serving as walking concierges, a strong advocacy arm, business programs for existing and recruited businesses, large scale marketing campaigns and over 100 event days bringing a million guests to Downtown annually.

Prior to her position in Fresno, Borders was the Executive Director of East Town Association in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. While there, she helped transform the local economy and stimulate the residential relocation to Downtown Milwaukee by producing large-scale community driven events focusing on local music. She also played a key role in improving East Town’s streetscaping, public art, and wayfinding signage projects.

Kate Borders first discovered her passion for creating positive community engagement making economic impacts in downtowns while employed at the Peoria Art Guild in Peoria, Illinois. As Executive Director, she produced one of the country’s top 10 annual fine art fairs in the country.

Although she was born in South Carolina, she is no stranger to Arizona as she attended the University of Arizona where she earned her BA in Music. She also received a Master’s Degree (MBA) in non-profit Arts Management from Columbia College in Downtown Chicago.

The DTC Board of Directors and Staff are looking forward to working with Borders. Spike Lawrence, Chairman of the DTC Board, expresses, “As the new President and Executive Director, Borders will be instrumental in the advancement of future projects for the Downtown Tempe Community, as well as be an integral part of informing the public to the vast amenities the Mill Avenue District has to offer.”
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission [Tempe HPC]

MEETING MINUTES

Date: THURSDAY, May 08, 2014

Location: Hatton Hall 34 East Seventh Street

Commissioners Present: Ira Bennett, Anne Bilsbarrow, Chuck Buss, Andrea Gregory, Charlie Lee, Scott Solliday, Brenda Shears,

Staff Present: Amy Douglass, Alyssa Gerszewski, Hansen, Billy Kiser, Joe Nucci, Mary O’Grady, Mark Vinson

Public Present: Lauren Allsopp, Bill Collins, Colleen Hausman, David Hausman, Victor Linoff

Call to Order: 6:02 P.M., Andrea Gregory, Chair

1. Call to Audience NO REPLY

2. Approval of HPC Minutes 04/10/2014

MOTION [BILSBARROW]: MOVE TO APPROVE TEMPE HPC MEETING MINUTES FROM 04/10/2014, SECOND [LEE], APPROVED 7-0.

3. Public Hearing Raymond (Hausman) House Hist. Designation

• Q: Is the stucco original to the house? A: Yes
• HPO received two additional letters of support for designation

MOTION [BENNETT]: “MOVE THAT THE TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION, MAYOR, AND CITY COUNCIL THAT THE RAYMOND(HAUSMAN) HOUSE BE DESIGNATED HISTORIC AND LISTED IN THE TEMPE HISTORIC PROPERTYREGISTER.” SECOND [SOLLIDAY], APPROVED 7-0.

4. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Plan Update

• Presentation by ASU Faculty Associate Dr. Lauren Allsopp
• Tempe has contextual zoning but exceptions are sometimes made for new development
• Discussion of the purpose and intent for an HP Plan
• 6 benefits: revitalization, tourism, environmental sustainability, increased property values, job creation, tax advantages
• Discussion of historic district mapping (Manhattan used as example)
• Discussion on steps to historic designation
• Critical Hope has steel casement window preservation program
• Discussion of marketing and public awareness
• Discussion of the need for annual review of HP Plan
• Overview of 10 objectives of an effective HP Plan
• Possible ASU student involvement in HP Plan (per Dr. Allsopp)
• Q: How long should it take to create a new HP Plan? A: 9-12 months.
• A.R.S. requires an HP Plan – it is a statutory obligation
• Nucci: spoke with Phoenix HPO Michelle Dodd about current Phoenix initiatives to create new HP Plan, which is viewed as an outreach device
5. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Incentives Update

- Presentation by Bill Collins from SHPO on 2013 preservation incentives update
- Analysis of the effects of historic designation on single-family residential properties (commercial and rental properties not addressed in study)
- Overview of property tax reduction program
- Discussion of the impact of the recent recession on historic vs. non-historic home values
- Mentions Donovan Rypkema’s publications on Historic Preservation economic effects
- Comparison of statistics from 2006 (height of housing bubble) to 2013 home sales and assessed home values
- NR historic districts have higher sales value than non-NR districts listed only on local register
- No cases found in which property values declined as a result of historic designation – no evidence for any negative financial effect over time in City of Phoenix
- Property tax break inflates home values
- Per 2013 update, historic designation did not prevent property value declines, which characterized all Maricopa County single-family residential properties post-2009
- Impacts of tax breaks on overall tax revenue are minimal
- Discussion of Prop 207 effects
- Tempe example of the positive effects of designation: Borden Homes (National Register) and Hudson Manor (no historic designation): Borden Homes has seen 10 percent rise in owner occupancy after designation, while Hudson Manor has seen increase in rentals.
- Discussion of the need for a similar economic incentives study for City of Tempe

6. Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Ordinance Update

- Vinson: HPC should wait for upcoming General Plan 2040 vote (May 20) to see if it passes, which will indicate current public sentiment, before finalizing proposals for ordinance updates
- Discussion on upcoming City Council elections – candidates might speak at a future HPF meeting regarding preservation issues
- Discussion of proximity effects on historic districts
- Discussion of historic setting vs. an owner’s preference of setting, which often contradict one another
- Tools to control proximity effects – zoning overlay districts
- Setting must be called out in the nomination as a contributing factor in order for proximity effects to be considered an issue
- Douglass: An historic district must have setting as an area of significance, per SHPO Jim Garrison’s matrix
- Discussion of external vs. internal proximity effects. Ex: Gracie’s development was external, built adjacent to Borden Homes historic district.
- Bilbbarrow: External development is not a preservation issue since it occurs outside of historic district boundaries, and any attempt to regulate proximity effect controls would be unenforceable; to be enforceable, historic district overlay zoning would have to be expanded to include property beyond the actual district, which is not viable.
- HPC determines it will not pursue recommendations for an ordinance update to regulate external proximity effects on historic districts.
- Discussion of archaeological monitoring and acquisition of database of sensitive areas – ordinance language on this issue needs clarification
• Linoff: Overview of HP Plan in Mesa; stresses the need to consider political realities when making suggestions for an ordinance update

7. **Discuss & Consider Proposed Cavalier Hills Historic Designation**
   • Cavalier Hills designation proposal has been withdrawn by applicant Virginia Hewett

8. **Discuss and Consider Graduate Student Intern Program Projects**
   • Gerszewski: Finishing Moeur Park NRN, working on GRIC grant funding packet
   • Kiser: No report

9. **Discuss and Consider Chair/Staff Updates:**
   • Nucci: Overview of Recent HPF Summit

10. **Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items**
    Next HPC Meeting Date Thursday 07/10/2014 at 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street (NO JUNE MEETING)

    Meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM

__________________________

Andrea Gregory, Chair

-minutes scheduled for HPC approval on 07/10/2014
FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS OR ACRONYMS

- **CDD – City of Tempe Community Development Department**: Established February 15, 2005, by City Manager Will Manley; the CDD consists of six divisions: Economic Development, Housing Services, Redevelopment, Neighborhood Enhancement, Rio Salado/Town Lake, and Special Projects, as well as the Community Design Studio / City Architect. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office is an agency of the Special Projects Division.
- **CLG – Certified Local Government**: In 1980, Congress established a framework for local preservation programs through an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act empowering Arizona cities and counties to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). Once certified, these entities are eligible for specialized assistance and funds for developing their own local preservation programs and entitled to comment on NR and other SHPO activities within their boundaries. The City of Tempe became a CLG in 1995.
- **DA – Development & Disposition Agreement**: a redevelopment contract between the City and one or more developers or redevelopers specifying terms and conditions for construction or reconstruction.
- **DSD – City of Tempe Development Services Department**: dealing with Building Safety, Land Use, Planning and Zoning.
- **DRC – City of Tempe Development Review Commission**: volunteer board advising Mayor and Council on matters related to the built environment and administration of General Plan 2030 and the Zoning and Development Code.
- **GRIC – Gila River Indian Community**: an alliance of two tribes, the Akimel O’odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa). Established by Executive Order in 1859, the Community covers more than 600 square miles and is the largest indigenous community in the Phoenix metropolitan area. GRIC helps make the Tempe Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program possible through a generous grant of State-Shared Revenue funds.
- **HPF – (see Tempe HPF)** Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation.
- **HSRC – (Arizona) Historic Sites Review Committee**: Arizona's official Arizona and National Register of Historic Places review board. The HSRC meets three times during the year to review National Register nominations and advise the State Historic Preservation Officer on nominations to the State and National Registers.
- **IEBC – International Existing Building Code**: adopted by Tempe City Council by Ordinance No. 2005.89 on December 1, 2005, as part of the code body promulgated by the International Code Council, provides means for preservation of existing Tempe building inventory through reasonable and feasible code processes.
- **IRS – Issue Review Session**: informal Mayor and Council public meeting where members of the public may come forward and talk with City Council during the “Call to the Audience” prior to regular Council meetings.
- **NPS – National Park Service**: the City of Tempe is a Certified Local Government through an inter-governmental agreement with the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.
- **NRN – National Register Nomination**: An application to list a property on the National Register of Historic Places is reviewed by the SHPO and then by the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee (Sites) before formal application is made to the Keeper of the National Register in Washington DC.
- **PAD – Planned Area Development**: site plan overlay to define development standards for a specific project.
- **SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office**: a division of Arizona State Parks, responsible for the identification, evaluation, and protection of Arizona's prehistoric and historic cultural resources; established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.
- **SRP-MIC – Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community**: created by Executive Order on June 14, 1879 by President Rutherford B. Hayes, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) is located in Maricopa County, aside the boundaries of Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and metropolitan Phoenix.
- **Tempe HPC – Tempe Historic Preservation Commission**: Created by Ordinance 95.35, adopted November 9, 1995. Members serve three year terms with the exception of the initial appointments; charged with administering the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance and Plan, as well as advising Mayor / Council on all matters related to historic preservation.
- **Tempe HPF – Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation**: A private nonprofit corporation established in 2005, Mission Statement 02.02.06 “The Foundation advocates preserving Tempe’s at-risk historic properties and supporting worthy preservation projects through education, community participation, and fundraising.”
- **Tempe HPO – Tempe Historic Preservation Office**: Responsible for the identification and conservation of Tempe's prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Office uses Federal, state, and city funding for the historic preservation program and assists owners of historic properties with grant applications, property maintenance, and preservation activities; provides staff support to the Tempe HPC.
- **THM – Tempe Historical Museum**: Located at 809 E. Southern Avenue in Tempe, the Tempe Historical Museum is a center where the community comes together to celebrate Tempe's past and ponder the future. Permanent and changing exhibits, educational programs, and research projects generally focus on some aspect of Tempe's history within the context of state and national events.
- **TOD – Tempe Transportation Overlay District**: placed to encourage appropriate land development and redevelopment consistent with and complementary to the community’s focused investment in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure in certain geographic areas of the City; typically in association with the light rail.
- **ZDC – Zoning & Development Code**: Adopted by Mayor and Council on January 20, 2005, effective February 22, 2005, the ZDC implements Tempe General Plan 2030 by encouraging creative development of the built environment in order to build a community that promotes the livability and uniqueness of Tempe; establishes zoning districts and development standards.
ACTION: Hold the second and final public hearing to adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 2, Article V, of the Tempe City Code relating to Boards, Commissions, etc.; Chapter 8, Article I, relating to Tempe Building Safety Administrative Code; and Chapter 14A, relating to Historic Preservation. (Ordinance No. O2014.22)

FISCAL IMPACT: There is no fiscal impact to the City.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt Ordinance No. O2014.22.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: In recent years, a limited number of boards and commissions have experienced some difficulty in holding meetings due to vacancies or non-active members. Additionally, because of the limited scope of some boards and commissions, meetings are held infrequently or not at all.

Council discussions on Boards and Commissions consolidation began at the Council’s August 17 retreat and continued at its December 9 Committee of the Whole meeting. The City Council reviewed the Boards and Commissions consolidation proposal at its February 3 and February 24 Council Committee of the Whole meetings and at its March 20 Issue Review Session.

To facilitate a meaningful experience for all board and commission members, the City Council asked staff to evaluate merging or eliminating some advisory groups and consider reducing the number of participants on larger groups experiencing quorum issues. These revisions are aimed at increasing efficiency, decreasing the number of vacancies, eliminating quorum issues on larger boards and commissions, and ultimately increasing participation.

Additionally, to gain public input, members of the public were able to express their opinions on the proposals from January 21 through February 3 using the City’s online survey tool, Tempe Forum.

The proposed consolidations are as follows:
- Merging the Building Code Advisory Board of Appeals (5 seats) with the Electrical Code Advisory Board of Appeals (7 seats) and the Plumbing and Mechanical Code Advisory Board of Appeals (5 seats). The new board would have 9 seats.
- Merging the Double Butte Cemetery Advisory Committee (9 seats) with the Parks, Recreation and Golf Advisory Board (9 seats). The new board would have 11 seats.
- Merging the Historical Museum Advisory Board (9 seats) with the Library Advisory Board (9 seats). The new board would have 9 seats.
- Transition the Tardeada Advisory Board to an informal working group.
- Change the two alternate positions on the Historic Preservation Commission to permanent positions.
- Reduce the number of seats on the Aviation Commission from 11 to 9.
- Reduce the number of seats on the Commission on Disability Concerns from 15 to 9.
- Reduce the number of seats on the Human Relations Commission from 13 to 11.
- Reduce the number of seats on the Municipal Arts Commission from 15 to 13.
- Reduce the number of seats on the Neighborhood Advisory Commission from 21 to 15.

ATTACHMENTS: Ordinance

STAFF CONTACT(S): Jeff Kulaga, Assistant City Manager, (480) 350-8844

Department Director: Jeff Kulaga, Assistant City Manager
Legal review by: Chuck Cahoy, Deputy City Attorney
Prepared by: Erin Fillmore, Executive Assistant to the City Manager
ORDINANCE NO. O2014.22

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA, AMENDING CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE V, TEMPE CITY CODE, RELATING TO BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, ETC., CHAPTER 8, ARTICLE I, TEMPE CITY CODE, RELATING TO TEMPE BUILDING SAFETY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, AND CHAPTER 14A, TEMPE CITY CODE, RELATING TO HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA, as follows:

Section 1. That Chapter 2, Article V, Division 2, Section 2-191 of the Tempe City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

DIVISION 2. HISTORICAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY ADVISORY BOARD

Sec. 2-191. Established; composition.

(a) There is hereby established the Tempe historical museum AND LIBRARY advisory board of the city to be composed of nine (9) members.

(b) The community services director shall designate a staff representative to serve the historical museum AND LIBRARY advisory board in an advisory capacity.

Section 2. That Chapter 2, Article V, Division 2, Section 2-194 of the Tempe City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 2-194. Officers.

The officers of the historical museum AND LIBRARY advisory board shall be selected by the board members at the first meeting of the board following the thirtieth day of June of each year, and shall serve until the thirtieth day of June of the next succeeding year. No officer shall serve in the same capacity for more than two (2) consecutive one year terms.

Section 3. That Chapter 2, Article V, Division 2, Section 2-195 of the Tempe City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:
PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TEMPE, ARIZONA this 12th day of June, 2014.

Mark W. Mitchell, Mayor

ATTEST:

Brigitta M. Kuiper, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Judith R. Baumann, City Attorney
4. The board may adopt such rules and regulations necessary for the discharge of its duties, provided said rules are not in conflict with the charter or this code.

5. The board is empowered to call upon the city attorney's office for legal counsel and upon any other office or board to aid and assist the board in its deliberations.

110.8. Appeal from decision of the community development director.

1. Any person dissatisfied with a decision of the community development director applying to the technical provisions of the building code TECHNICAL CODES or to an alternate material or method of construction may request a hearing before the board by filing an appeal with the community development director on a form provided therefore. Such appeal shall be heard at the next regular meeting of the board unless such appeal is filed within 21 days preceding the next regular board meeting, in which case such appeal shall be heard at the next succeeding regular or special board meeting.

2. All hearings shall be open to the public and any person whose interest may be affected by the decision shall be given an opportunity to be heard.

3. The board shall render all its decisions on appeals in writing to the appellant with a copy to the community development director.

110.9. Appeal from decision of the board.

1. If the board's decision is not concurred with by the appellant or the community development director, the appellant or the community development director may then appeal the decision to the city council within 21 days after the board's submission of such decision to the appellant and community development director. The appeal shall be in writing and shall be filed with the city clerk.

2. The city council's decision on the matter shall be predicated on the same findings as set forth in Section 110.7 and shall be final.

110.10. Appeal filing, fees.

1. Appeals shall be filed in the office of the community development department on a form provided therefore. A fee shall be paid at the time of filing of an appeal, in accordance with the schedule established by city council (see Appendix A).

2. No part of the fees required herein shall be refundable after an application is filed and the fee paid.

Section 21. That Chapter 14A, Section 14A-3 of the Tempe City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:
Sec. 14A-3. Historic preservation commission; historic preservation officer.

(a) The Tempe historic preservation commission is hereby established. The commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the city council in all matters concerning historic preservation. The commission shall make recommendations to the development review commission regarding designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts. Other actions of the historic preservation commission, as set forth below, shall be subject to appeal to the city council, as described in § 14A-8 of this chapter.

(b) The commission shall consist of seven (7) NINE (9) members and no more than two (2) alternates, meeting certain qualifications as set forth below, appointed by the mayor and approved by the city council.

1. All members shall be Tempe residents with a demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation; and

2. The commission shall be composed of three (3) FOUR (4) at-large members and four (4) FIVE (5) professionals, drawn from the following disciplines, with no more than two (2) such professionals from the same discipline: architecture, architectural history, archeology, historic preservation law, history, landscape architecture, planning, building construction, or other related field.

(c) Members shall serve a term of three (3) years, except that two (2) of the initial members shall, upon appointment, be designated to serve terms of two (2) years each. In addition, two (2) other initial members shall be designated to serve first terms of one year. Those subsequently appointed shall serve regular terms of three (3) years. Members may be reappointed, but shall serve not more than two (2) complete, consecutive terms. If a commission member accumulates three (3) consecutive unexcused absences, the matter will be referred to the mayor's office for resolution. Members of the commission shall serve voluntarily and without compensation.

(d) The Tempe historical museum administrator, or designee, shall serve ex-officio, with no vote, except as specified.

(e) Whenever a member is unable to attend or must decline participation due to a conflict of interest, that member shall give timely notice to the HPO or chair of the commission. In the event that a sufficient number of members, including alternates, are not available to constitute a quorum, the HPO or the Tempe historical museum administrator or designee is authorized to act as a member on consent agenda items only, and only to the extent that this presence constitutes a quorum.

(f) Four (4) FIVE (5) members shall constitute a quorum of the commission; the concurring vote of four (4) FIVE (5) members shall be necessary for any action of the commission on any matter.
(g) Conflict of interest of commission members is governed by Arizona Revised Statutes, applicable judicial decisions and opinions of the city attorney.

(h) The commission shall elect, from within its own membership, a chair and vice-chair.

(i) The commission shall hold a minimum of four (4) public meetings/hearings per year. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the commission chair or four (4) FIVE (5) or more members of the commission. The minutes of its proceedings, indicating the vote of each member and records of its examinations and other official actions shall be kept and filed in the offices of the community development department and the city clerk as part of the public record.

(j) The commission shall adopt rules of procedure consistent with the provisions of this chapter for the performance of its duties.

(k) Commission duties and activities shall include the following:

(1) Reviewing applications for the designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts and making recommendations to the development review commission, such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in § 14A-4 of this chapter;

(2) Reviewing and making decisions on applications for proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties or properties located within an historic district; such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in § 14A-6 of this chapter;

(3) Making recommendations to the city council concerning the use of federal, state, city or available private funds to promote the preservation of properties and districts within the city, including acquisition, the awarding of such subgrants as may become available and the requiring of preservation covenants, as well as the acquisition of preservation easements;

(4) Recommending to the city council and other applicable boards and commissions, changes in the Zoning and Development Code, building code, general plan or other local laws as may enhance the purposes of this chapter;

(5) Cooperating with representatives designated by the property owners of the district from designated historic districts to formulate design guidelines for alterations and new construction within their districts;

(6) Initiating and conducting detailed studies and surveys of properties, structures and areas within the city and assess their potential for designation, and in order to formulate an historic preservation plan for the city; and
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(7) Developing and participating in public information activities in order to increase public awareness of the value of historic preservation, and perform other functions that will encourage or further the interests of historic preservation.

(l) The Tempe historic preservation officer (HPO) is hereby established. The HPO shall be appointed by the director of the community development department, have a demonstrated interest in historic preservation and be a qualified professional in one or more pertinent fields such as archeology, architecture, cultural geography, landscape architecture or planning. The duties of the HPO shall include:

(1) Serving as secretary to the historic preservation commission, facilitating its efforts and, with other city staff as necessary, providing administrative support;

(2) Accepting applications for designations and proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal;

(3) Acting as intermediary between the commission and other city regulatory functions;

(4) Providing technical and background information to the commission and public, as required;

(5) Approving proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties and properties within historic districts, in the instance of such work being obviously minor in nature and impact, or in cases of imminent public hazard, and reporting such approvals to the commission;

(6) Preparing annual written reports of commission activities that are submitted to the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) and made available to the public. The reports shall contain, at a minimum, minutes of meetings, decisions made, special projects and activities, the number and type of cases reviewed, current resumes of commission members and member attendance records; and

(7) Maintaining the Tempe historic property register and lists of historic eligible and archeologically sensitive properties.

Section 22. That Chapter 14A, Section 14A-4(c) of the Tempe City Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(c) The designation process is as follows:

(1) Application for the designation of a landmark, historic property or historic district shall be made by the owner of such real property, or of property located within the boundaries of such proposed district, situated in the city, or by any
officer, department, board, commission or the city council, with the HPO at the community development department, on such form(s) and accompanied by such fee(s) as may be adopted;

(2) Any such application for designation, as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection above, shall also be accompanied by:

a. A vicinity ownership map showing all parcels in the vicinity adjacent to, including and surrounding the proposed designated property or district, within a radius of three hundred (300) feet from the external boundaries of the property or district; each such parcel shall be designated by a number to correspond with the ownership/tenant list described in subparagraph b. of this paragraph below;

b. A typed or legibly printed list containing names and mailing addresses, including zip codes, of owners of parcels as described in subparagraph a. of this paragraph above, and identified by the same number as on the vicinity ownership map, and the names and addresses, including zip codes, of any tenants associated with the described parcels;

c. An accurate legal description or parcel number(s) as recorded with Maricopa County, of the proposed designated property or properties within the proposed historic district; and

d. A written description of the proposed designated property or historic district, addressing the pertinent criteria, as described in subsections (a) and (b) of this section;

(3) The HPO shall then place the request on the next available agenda of the commission for a public hearing. Upon request by the applicant, a special meeting may be called at the discretion of the chair of the commission, or by four (4) FIVE (5) or more commission members;

(4) Upon receipt of an application and placement on the next available commission agenda, the HPO shall compile and transmit to the commission a complete report on the subject property or district. This report shall address the location, condition, age, significance and integrity of historic features and identify potential contributing and noncontributing properties and other relevant information, together with a recommendation to grant or deny the application and the reasons for the recommendation;

(5) At a public hearing, the commission shall review the application based on the applicable criteria in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, together with the HPO report, and make a recommendation to the development review commission. Any recommendation for approval may be subject to such
conditions as the historic preservation commission deems applicable in order to fully carry out the provisions and intent of this chapter;

(6) Once forwarded to the development review commission, a public hearing shall be set and conducted according to the applicable procedures for amendment, as described in Section 6-304 of the Zoning and Development Code;

(7) After such public hearing, the development review commission shall make a report and recommendation to city council. The city council shall then set a public hearing on the application in accordance with subsection (e) of this section; and

(8) The recommendation of approval of any designation by the historic preservation commission shall be void if the designation has not been adopted by the city council within one year of the commission's action.

Section 23. Implementation

a. No sitting member of the boards and commissions consolidated or reduced in membership by this Ordinance shall be removed from office by operation of this Ordinance prior to the expiration of the member’s term, the member’s resignation, or the member’s removal from office as otherwise provided by law.

b. Each board or commission consolidated or reduced in membership by this Ordinance shall continue to meet and act with the duly-appointed and approved members constituting the membership of that board or commission until such time as expirations of term, resignations, or other provisions of law reduce the membership of each board or commission to the number of members specified in this Ordinance.

c. Future appointments and approvals of members of the boards and commissions shall be consistent with the terms of this Ordinance, the Tempe City Code, and the City Charter; provided, however, that appointments and reappointments to the boards and commissions shall be made so as to ensure that the members of the boards and commissions have staggered terms and to otherwise ensure the proper functioning of the boards and commissions.

Section 24. Pursuant to the Tempe City Charter, Section 2.12, ordinances are effective thirty (30) days after adoption.
Objective

To gain a deeper understanding of stakeholders and sustainable solutions to foster resilient and equitable communities at a local and international level.

Experience

Arizona State University, Teaching Assistant  
August 2013- Present
  - Facilitating classroom & virtual discussion
  - Grade topical & research papers

City of Phoenix: Office of Environmental Programs, Intern  
February- May 2013
  - Assist staff on projects and assignments such as grant writing, presentations, and public outreach
  - Coordinate constituent events and engage with community members and stakeholders

Nando’s Mexican Café, Manager and Bartender  
September 2003- Present
  - Coordinate training and progress of new and current employees
  - Multi-tasking including: floor supervision, product ordering and development
  - Conflict resolution

Education

Arizona State University, Master’s in Urban & Environmental Planning  
August 2013- Present
  - Relevant coursework and projects to the field of urban and environmental planning
  - Co-author on activation plan for the Warehouse District in Phoenix, Arizona
  - Upsilon Rho Beta, Urban Planning Honors Society: Vice President and member

Arizona State University, Double-Bachelor’s in Sustainability & English Literature  
August 2010- May 2012
  - Graduated Cum Laude
  - Co-author on research paper and poster on the behavioral norms and beliefs about the landscape management of Phoenix, Arizona

Skills

  - Highly accountable to work independently and within a group setting
  - Training in nonviolent communication
Interest in Phoenix warehouse district rises

Eugene Scott, The Republic | azcentral.com  6:27 p.m. MST March 25, 2014

In the past six months, interest in Phoenix's Warehouse District along downtown's southern edge appears to be growing.

The Pressroom, an event and concert venue capable of hosting more than 1,000 people, opened last month. Mars Hill Church, a Seattle-area megachurch, launched its Phoenix campus with more than 700 people in the Bentley Projects, an art gallery and event space, a month earlier. And the City Council recently approved zoning for the Ball Park Apartments, a 276-unit community.

Mayor Greg Stanton mentioned the area last week in his State of the City address.

"We're finding new, productive uses for older buildings by waiving fees and adjusting permit policies," he said. "Adaptive reuse projects are taking off, (like) the Warehouse District, where Arizona State University's Herberger Institute of Design has given new life to the community."

But some say the city has not done enough to preserve older buildings and that the city, which is facing a nearly $38 million budget shortfall, is too quick to support projects that will destroy the few remaining such structures.

"It's a complicated problem. In fairness to the city, they are underfunded, but somehow they are able to pull money out of their (behinds) when they need to," said Michael Levine, who has renovated several downtown warehouses. "No more demolition, no more excuses."
ASU art student A.J. Nafziger carries a painting in front of the School of Art in Phoenix's Warehouse District, 605 E. Grant St. (Photo: Mark Henle/The Republic)

The warehouses were constructed along rail lines in Phoenix's early days, when supplies and merchandise arrived by railroad.

The area known as the Warehouse District generally spans just south of the downtown core from Seventh Street to Seventh Avenue and Grant to Jefferson streets.

The Warehouse Character Area is a much larger area that weaves in and out of the section immediately south of the downtown core. It is sometimes as far north as Madison Street and as far south as Hadley Street and goes from Seventh Street to Seventh Avenue, according to acting Planning and Development Department Director Alan Stephenson.

Fewer than 60 historical buildings remain in the character area, Levine said. Dozens of them have been torn down over the past three decades to make room for condominiums, US Airways Center and parking lots, he said.

"I'm trying to save Phoenix from itself," Levine said. "You can't have historic preservation if there's no buildings left to save. It's black and white. The buildings have to be saved."

City leaders have recently prioritized urban revitalization projects in some of downtown's more high-profile areas, including adding bike lanes, planting more trees and installing more public art.

"Compared with the rest of the city that needs beautification, there's way too much focus on the downtown core to begin with," Levine said.
Comparable projects aren't needed near the warehouses, Levine said. He simply wants to see the buildings protected and not sold to the first developer with the biggest check.

"I'm not asking for any streetscaping — just stop the demolition," he said. "The buildings will outlast any of the bad landscaping and streetscaping the city can do. That, I'm confident in."

But preserving the Warehouse District's privately owned buildings is not necessarily easy for the city, said Jennifer Boucek, director of the non-profit Preserve Phoenix.

Voters passed Proposition 207 in 2006, which supporters say prevents cities from taking private property for third-party private development merely to increase tax revenue and requires cities to justly compensate property owners when government regulation devalues private property.

But preservationists say the proposition has paralyzed cities, preventing them from taking private property for historical preservation out of fear of lawsuits by property owners claiming that eminent domain has devalued their property.

"If you look at how interested people are in historic preservation, I think many would be surprised to know that they voted in something that makes it almost impossible for the city to protect its heritage," Boucek said.

There are privately owned warehouses now eligible for preservation that the city likely will not try to save, Boucek said.

"With the Warehouse District, it is a great shame that Phoenix did not act more aggressively in the years before Proposition 207 was enacted," she said. "Because development of that district could have been so beneficial for the overall development of downtown."

Other neighborhoods in and bordering the downtown core, such as Evans Churchill and Grand Avenue, have been more successful in preserving their buildings because residents and property owners united to mobilize their efforts at City Hall, Levine said.

The various property owners in the Warehouse District often seem to work against one another, Boucek said.

"I don't know why a group hasn't come together in that district," she said. "It may be because a lot of the people who purchase there are just land speculators who are waiting for the day to do something more lucrative with the property."

Levine said it's hard to come together when different people have different interests. While some of his peers say they want to preserve buildings, others would allow them to be demolished for the right price.

He hopes the area's successes help decision makers see the economic value in preserving the district's buildings.
"You just have to hit people over the head time and time again," Levine said. "The buildings are always worth more standing than they are in a pile of rubble."

Ryan Welsh, lead pastor of Mars Hill Phoenix, said his church originally opened in the Warehouse District to be close to downtown but has since come to see its intrinsic value.

"We really love it," he said "And we're very open to the possibility of buying something down there long-term now that we're there."

Read or Share this story: http://azc.cc/Qc4sLQ
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Plan

_Preservation is about deciding what's important, figuring out how to protect it, and passing along an appreciation for what was saved to the next generation._ (http://www.nps.gov/history/preservation.htm, 03/27/14)

Few communities with historic preservation programs have adopted formal historic preservation plans. There is a perception that historic preservation is largely reactive in nature, responding to threats at the last moment; however, current historic preservation practice is often woven into many facets of a city government’s activities and plans. _PreserveHistoricPHX_ identifies goals and strategies for the city of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office as it works over the next ten years to protect, enhance and preserve properties and areas of historical, cultural, archaeological and aesthetic significance in the interests of the health, prosperity and welfare of the people of the city of Phoenix. Historical and cultural resources include elements from the built environment such as buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts. Seeking to build on past successes and overcome new changes, _PreserveHistoricPHX_ pinpoints ways in which historic preservation can play a role in economic development, neighborhood revitalization, building community and civic pride and promoting a sustainable lifestyle. Without an eye to the past, the community can neither recognize how it achieved its current form and unique personality nor can it build upon that history and character. Historic and cultural resources are tangible evidence of the multitude of changes and growth that Phoenix has experienced from the first settlement by the Hohokam ca. 500 AD to Jack Swilling’s recognition of the expanse farm land at the foot of the north slopes of the White Tank Mountains to the great post World War II boom to today.

**What is an historic preservation plan?**

An historic preservation plan is many things:

- A protection strategy for valued heritage;
- A long-term vision for the city's historic preservation program;
- A set of priorities for future activities; and
- And a list of some innovative strategies for achieving the identified goals and objectives.

It is a long-term vision for the city’s historic preservation program, proactively setting priorities for future activities, and identifies innovative strategies for achieving the identified goals and objectives. It is also one of the strongest tools available for preserving our valued heritage properties. Such a plan is even stronger when it is closely linked into the local land-use decision-making process. As a supplement to the _General Plan for the City of Phoenix_ it seeks to integrate historic preservation issues into the broader goals and strategies developed in the planPHX process.

**What does it do?**

Historic preservation plays a vital role in maintaining the character and identity Phoenix. _PreserveHistoricPHX_:

- Serves as a guiding document for future HP projects and programs in the city;
- Details the city's HP goals;
- Recommends the implementation of specific policies and actions for achieving those goals;
- Summarizes the information available on the historic resources in the city of Phoenix; and
- Highlights the issues and concerns of residents and professionals regarding the preservation and enhancement of cultural and historic resources.

_PreserveHistoricPHX_ represents the city’s first effort to think comprehensively about the role historic preservation throughout Phoenix and identify what other tools may be available to preserve and stabilize neighborhood character other than historic preservation. It is intended to be used to inform future decisions and play a strategic role in guiding preservation activity over the next 10 years.

**How was it created?**

_PreserveHistoricPHX_ started with a review of the historic preservation plans accessible on-line for other communities in the western United States. The Historic Preservation Office (HPO) wanted to know what other municipal and state governments found important enough to address in their historic preservation plans or general plan elements. The plans had many sections...
in common, including a history of the community, the legal basis for historic preservation, the history of the preservation program as well as information regarding the economic benefits of historic preservation and its connection with improved sustainability.

**Public Participation**

The HPO then held four public meetings to solicit input from the residents of Phoenix. Two general meetings (March 15, 2014, and April 1, 2014) were held at the Burton Barr Central Library and two special meetings for interested groups (Phoenix Historic Neighborhoods Coalition, March 20, 2014, and the Story Preservation Association (FQ Story Historic District), April 8, 2014) were held upon request. Approximately ninety people attended the meetings. The complete results of these public meetings are available in Appendix D.

At each meeting we asked two questions:

1. What should be preserved?
2. How should it be preserved?

After the first question, each participant was given eight colored dots to place after the properties that were most important to them. Those who attended our meetings expressed an interest in preserving properties in the:

- **Post War Expansion (1945-1975) era**: 41%
- **Statehood to Great Depression (1912-1931) era**: 17%
- **Great Depression & World War II (1932-1944) era**: 10%

The following property types received the most votes:

- **Commercial**: 38
- **Public/Institutional** (Governmental, Religious & Educational buildings): 25
- **Single-family Residential**: 24

The individual properties and districts that received the most votes were:

- **Union Station (1923)**: 17
- **Westward Ho Hotel (1928)**: 15
- **Arizona State Fairgrounds & Veteran’s Memorial Coliseum**: 13
- **St. Matthew’s Neighborhood**: 11

These general concepts received the most votes:

- **Landsapes & Streetscapes**: 67
- **Historic Neighborhoods**: 48
- **Phoenix Trolley System**: 44
- **Adobe Buildings**: 35
- ** Signs, neon and vintage**: 15
- **Alleys**: 15
- **Windows**: 15
- **Industrial Buildings & Warehouses**: 13
- **Canals/Irrigation Structures/Flood Irrigation**: 11

After the voting for the first question was completed, all of the participants gathered to answer the second question: How should it be preserved? The responses were then classified by staff under one of the following areas:

(a) Alternatives to designation
(b) Customer service initiatives
(c) Response to demolitions

---

1 This category includes the Arizona State Fairgrounds, Fairgrounds & Coliseum, State Fairgrounds and Coliseum.
2 This category includes historic driveways, streetscapes, streetscapes, streetscapes/landscapes, streetview of historic home, hardscape, sidewalks, sidewalks, landscapes, landscaping, landscaping in residential districts, lawns in historic districts, murphy bridle path, salt cedar trees and shade trees.
3 This category includes general mentions of historic neighborhoods as well as most of those identified by name. St. Matthews Neighborhood is mentioned separately because it garnered 11 votes on its own.
4 This category includes Phoenix trolley cars, Phoenix Trolley Museum and street railway lines embedded in streets.
5 Both general meetings attended by 4+ representatives of the Phoenix Trolley Museum who primarily cast their votes in favor of all things trolley related.
6 This category includes Canal system, Canals, Canals/Irrigation Structures/Flood Irrigation and Dirt Canals.
This information was used to create the goals and objectives for the program for the next 10 years. (See Moving Forward).

**B. Legal Basis for Historic Preservation**

Sidebar: In 1978, the US Supreme Court, in the landmark case *Penn Central Transportation Co. v. City of New York*, 438 U.S. 104 (1978), recognized that historic preservation was a valid public purpose and a legitimate function of government. In this case, Grand Central Terminal in New York was saved for future generations to appreciate.

**National**

Federal legislation related to historic preservation dates back to the early 1900s and the 1906 Antiquities Act (PL 59-209). President Theodore Roosevelt, noted outdoor enthusiast, established many national parks during his term in office. The passage of the Antiquities Act was a response to threats to mostly prehistoric Native American ruins and artifacts on federal lands in the American West. The Act authorized permits for legitimate archaeological investigations and penalties for taking or destroying antiquities without permission. It also authorized the President to proclaim "historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest" as national monuments. Two of the earliest National Monuments designated are located in Arizona. Two of the earliest were Montezuma Castle, cliff dwellings of the Sinagua people (near Camp Verde, Ariz., Dec. 8, 1906) and the Tonto National Monument (located in the Tonto National Forest, established Oct. 21, 1907) is one of many wilderness areas monuments.

Congress created the National Park Service (NPS) in August 25, 1916 with the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. §1). In 1935 Historic Sites Act (PL 74-292) became law. It “declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States” giving the NPS the authority to

(a) “secure, collate, and preserve drawings, plans, photographs, and other data of historic and archaeologic sites, buildings, and objects” for which NPS utilized the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), launched in 1933 as the nation’s first federal historic preservation program to document America’s architectural heritage,

(b) Make a survey of historic and archaeologic sites, buildings, and objects for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

(c) Make necessary investigations and researches in the United States relating to particular sites, buildings, or objects to obtain true and accurate historical and archaeological [sic] facts and information concerning the same.

Following the Great Depression and World War II and in response to the needs expressed by leaders of the American historic preservation movement, President Harry Truman signed legislation creating the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) on October 26, 1949, (PL.81-408), to provide support and encouragement for historic preservation efforts. The National Trust focused on acquiring and administering historic sites and in 1951 procured the Woodlawn Plantation in northern Virginia. In 1965, the Special Committee on Historic Preservation sponsored by the United States Conference of Mayors with Ford Foundation support, formed in the summer of 1965 including representatives from the NTHP and NPS, worked to publish recommendations for furthering historic preservation at the federal level. The result of this task force, *With Heritage So Rich*, was published in early 1966 and recommended passage of National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law on October 15, 1966.

“The preamble to the law declared that the historical and cultural past of the nation should be preserved as ‘a living part’ of community life in order to ‘give a sense of orientation to the American people.’” Passed by 89th Congress, the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended in 2006, has led to the creation of state, county and municipal historic preservation programs across the US. But the 89th Congress didn’t stop there. It became known as the “Preservation Congress” because of the passage of two laws in addition to the NHPA:

7 (Glass, 1990), 19.
• Department of Transportation Act which created a policy of preserving natural and man-made sites along highway routes. Spelled out in Section 4F, specifies preservation responsibilities of the Sec. of Transportation
• The Demonstration Cities Act – made policy for Secretary of Housing and Urban Development “to recognize preservation and to fund preservation projects which, in essence, laid the basis for an entirely new potential for urban renewal through the agency. Result encourage recycling and reuse of existing housing stock instead of demolition and replacement

The NPS is the federal agency responsible for the administration and implementation of the NHPA. As the lead preservation agency, it sets the standards and guidelines for the preservation of historic and cultural resources, and how they are to be identified and treated and it maintains the National Register of Historic Places.

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing professional standards and providing advice on the preservation and protection of all cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (the Standards), apply to all proposed development grant-in-aid projects assisted through the National Historic Preservation Fund, and are intended to be applied to a wide variety of resource types, including buildings, sites, structures, objects, and districts. They address four treatments: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. They are common sense historic preservation principles in non-technical language. They promote historic preservation best practices that will help to protect our nation’s irreplaceable cultural resources and are used by preservation programs across the country when reviewing work or changes to an historic property. Many historic preservation programs across the United States use the Standards as the basis for their design guidelines.

The NPS offers technical support, and administers grant funding for State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPO) and Native Hawaiian officials. Title I of the NHPA set up these matching grants to allow states to complete surveys and create comprehensive preservation plans.

In 1980 the National Historic Preservation Act was amended to broaden the federal-state preservation partnership to include local (towns, cities and counties) partners and the Certified Local Government program was born. There are 27 cities and one county (Pima) in Arizona with certified historic preservation programs. CLGs must have established a preservation ordinance and a formalized means of identifying, registering and protecting cultural resources within their boundaries. The CLGs perform much of the historic property survey work in Arizona. Phoenix became a CLG in 1988.

**Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources**

In 1893, the oldest and largest anthropology museum in the Southwest, the Arizona State Museum (ASM), was created by the Arizona Territorial Legislature. ASM is the state’s official permitting agency for archaeological and paleontological projects and the official archaeological repository. It administers the Arizona Antiquities Act (1960) and assists state and federal agencies with enforcing related legislation.

Prior to the passage of the NHPA, there was strong interest in preserving historic and prehistoric sites within the state of Arizona. In 1957, preservationists were part of a coalition that lobbied the state legislature for the creation of the Arizona State Parks Board. Bert Fireman, a prominent Arizona historian and a member of the Parks Board, persuaded the Board to include historic sites among the first State Parks: the former county courthouse in Tombstone, Jerome, Tubac Presidio, Yuma Territorial Prison, Picacho Peak near the site of the Civil War skirmish and Fort Verde.

The passage of the NHPA had an important impact on the work at Arizona State Parks (ASP). While the Parks Board was willing to participate in preservation activities, before the ground-breaking federal law, they focused energy on acquiring parks and establishing services there, especially in natural and recreational areas. The NHPA mandated that State Historic Preservation Offices work in conjunction with the NPS and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to establish a list of properties important to the nation’s history, now known as the National work with federal agencies to avoid the destruction of these sites and administer a program of grants-in-aid to assure their preservation. Arizona Governor Samuel Pearson Goddard, Jr. (1965–1967) appointed Arizona State Parks Director Dennis McCarthy to take on the role of the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Preparation of the first statewide historic preservation plan began in 1969. The NPS approved Arizona’s Interim Plan for Historic Preservation in December 1970 which allowed the state to continue to receive its allocation from the Historic Preservation Fund. This plan established a process for identifying and nominating properties within the state of Arizona to the National Register of Historic Places. It was not until 1974 that the Arizona state legislature established the Arizona State Register.
In 1981, Governor Bruce Babbitt (1978-1987) created the Governor’s Task Force on Historic Preservation. The 12 member body, which included individuals from museums, historical and heritage societies, and universities, established five policies to encourage removal of barriers to historic preservation efforts and replace them with incentives for preservation by state and local government agencies, and state residents. The first policy recommended improving the Arizona Register of Historic Places. At the time, the Arizona Register lacked clear conditions for listing properties and held lesser status to the NRHP.

The second policy addressed cultural resources under state ownership. The policy recommended that:

- All state agencies inventory the cultural resources under their control;
- The state adopt the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation Projects for the treatment of historic buildings;
- The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission make recommendations to the legislature for the development of a policy for the acquisition and disposition of historic resources and to ensure that these resources were adequately maintained;
- State agencies be directed to give first consideration to historic buildings when planning for acquisition or lease of facilities; and
- The state adopted a model building code adjusted to the special concerns of historic buildings and to make it available to other jurisdictions for local use.

The third policy focused on encouraging preservation in the private sector through tax incentives, grants and technical assistance. The recommendation resulted in the creation of the state historic property tax incentive program for owner-occupied residential properties.

The fourth policy took its cues from the revisions to the NHPA in 1980 which instituted the Certified Local Government program to encourage decentralization of historic preservation programs. The resulting legislation enabled the creation of local historic districts and special overlay districts. It also recommended the creation of the Governor’s Award for special achievements in historic preservation. (SIDEBAR OPPORTUNITY re: awards COP HPO has received?)

The last policy sought to promote awareness and appreciation of the unique cultural and historic resources within Arizona, which the Task Force hoped would increase public involvement in preservation projects.

In 1982, the State Historic Preservation Act was passed by the legislature. The State Act encouraged historic resources by state agencies and expanded the role of SHPO to include review of plans by state agencies to determine whether or not they would adversely impact historic properties.

**Municipal Planning**

The General Plan for Phoenix as required by State Law Title 9, article 4, Chapter 6 Municipal Planning. For more information on this requirement and the purpose of the General Plan, see section X of the Phoenix General Plan.

In Arizona, historic preservation is accomplished through the zoning power, which allows local governments to regulate the use of property. In accordance with State Enabling Legislation: A. R. S. §9-462. 01(A)(10) Zoning regulations; public hearing; definitions:

(A) Pursuant to the provisions of this article, the legislative body of any municipality by ordinance may in order to conserve and promote the public health, safety and general welfare.

(10) Establish districts of historical significance provided that:

(a) The ordinances may require that special permission be obtained for any development within the district if the legislative body has adopted a plan for the preservation of districts of historical significance which meets the requirements of subdivision (b) of this paragraph, and the criteria contained in the ordinance are consistent with the objectives set forth in the plan.

(b) A plan for the preservation of districts of historical significance shall identify districts of special historical significance, state the objectives to be sought concerning the development or preservation of sites, area and structures within the district, and formulate a program for public action including the provision of public facilities and the regulation of private development and demolition necessary to realize these objectives.

(c) The ordinance establishing districts of historical significance shall set forth standards necessary to preserve the historical character of the area so designated.

(d) The ordinances may designate or authorize any committee, commission, department or person to designate structures or sites of special historical significance in accordance with criteria contained in the ordinance, and no designation shall be made except after a public hearing upon notice of the
The history of historic preservation in Phoenix can be found in section x.

Local
In 1984, Mayor Terry Goddard and the City Council created an Ad Hoc Committee on Historic Preservation which recommended, among other things, the adoption of an historic preservation ordinance.

Chapter eight of the zoning ordinance is known as the “Historic Preservation Ordinance of the City [sic based on ordinance text] of Phoenix.” It states,

It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement and preservation of properties and areas of historical, cultural, archaeological and aesthetic significance are in the interests of the health, prosperity and welfare of the people of the City of Phoenix. It is further intended to recognize past needless losses of historic properties which had substantial value to the historical and cultural heritage of the citizens of Phoenix, and to take reasonable measures to prevent similar losses in the future. (§802.A)

The preservation ordinance provided for the establishment of historic preservation districts in order to:

1. Protect, enhance and preserve the improvements and landscape features of landmarks, districts and archaeological resources which represent distinctive elements of the city's cultural, educational, social, economic, political, architectural and archaeological history.
2. Safeguard the city’s historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such districts.
3. Foster civic pride in the accomplishments of the past.
4. Protect and enhance the city’s attraction to visitors and the support and stimulus to the economy thereby provided.
5. Promote the use of historic preservation districts and properties for education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the City of Phoenix.

The ordinance, and the policies and procedures of the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office are in place to:

- Encourage the retention and adaptive use of historic properties;
- Ensure that alterations, new construction and subdivisions of lots are compatible with the character of the district or property;
- Recognize the value of historic preservation districts and the contributions that they make to the cultural, educational and historic values of the city,
- To encourage the retention and maintenance of historic properties and districts; and
- Encourage the restoration of historic properties.

The ordinance also encourages the identification of pre-historic and historic archaeological resources, the preservation or recovery of these resources, as appropriate. It also encourages recognition that archaeological resources found on public land are the property of all citizens [sic – ordinance text], and are not private property.

The ordinance created the position of the Historic Preservation Officer and the Historic Preservation Commission made up of nine individuals with demonstrated special interest, knowledge or experience in historic preservation. At least one member of the commission must fulfill each the following roles: registered architect, real estate professional, archaeologist and historian.

Furthermore, it establishes the Phoenix Historic Property register and the means by which historic properties are listed therein, defines the effect of HP zoning, establishes the processes for reviewing projects for Certificates of No Effect and Certificates of Appropriateness when owners seek to make changes to the property and outlines the steps necessary when considering a property for demolition and/or removal from its original site. See the section on Design Review on page... for more information.
C. Benefits of Historic Preservation

The city of Phoenix, in its process to update the city’s general plan, recognizes building the “sustainable desert city” as a core value that will enhance the community’s prosperity, health and environment. In common usage, sustainability is often conceived in terms of energy efficiency and the “green movement.” However, true sustainability actually refers to the broader means by which a system (in this case, one of the largest urban populations existing in a desert environment) is able to ensure its existence over a long period of time. In recent years, the Sustainability Movement has actively promoted the conceptualization of sustainability in terms of three pillars, or overlapping domains: The social, economic, and environmental. In the sense that it sits at the heart of addressing social, economic and environmental benefits, historic preservation reflects the core values of sustainability, as promoted in the city’s general planning efforts.

There are many economic benefits to historic preservation. According to Donovan Rypkema, the principal of PlaceEconomics, (a Washington, DC-based real estate and economic development consulting firm) and one of the foremost experts on the subject of the economics of historic preservation, writes that,

The good news is historic preservation is good for the economy. In the last fifteen years dozens of studies have been conducted throughout the United States, by different analysts, using different methodologies. But the results of those studies are remarkably consistent — historic preservation is good for the local economy. From this large and growing body of research, the positive impact of historic preservation on the economy has been documented in six broad areas: 1) jobs, 2) property values, 3) heritage tourism, 4) environmental impact, 5) social impact, and 6) downtown revitalization. (Rypkema & Cheong, 2011)

Historic Preservation projects create jobs. The highest expense on an historic rehabilitation project is typically labor costs, in some cases 60% or more. Labor is often hired locally; those laborers in turn, spend their income locally, supporting businesses that are part of the local economy.

Historic preservation supports and increases property values. Sales of homes in nationally and locally designated historic districts nationwide have been shown to receive a sales price premium over comparable properties in undesignated neighborhoods. A study by the Arizona SHPO regarding economic effects of historic designation on property values in the city of Phoenix (2007) reinforces the results seen in other state and local surveys across the nation. A subsequent SHPO study regarding the results of the collapse in property values between 2007 and 2011 (dubbed the Great Recession) showed that properties within designated historic districts were impacted to a lesser degree than properties in similar neighborhoods that do not have historic designation.

Historic preservation attracts visitors. A 2013 study by Mandala Research, LLC, reports that 71% (approximately 170.4 million) of American travelers did so for leisure purposes. Of those travelers, 76% could be classified as traveling to participate in cultural or heritage activities. These tourists spend more money and have longer stays than those who engage in travel for other reasons.

Historic preservation creates affordable housing. Historic housing is frequently located near existing services and public transit, reducing transportation costs for residents. The New York City Housing Authority determined that it would cost

Historic preservation supports local businesses. Older and historic buildings are frequently used by small independent businesses when they are first starting out and 75% of all net new jobs are created by small businesses. According to a study referenced
on www.localfirstaz.com by Civic Economics, for every $100 spent at a locally owned business, $27 leaves the local economy vs. $57 for a non-locally owned business.

**Cultural**

Historic and archaeological resources within the city of Phoenix are important because they help to convey what is unique about this community. Simple details such as landscaping and architectural design illustrate the influence of key events from the history of the area. Historic neighborhoods in Phoenix frequently displayed lush green lawns, were affected by the construction of the Roosevelt Dam, whereas Tucson more commonly had natural desert landscaping because it relied on rain or wells for its water. Identifying unique attributes in the city of Phoenix

**Community Character**

**Civic Pride**

**Phoenix History**

**Environmental**

Preservation architect Carl Elefante is credited with historic preservationist’s often expressed mantra of “the greenest building is the one already built.” Indeed, preservation of existing buildings services to reduce the carbon footprint of our city through favoring investment of infrastructure in its historic core, adaptively reuse existing infrastructure in new- and often creative-ways, and ultimately recycle the embodied energy that is already stored in the materials that comprise existing buildings. In recent years, he National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Sustainable Community initiative has conducted an impressive degree of research to quantify the environmental benefits of historic preservation practices. While programs established to promote energy efficiency in new construction, such as LEED accreditation, are broadly acclaimed within environmental circles, the National Trust’s study found that the CO2 reduction benefits gained through application of these practices was far outweighed by the carbon footprint created by new construction. Their study found that, regardless of improved energy efficiency, it takes 10 to 80 years for a newly constructed building to overcome the adverse climate change impacts that its construction generates.

Adaptive and continued reuse of historic buildings not only minimizes the carbon footprint associated with extracting and transporting new construction materials, but also serves to conserve the embodied energy stored in the city’s existing infrastructure and buildings. Furthermore, adaptive reuse of now vacant buildings will also serve to lessen the amount of demolished building materials which currently comprise 25 to 40 percent of the waste entering United States’ landfills every year. (Sidebar here highlighting City’s adaptive reuse program)

One of the most significant threats to historic preservation stems from the misperception that older buildings are not energy efficient. On the contrary, the substantial construction of historic buildings (e.g. double bonded brick over frame and stucco) and design elements for passive cooling (adobe construction materials, building orientation, and location of windows) often renders them more energy efficient than those constructed today. Owners of historic homes in Phoenix, in particular, are often approached by vendors of contemporary “double-paned” windows marketed as minimizing heat gain, and lowering electric bills. However, research has shown that the amount of energy- and money- "saved" through replacement of windows is negligible when compared to the costs of replacement. Other options, such as installation of awnings, exterior window shades, and shade enhancing landscaping are not only more cost effective treatments for reducing heat gain, but are also options that preserve the character of the historic building's exterior façade.

Energy conservation will always remain a critical issue for all residents of Phoenix, including those living and working within its historic districts. The City Historic Preservation Office, through the design review process, works with homeowners and business owners to assist them in planning improvements to their property that will achieve desired energy efficiency and also meet the city’s historic preservation design guidelines.
II. HISTORY OF PHOENIX

Pre-Historic to Proto-Historic (to 1540)

Archaeological evidence suggests that more than 14,000 years ago, the ancestors of Native Americans arrived on the North American continent. Archaeologists generally believe that Native Americans migrated from northeast Asia across the Bering Straits land bridge, between Siberia and Alaska during the late Pleistocene Epoch, or last Ice Age. Over the course of centuries, these new arrivals settled both the North and South American continents from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego on the tip of South America.

The first Native Americans, called Paleo-Indians (paleo meaning ancient) by archaeologists, were hunters and gatherers. They hunted Pleistocene megafauna, or big game animals, such as mammoths, mastodons, giant bison, ancient horses, camels, and giant sloths. Although mammoths and other Pleistocene mammal skeletons have been discovered in the Salt River Valley, no Paleo-Indian remains have been recovered.

With the end of the Pleistocene, a warmer climate resulted in mass extinctions of Ice Age megafauna. Paleo-Indians were forced to hunt smaller game, which led to the development of a new culture archaeologists call the Archaic.

Sometime around 9,000 years ago, Archaic people lived throughout the American Southwest. These small bands of hunters and gatherers led a nomadic life, traveling from place to place with the seasons, searching out a variety of wild plants, and hunting. About 3,000 years ago their way of life began dramatically to change as many Archaic peoples of the Southwest adopted an agricultural lifestyle and became more sedentary. South of the Salt River Valley, we now have evidence of irrigation canals being constructed and in use as early as 1,500 B.C. As farming became more established, groups began developing differences in their material culture. Through these differences, cultures of the Southwest became more visibly distinct from one another.

The Hohokam settled the region of central and southern Arizona sometime after A.D. 1 and lived in the area for more than 1,000 years until around A.D. 1450. Their name comes from the Pima Indian (Akimel O’odham) word Huhugam, roughly translated as “those who have gone.” The Hohokam turned the arid desert of the Salt and Gila River valleys and other areas of southern Arizona into lush farmlands and thriving villages by building a highly sophisticated system of irrigation canals without modern engineering equipment or beasts of burden. Many of the canals were so well engineered that early settlers of Phoenix later used them for their own farming needs. In the Salt River Valley, the Hohokam built more than a thousand miles of canals that conveyed water to large villages, farmsteads and agricultural fields. They cultivated cotton, corn, beans, and squash, and they supplemented their diet by hunting local small game such as rabbits and mule deer as well as fishing in rivers and canals.

Pueblo Grande, located in Phoenix, is one of only two Hohokam villages in the Salt River Valley where a preserved platform mound is still visible. Pueblo Grande appears to have been settled some time before A.D. 500 and was abandoned around A.D. 1450. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a National Historic Landmark. Pueblo Grande's location near the headwaters of several large prehistoric canals suggests it may have had a prominent role in the operation and maintenance of the system and overall distribution of water to other villages north of the Salt River.

The Hohokam engaged in extensive trade networks within present day Arizona, New Mexico and California and deep into Mexico. Trade items included marine shells, pottery, obsidian, turquoise, and copper bells. Shells from the Pacific coast, the Gulf of California and the Gulf of Mexico were used to make jewelry, including pendants, rings and bracelets. Archaeologists believe the Hohokam traded cotton and corn with other communities in exchange for non-local raw materials. The Hohokam also produced distinctive red-on-buff pottery featuring complex designs.

For most of their occupation, the Hohokam practiced cremation as the preferred treatment of the dead. Specialized artifacts found in association with cremation burials, such as carved stone palettes, ceramic effigy vessels, and ceramic and stone censers, indicate associated ritual activities. In later periods, extended inhumation burials became more common.

The Hohokam created rock art known today as petroglyphs and pictographs. Petroglyphs are images pecked into stone. Pictographs are painted images on rock surfaces. Because pictographs are painted, they are more vulnerable to erosion from the elements, and they tend not to preserve well. All of the mountain ranges surrounding the Salt River Valley contain Hohokam petroglyphs, especially the South Mountains, which contain hundreds of panels and are considered sacred to local tribal communities. The Hohokam used a variety of images and designs in their rock art, many of which appear on their pottery. Although no one can be certain what Hohokam rock art meant, it clearly had a special significance to the Hohokam,
given the time and energy it would have taken to produce and its presence on high cliff walls and other practically inaccessible areas.

The Hohokam lived in pit house settlements for much of their occupation. Pit houses were built by digging a shallow pit into the ground. The house was constructed in the pit and consisted of a wooden super-structure of mesquite or cottonwood beams interlaced with sticks, saguaro ribs, cholla branches, and grasses. These were then covered with mud and adobe. Floors were often lined with caliche or adobe. Less formal structures often indicate seasonal rather than permanent occupation.

The Hohokam also built monumental public architecture such as ball courts, adobe compounds, big houses and platform mounds. Ball courts were constructed at large village sites. They are oval-shaped depressions that served as marketplaces where trade activities took place and a ball game may have been played. Ball courts were popular for several hundred years, but appear to have been abandoned around A.D. 1150 at which time above-ground adobe compounds and platform mounds became common.

Big houses, such as the multi-storied adobe structure at Casa Grande National Monument were built at some of the large villages during the Hohokam Classic Period (ca. A.D. 1150-1450). A big house was reported to have been present at Pueblo Grande, but was destroyed before current historic preservation laws were enacted.

Also during the Classic Period, the Hohokam constructed platform mounds – large earthen structures with rooms and plaza areas on top of them. Platform mounds were present at large village sites in the Salt River Valley, though only two complete mounds remain preserved today, at Pueblo Grande and Mesa Grande cultural parks. Platform mounds may have replaced the public function previously served by ball courts; however, this remains a topic of archaeological research.

There are multiple interpretations about why the Hohokam chose to start building above-ground dwellings instead of pit houses, why they stopped building ball courts and started building platform mounds, and why they changed centuries-old burial practices. These changes that took place during the Classic Period may have had to do with new cultural influences, social stresses, a change in ideology, or with depletion of resources such as the wood needed for construction and cremation ceremonies.

Why the Hohokam chose to vacate their villages and irrigation structures in the 15th century remains another important topic of archaeological research, but it may have had to do with a combination of environmental and social factors. Severe drought followed by a series of catastrophic floods, an influx of population from other culture areas into southern Arizona, and an apparent breakdown in trade relationships that had been in existence for hundreds of years are possible explanations. Perhaps the most plausible theory is that Hohokam society collapsed through internal conflicts triggered by environmental pressures on a population that had met or exceeded the carrying capacity of the land. With new archaeological evidence coming to light almost daily, it is now known that the Hohokam did not simply vanish or abandon their villages overnight, but instead their cultural collapse appears to have been an extended process lasting several generations.

There is little information about the Protohistoric period - the time between the abandonment of the Hohokam villages and irrigation systems and the arrival of Spanish explorers in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. When the Spanish arrived in Arizona, Akimel O’odham (Pima) and Tohono O’odham (Papago) groups were living in the middle Gila River Valley in small autonomous settlements, practicing floodwater farming. The Pee Posh (Maricopa), migrated from the west and formed an alliance with the Pima in the early 1800s, and together they continue to occupy the Salt-Gila basin today. The Salt River Valley appears to have been largely unoccupied between A.D. 1450 and re-settlement in the mid-1800s by Euro Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans. It may have served as a buffer zone between cultural groups that were not on friendly terms.

More than a thousand prehistoric and historic archaeological sites remain within the City of Phoenix. These sites are located in the downtown area, along the Salt River and washes, and in the foothills and canyons of the mountain preserves. Remnants of archaeological sites are preserved under parking lots, city streets, historic buildings and playing fields in city parks.

**Early Historic (1540-1864)**

Many Spanish explorers such as Francisco Vásquez de Coronado, Fray Marcos de Niza, Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, Antonio de Espejo, Juan de Oñate, Don Diego de Vargas traveled across the territory that would become Arizona beginning in 1540. It is believed that they did not venture into the area that would become the city of Phoenix. Missions were established in southern Arizona, one of the most notable being San Xavier del Bac (founded in 1692, constructed 1783-1797) and with the Pueblo Indians in northern Arizona and New Mexico.

In 1821, Mexico won its independence from Spain and took with it the territory that would become Arizona. By 1826, funding that supported missions in Arizona had all but dried up. During the 1820s through the 1840s, Apache raiding parties made life
especially difficult for settlers in southern Arizona. Trappers, traders and ranchers, and prospectors heading to California, traveled through and settled in Arizona during this time.

From 1846 to 1848, following the American annexation of Texas, the Mexican-American War was waged. On February 2, 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed, ceding the territory including California, Nevada and Utah, as well as parts of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Wyoming, to the United States. Modern day Phoenix is located in this section of Arizona. The remainder of Arizona became part of the United States’ territory with the Gadsden Purchase on December 30, 1853.

**Early Resettlement (1865-1879)**

The American settlement of the Salt River Valley began in 1867 when John Y.T. Smith established a wild hay harvesting camp on the north bank of the Salt River. Smith was master of transportation for the 14th Infantry, which was heading for Fort McDowell (established in 1865) in the new Arizona Territory. Shortly after arriving on the Salt River, he negotiated a contract to supply Fort McDowell with hay.

Later that year, John W. “Jack” Swilling, a Wickenburg miner and former Confederate soldier, organized the Swilling Irrigation & Canal Company. Swilling constructed an irrigation ditch on the north bank of the Salt River upstream from Smith's hay camp. Crops irrigated by the Swilling Ditch were first harvested in the spring of 1868. When the first government survey examined the Salt River Valley in April 1868, it found a cluster of houses made of adobe at the Swilling settlement, located in the area bordered today by 28th and 32nd streets, Van Buren Street and the Salt River.

By 1870, 270 people lived near Swilling's Ditch. It was known as the “Phoenix Settlement” and supported a post office, a few businesses and a flour mill. The name “Phoenix” was selected to evoke the image of a new and flourishing community which had risen up from the ashes of the Hohokam civilization that had vanished centuries earlier.

On October 24, 1870, a committee was appointed to select the location of the townsite. All east-west streets were named for early United States presidents (Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Harrison and Van Buren). The names selected for the north-south streets were intended to reflect the region’s Native American and Spanish heritage and included Apache, Tonto, Aribiapa, Pinal, Pima, Maricopa, Montezuma, Cortes, Mojave, Papago, Yuma, Cocopa, Hualpai and Yavapai. The north-south street that ran through the center of the townsite was appropriately named “Center Street” (later Central Avenue).

In January 1871, Capt. Hancock began the construction of a small, one-story adobe building, the first permanent structure built in Phoenix. After its completion, Maricopa County (founded February 1871), paid Capt. Hancock a rent of $10 a month for use of the rear portion of the building for the first county offices. In this same building, William Smith opened the first store in July 1871. The building, located at 1st Street and Washington Street, was demolished in the early 1880s to make room for a more modern, brick building.

Hancock's building was followed by other stores, a brewery, a butcher shop, two churches, and a county courthouse. The first church was built in 1871. Classes were held in the courthouse until 1873, when a school was built. By 1875, Phoenix had 16 saloons, four dance halls, two card parlors, and one faro table.

The Panic of 1873 caused mining operations, military posts and government agencies in Arizona to reduce expenses, and farmers and merchants in the Salt River Valley were impacted. Development in Phoenix came to a halt. By 1876, the region’s economy had improved. The Salt River Herald, the town’s first newspaper, reported that “the growth of the town has not been feverish nor of mushroom order, but it has been steadily and heartily improved.”

By end of the decade, most of the major commercial and service establishments were located along Washington Street. While many businessmen lived near their places of work, the more affluent were beginning to move to residences along Center Street north of Adams, beginning a pattern that would remain in effect for decades afterward.

Irrigation was key to the town’s sustained growth. The irrigators continued to follow the ancient Hohokam canal patterns, and thousands of additional acres of arable land were brought into cultivation. Along with the Salt River Valley Canal (originally known as the “Swilling Ditch” or the “town ditch”), the major waterways included the Maricopa Canal (completed in 1870) and the Grand Canal (completed in 1878).

**Early Expansion and Pre-Statehood (1880-1911)**

The presence of government continued to expand when, in 1883, Maricopa County supervisors ordered the construction of a $25,000 courthouse on its reserved site fronting West Washington Street. Four years later, Phoenix voters approved $15,000 in improvement bonds for the construction of a city hall on its reserved site fronting East Washington Street. Both buildings became local points of pride.
Another important development during this period was the completion of the 44-mile-long Arizona Canal, which opened up an additional 100,000 acres of desert to potential agricultural development. Unlike the other canals which were built upon the existing Hohokam system or extensions of it, the Arizona Canal was a striking departure. Wider and longer than the other canals, it ran through land not previously irrigated by the Hohokam or their successors. Work on the canal began in 1883 and was completed two years later. Exhaustive promotional efforts by Arizona Canal builder and land developer W.J. Murphy and his associates contributed to the first extensive exposure of Phoenix and the Salt River Valley to the rest of the country. Their efforts attracted many new farmers who settled on lands watered by the Arizona Canal, including citrus and fruit growers from southern California. In June 1887, Murphy and his associates formed the Arizona Improvement Company, a water and land development corporation. Among other ambitious projects, the company created Grand Avenue, a 100-foot-wide thoroughfare that began at the intersection of Seventh Avenue and Van Buren Street at the northwest corner of the townsite and angled northwest for 18 miles. Along its path, the company surveyed the town sites of Alhambra, Glendale and Peoria and actively promoted their development potential.

As agricultural production increased, the desire for a railroad link to the outside world grew stronger. In the late 1870s, the Southern Pacific Railroad built its transcontinental route across the Arizona Territory, but the closest it came to Phoenix was Maricopa, roughly 30 miles to the south. To relieve Phoenix's isolation from the railroad, boosters built a freight wagon and stagecoach road from Maricopa to Phoenix in 1879, which failed to fully satisfy the needs of the community. In June 1886, a group of local promoters organized the Maricopa and Phoenix Railroad Company. The project was completed on July 4, 1887. Promoters then organized a campaign to move the territorial capital from Prescott to Phoenix. In 1877, the capital had been moved back to Prescott from Tucson, much to the displeasure of southern Arizonans. During the next several Arizona Legislature sessions, the subject of the capital location was debated, but Prescott managed to retain it despite the opposition of Tucson and Phoenix. In the 1885 session, Phoenix received the Arizona Insane Asylum (Arizona State Hospital) with an appropriation of $100,000, and Tucson received the University of Arizona with an appropriation of $25,000, but neither was considered to be as prestigious or as valuable as the territorial capital.

By the 1889 session, Phoenix and Tucson promoters had joined forces to move the capital to the Salt River Valley. Despite bitter opposition from the Prescott backers, the Arizona Legislature approved the move. On February 7, 1889, the Legislature met for the first time in the new capital of Phoenix. The new city hall became the temporary capitol until a new building could be constructed.

By 1890, Phoenix's position as the political and commercial center of the territory had been solidified. Between 1885 and 1890, the city's population tripled, from 1,000 to 3,152 residents. A second railroad, the Santa Fe, Prescott and Phoenix Railroad, established later that decade, further connected Phoenix to outside world, providing access to Midwestern and East Coast markets.

In November 1887, the Phoenix Street Railway Company began operating a mule-drawn line along Washington Street, just east of the townsite. The Arizona Improvement Company also ran a mule-drawn line along Washington Street beginning in January 1888.

By 1893, the streetcar system had been electrified and expanded to serve the fairgrounds, the Maricopa and Phoenix Depot, and a new park at the east end of the line known as “Phoenix Park” (now Eastlake Park). The entire system was now operated by the Phoenix City Railway Company, under the leadership of General Sherman. Hundreds of Phoenix area citizens relied on the streetcars for basic transportation.

Despite some financial difficulties, which included a foreclosure action and the entire system being sold at public auction in 1899, the streetcar system continued to expand and remained a driving force behind new subdivisions in Phoenix well into the first two decades of the twentieth century. Between 1914 and 1925, when the city of Phoenix acquired the streetcar system, no new lines of significance were established. The City continued to operate the system during the Depression and World War II, gradually replacing several streetcar lines with bus lines, until 1948, when it shut down for good.

By the mid-1890s, it was clear that the future of Phoenix lay to the north. In February 1891, the Salt River overflowed its banks, destroying canals, fields and much of the town itself. One year later, flood waters forced the evacuation of neighborhoods as far north as Jackson Street. Fearing more floods, those who could afford to fled north. From this point forward, the southern neighborhoods were occupied primarily by Mexican, African, and Chinese Americans as well as less affluent Anglo Americans, who were barred from the northern neighborhoods.

The first decade of the twentieth century was a critical period for Phoenix. The problem of too much or too little water continued to plague the city. The floods of the early 1890s followed by a severe drought later in the decade forced thousands
of acres out of cultivation. Territorial representatives and several of the large landowners were actively pressing the local officials, as well as legislators in Washington D.C., for water control projects in the West.

Their success came with the foundation of the U.S. Reclamation Service, which was authorized to undertake water-related projects in the west. Users of the projects were required to form cooperative associations to manage the system and pay for improvements which would be financed by the federal government. In February of 1903, the Salt River Valley Water Users Association (SRVWUA) was formed.

Later that year, the SRVWUA succeeded in passing legislation authorizing construction of Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River. Completed in 1911, Roosevelt Dam established a stable water supply to farmers across the Valley. It became the cornerstone for the physical growth of Phoenix as the expanding economy attracted businesses and people to the area. The federal commitment to construction of the dam and the anticipated boom in the economy and local population were no doubt factors that influenced Congress to grant Arizona statehood on February 14, 1912.

The completion of Roosevelt Dam and the granting of statehood launched a period of unprecedented growth in the Salt River Valley. Phoenix would never be the same small town again but would double in population in each of the first three decades of the twentieth century. The city limits were expanded multiple times, extending in all four directions, but primarily to the north.

**Statehood to the Great Depression (1912-1931)**

The United States’ entry into World War I in 1917 had a major effect on the Valley. Population growth slowed dramatically. Fortunately for Phoenix, the adverse effects were offset by an increased demand for certain agricultural products. Long-staple cotton was essential to the war effort for the manufacture of tires, balloons and airplane fabric. The Valley was an ideal site for its production due to the climate and plentiful irrigation water from Roosevelt Dam.

Several new reclamation projects on the Salt River improved irrigation and enabled the expansion of the citrus industry which soon became the major cash crop of the region. Increased production of hay and alfalfa supported the growth of cattle ranches around the state. As the cattle industry grew, the Valley benefited as an extensive meat-packing industry developed locally. Demand for copper also was high during this time. As mining regions prospered, this brought about an increase in the demand for goods and services supplied from Phoenix. This, in turn, fueled the growth of local business. The record levels of agricultural and commercial production resulted in increased population and corresponding expansion of the city limits.

By the late 1920s, the automobile had taken its place as the preferred mode of transportation. Cars first appeared on Phoenix streets in the summer of 1900. By 1913, there were 646 cars; by 1920, 11,539 cars; and in 1929, 53,064 cars. In order to address the growing problem of dust, Mayor Lloyd Christy organized the Phoenix Citizens Street Paving Association in November 1910. Two years later, 19 blocks of downtown streets had been paved. By 1915, a total of 7 miles had been paved; by 1920, 25 miles; and by 1929, 86 miles of paved roads connected virtually every neighborhood in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Another significant improvement in transportation which affected the community’s development was the completion of the new Southern Pacific Railroad direct line to Phoenix. A new Union Station opened in 1923. Phoenix Sky Harbor was built in 1935. The city was then accessible to anyone who could drive, fly or travel by train. The city had become a leading retail and wholesale trade center connected to national and international markets through three important transportation networks.

**The Great Depression and World War II (1932-1944)**

Phoenix enjoyed a tremendous building boom in the 1920s. During the Great Depression, however, Phoenix’s great early twentieth century residential housing boom nearly ground to a halt. The initial stock market crash did little to affect the Valley; within the months preceding the October 1929 crash, industries surrounding Phoenix founndered, which in turn stunted businesses. An influx of itinerant families poured into the Valley from the east, searching for work and housing.

The turn-around began with the initiation of President Roosevelt’s New Deal programs in the mid-1930s. Phoenix benefitted from the relationship with the federal government through jobs, various infrastructure improvement projects, government and school building construction. Even through the decade of the Great Depression, the city grew from 48,118 in 1930 to 65,414 in 1940.

Residential construction in Phoenix had only begun to rebound from the Great Depression when the onset of World War II curtailed nearly all “nonessential” domestic housing throughout the country. Likewise, residential construction in Phoenix temporarily halted but resumed when the city was designated a “war industry district.” The city’s safe, inland location and sunny, year-round working conditions attracted numerous defense related industries and air bases to its environs. After years of unemployment, multitudes of workers moved to Phoenix for the job opportunities and they all needed housing. Housing
shortages were so acute that Phoenix residents were urged to open their homes to defense workers to support the war effort. Ultimately, the federal government lifted construction restrictions in Phoenix in order to supply housing for defense workers.

By 1939, war industries throughout the country were gearing up for the impending conflict, and restrictions on domestic construction were already being imposed. In the long run, the war proved an unexpected boon for Phoenix as related industries and military bases located in the Valley of the Sun to take advantage of its location and climate which was well-suited to training and production. By the end of the war in 1945, Phoenix boasted six military facilities, two major air bases, three training fields, and a Naval Air Station. Entire communities of houses, stores and businesses had been built to serve the military and civilian population attached to these military posts and war-related industries.

Postwar Expansion (1945-1975)

Many servicemen and defense workers who had spent time in Phoenix during the war were impressed with the Valley’s climate and convinced of its opportunities. Thousands returned to the city after the war. In 1940, Phoenix was a small city of 65,000 occupying an area of less than 10 square miles. By 1950, the city claimed a population of more than 100,000. Ten years later, Phoenix was the largest city in the Southwest with a population of 439,170. Much of the population gain can be attributed to the annexation of satellite communities such as Sunnyslope, Maryvale and South Phoenix. Not surprisingly, Phoenix’s growth rate exceeded that of any other U.S. city in 1960.

Phoenix attracted a number of manufacturing plants and related businesses in the postwar era, including Motorola, AiResearch and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. In turn, these jobs drew even more workers who crowded into the city demanding new homes, parks, schools, churches and shopping areas. Phoenix builders labored to oblige them.

They were assisted in large part by government-insured mortgage funding through the FHA and Veterans Administration (VA). Federally insured loans brought home ownership within reach of most working and middle class families. An expanded FHA program and the newly passed G.I. Bill of Rights (1944), which guaranteed mortgage loans with no down payment, eased the way for millions of these new families to buy their own homes. Since many of these families migrated to the southwest in the postwar era, the use of FHA and VA loans helped promote the housing industry and the growth of suburbs in Phoenix.

Phoenix’s African American population took advantage of FHA and VA loans in the postwar era, as well. Unfortunately, the programs did nothing to erase racial boundaries in the city and, in fact, helped institutionalize segregation. De jure segregation had been a fact of life in Arizona since the territorial government passed an anti-miscegenation law prohibiting interracial marriages in 1864. The legislature solidified its position in 1909 when it passed a law that permitted school segregation; Phoenix Union High School had integrated classes until 1912 when the Phoenix Union Colored High School was established and classes were held separately on the same campus. A separate school was not built until 1926. During the 1920s, when the Ku Klux Klan re-emerged and communities throughout the country were establishing color lines, Phoenix codified segregation in parks, swimming pools, theaters, grocery stores, restaurants, and cemeteries. Upscale additions maintained restrictive covenants to uphold their “whites only” status. In most areas of the city, however, it was simply understood that African Americans, as well as other minorities, lived south of Van Buren Street.

The FHA also found it advantageous to maintain the color line, justifying it along economic lines as promoting stability and resale value. As early as 1938, the agency produced a manual that encouraged builders to restrict their projects to whites only. Consequently, new subdivisions for African Americans were platted in South Phoenix, near existing enclaves of substandard, segregated housing. Despite the blatant racism inherent in the system, many African Americans bought homes in South Phoenix subdivisions with the aid of FHA and VA loans. Neighborhood segregation continued in Phoenix into the 1950s and beyond. In 1954, Lincoln and Eleanor Ragsdale, a prominent couple in the Civil Rights movement, broke the color line by moving into the all-white North Encanto neighborhood on Thomas Road. Nevertheless, more than a decade passed before significant integration was achieved in the city.

The widespread growth in the Valley would not have been possible without the advent of air conditioning. Before the 1940s and 1950s, summers meant sleeping outside on cots while draped in damp sheets or in attached sleeping porches lined with screens. Evaporative coolers and later whole-house refrigeration allowed comfort year round. The serious impediment of Phoenix’s scorching summers was wrangled through climate control, thereby attracting new residents.

No individual builder made a greater impact on expanding the Valley’s residential housing stock than John F. Long. Long, a former World War II serviceman, built his first home with wife Mary. The demand for houses was so high at the time, that it was not unusual to receive an offer to buy a house before it was completed. Long agreed to sell his home at a handsome profit, which he immediately reinvested in the raising of a new house. By 1949, Long had his own construction company with six employees. That year he began his first subdivision.
Long realized that diversifying his efforts with amenities and complimentary retail facilities enhanced the attractiveness of his new neighborhoods. He built community and shopping areas himself rather than setting land aside for another developer. By the mid-1950s he reserved land for schools and parks, which he donated or sold at low prices. As the ambitious vision of Maryvale grew, Long became increasingly protective of his community. He tried to maintain interest through such activities as yard beautification competitions.

In 1956, Maryvale grew at a faster rate than Phoenix itself, with 1,021 new houses compared to only 956 building permits in the city. Long consistently set building records—1,785 houses in 1957 and 2,500 in 1958. In 1958, he was the nation's second largest home builder, beaten by a developer in Florida with only five more units. He continued this pace into the early 1960s and was slowed only by the general downturn in the housing industry that severely affected many local builders. By 1964, Long moved into other areas like Moon Valley and Paradise Valley, although he did not dominate these places as he previously had with Maryvale.

In roughly 23 years, he constructed some 23,000 houses. By 1984, when he was inducted into the National Housing Hall of Fame, the total had risen to approximately 30,000. No other local home builder has matched John F. Long's record of city building.

In today's Maryvale, minorities are now an important segment of the population. It is one of the few areas in the city that retains a distinctive identity, a legacy of Long's vision of building not just housing, but an entire community. Preserving this identity has contributed to recent efforts to stabilize and revitalize Maryvale.

Phoenix's population continued to grow through the 1960s and 1970s, fueled by an abundance of land for development and a low cost of living. Technology firms were drawn by the same factors as well as the expanding pool of potential employees. Valley industry was dominated by aerospace and electronics companies eager to take advantage of the inexpensive land. Though still an important component in the city and Valley's economy, agriculture continued to lose acreage to commercial, industrial and residential development. By the late 1970s, 10,000 acres of fields a year were being converted from agriculture to other uses, and the farming industry was replaced by tourism as the second largest source of the city's income. Phoenix outpaced national population growth rates throughout the latter half of the 20th century.

Along with the continued outward expansion, dramatic architecture rose skyward. Arizona Veterans Memorial Coliseum opened in 1965 and became home to the new Phoenix Suns professional basketball team in 1968. In the spirit of urban renewal, the blighted area in downtown known as the Deuce was razed and replaced by the Phoenix Civic Plaza complex in 1972. That same year, the monumental Valley Center (now known as the Chase Tower), was constructed over an entire city block. The 40-story building, designed by Welton Becket and Associates in conjunction with local architects Guirey, Snrka, Arnold & Sprinkle, has been the tallest building in the state since its construction.

The 1970s brought visible change to Phoenix city government. In 1972, local African American community leader Calvin Goode was elected to the city council. Goode went on to serve eleven terms until 1994. In recognition of his service to Phoenix, the 1963 city hall building was renamed in his honor. Four years later, Margaret T. Hance was elected the city's first female mayor. She served two terms. The park built over the Interstate-10 tunnel in downtown is named for her.

Phoenix became a nexus of the Chicano Movement in the 1960s and 1970s. In May of 1972, in an unassuming building at 10th Street and Hadley Street, César Chávez, with the assistance of the United Farm Workers union, held a 24-day "fast of love". The fast was a protest against Arizona House Bill 2134, which severely restricted the ability of farm workers to strike. It was during the fast that Chávez spoke the words, "¡Sí Se Puede!" The phrase became a rallying cry in the Chicano Movement as a whole.

**Conclusion**

In a little over a century, Phoenix has risen from a pioneer settlement along the Salt River to become the largest metropolis in the Southwest. From a planned, compact townsite, with uniform lots and blocks, the city and its satellite communities have grown to encompass a metropolitan area of roughly 4.3 million people. The direction and extent of Phoenix's growth has been driven largely by developers who obtained inexpensive land on the city's periphery and platted new subdivisions that moved the population ever outward from its downtown core. Suburban growth initially followed the streetcar lines in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but increased automobile ownership in the early- to mid-twentieth century, allowed developers to spread. Exponential growth in the years following World War II led to even greater suburban development. Today, the city of Phoenix encompasses over 518 square miles and is the sixth most populated city in the United States.
III. HISTORY OF PRESERVATION IN PHOENIX

Historic preservation efforts in Phoenix date to 1867, when founding father Jack Swilling cleaned out the prehistoric canals along the Salt River and used them to run water to fields where he grew hay, wheat, barley and corn to help supply the soldiers at Fort McDowell. Although Swilling’s intention was not necessarily to preserve history, he recognized the value of the canals and profited from their reuse, thus becoming the town’s first preservationist. The name that Swilling and his pioneer colleagues gave their new settlement—Phoenix—reflected their hope that life would rise again from the remains of the past.

During the 1920s, two significant events took place that made Phoenix a trailblazer in the field of historic preservation. First, in 1924, a group of prominent Phoenicians, with the aid of U.S. Senator Carl Hayden, bought 13,000 acres from the federal government for $17,000. Originally known as Phoenix Mountain Park, the property was later renamed South Mountain Park. Now at over 16,000 acres, it is the largest municipal park in the United States. Also in 1924, Thomas Armstrong, former president of the Arizona Archaeological & Historical Society, purchased the Pueblo Grande platform mound and surrounding three acres and donated the property to the city of Phoenix. Later that same year, city engineer Omar Turney convinced the city to purchase approximately 10 acres of property south of the platform mound known as the Park of Four Waters. This land contained the remnants of irrigation canals that supplied water to the Hohokam villages on the north side of the Salt River. In 1929, the city hired Odd Halseth as Pueblo Grande museum director and city archaeologist—the first municipal archaeologist in the nation.

In 1942, the Arizona Museum and city of Phoenix agreed to restore an adobe building believed to be the home of Phoenix pioneer Darrell Duppa. During the 1940s and 1950s, restoration advice was sought from preservation experts, and restoration proceeded with reconstruction of the walls and roof, the replacement of doors, and addition of concrete to the roof and floors. The building operated as a museum into the 1980s, when it was discovered that the adobe was not Duppa’s home but a barn constructed for John Montgomery’s dairy operation. The adobe, which is still owned by the city, is currently vacant but was listed on the Phoenix Historic Property Register in 2005 as a rare 19th century agricultural outbuilding.

In 1954, the Camelback Improvement Association formed to oppose construction on Camelback Mountain, a beloved Valley landmark. Building on the mountain began in the 1930s as the Arcadia area developed and Phoenix expanded eastward. Activists worked to stop development on the mountain throughout the 1950s and early 1960s but were largely unsuccessful until they found an unlikely ally in politician and Phoenix native Barry Goldwater. After an unsuccessful presidential bid in 1964, Goldwater headed an aggressive campaign to gather public donations through a nonprofit organization to buy Camelback Mountain, and he successfully lobbied for $211,250 in matching funds from Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Thanks to Goldwater’s efforts, the Save Camelback Mountain Foundation turned over the mountain and extra funds to the city in 1968.

In 1966, Pueblo Grande Ruin became the first property in Phoenix to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The property was also listed as a National Historic Landmark (NHL) and, to date is the still the only NHL in Phoenix. Efforts to preserve urban mountains continued into the 1970s, as Phoenix voters approved a $21.5 million bond in 1972. This was the first of several ballot initiatives to purchase and maintain the urban mountains as public parks. Throughout the next several decades, the city added many thousands of acres to the system, including North Mountain, South Mountain, Camelback Mountain and Piestewa Peak.

During the National Bicentennial Celebration in 1976, a significant preservation milestone was achieved with the establishment of Heritage Square, a project led by former Phoenix Mayor John Driggs and the Junior League of Phoenix, Inc. The square included the Victorian-era Rosson House, one of the last left in the downtown area, and several other buildings from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Driggs and the Junior League purchased and rehabilitated the buildings on behalf of the city through community fundraising. Completed in 1980, the project was a great success and remains one of the city’s most recognizable preservation achievements.

Despite these many accomplishments, the catalyst that ultimately created the city’s historic preservation program was freeway construction. Initially unveiled in 1957 and championed by local business leaders, Phoenix’s first freeway system was not constructed until the 1970s because politicians and residents did not fully embrace freeways and refused to approve tax increases to fund them. The delay gave Phoenicians a chance to fully consider the effects of the freeway, and many had second thoughts. In April 1973, Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette, issued an editorial opposing freeway construction, claiming the freeway was an environmental disaster and an eyesore that would ruin the Valley’s natural beauty. Pulliam particularly disliked the proposed elevated section of the freeway, designed to rise 100 feet as it crossed Roosevelt Street in downtown Phoenix. Pulliam’s fervent attacks and refusal to give column space to freeway proponents forced a non-binding citywide vote on the freeway plan. The landslide defeat of the measure in May 1973 forced the city council to abandon the project.
However, the issue did not go away completely, as the organization Use Now I-10 Effectively (UNITE) gathered enough support to place the issue on the ballot in November 1985 and secure its passage. Although the freeway would follow the original route, the second round of the freeway fight would be different; this time, the issue of freeways broadened beyond discussions of aesthetics, traffic flow and western lifestyle to include Phoenix’s cultural heritage. Beginning in 1976, Arizona State University professor Dr. Gordon Weiner waged a public campaign to save the archaeological sites affected by the freeway construction. Weiner was joined by a second ASU professor—Fred Plog—as well as several neighborhood organizations, which saw freeway construction as a threat to property values and the area’s quality of life.

Weiner and Plog eventually enlisted the support of a young Harvard-educated lawyer and preservation advocate, Terry Goddard, and incorporated a nonprofit organization named Arizona: Past & Future Foundation (AZP&F). In 1979, the organization filed suit in the Ninth Circuit Court in against the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and the Arizona Department of Transportation, asserting that the agencies failed to meet federal standards under Section 4(f) of the 1966 Department of Transportation (DOT) Act requiring the protection of historic resources. Despite what the organization believed was a strong case and broad neighborhood support, AZP&F lost in the Ninth Circuit. After consulting with the lawyers, the team decided that it was unlikely to prevail at the next level and chose not to appeal. Despite the setback, the fight created the cohesion and awareness of preservation issues key to creating a historic preservation ordinance. In particular, Terry Goddard would later be elected mayor and become the “father” of the city’s historic preservation program.

Meanwhile, in 1978, concerns over the quality of life of the city’s historic core and residents’ demands for protection from development led to the adoption of the Special Conservation District Ordinance. Described as offering the benefits of historic preservation, the provision allowed neighborhoods to “conserve, revitalize, or generally upgrade their neighborhood by tailoring the zoning ordinance to the unique needs of the area.” A year later the city completed the Phoenix Historic Building Survey, which identified properties eligible for listing on the NRHP. The report urged the city to take steps to promote the appreciation and preservation of its historic and archeological heritage but stopped short of recommending a formal program. Meanwhile, the advocacy of the Phoenix Junior League continued to raise public consciousness. The League hosted the Phoenix Preservation Strategy Forum in 1982, which sought to bring together Phoenix’s leaders and representatives of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine potential next steps to save the city’s resources. The organization also completed the Historic Phoenix Commercial Properties Survey in 1984 and was responsible for many of the properties identified in the survey being listed on the NRHP. The Roosevelt and Encanto-Palmcroft neighborhoods were also surveyed and listed on the NRHP in 1983 and 1984, respectively.

After decades of many individual preservation efforts, Goddard’s term as mayor in the wake of the I-10 controversy signaled a distinct shift in how the city managed its built environment. Making good on campaign promises, Goddard assembled his Mayor’s Ad Hoc Committee on Historic Preservation (HP) in October 1984. In order to prevent demolitions from taking place before the committee could issue its report, Goddard persuaded the City Council to approve a temporary ban on razing or significantly altering the exterior of the historic buildings and districts already listed on the NRHP. In August 1985, the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations—which included adoption of an ordinance that would establish HP overlay zoning, a Phoenix Historic Property Register (PHPR), a review procedure for HP-zoned properties, an HP Commission, and the position of HP Officer—were adopted by the City Council. The city’s HP Commission held its first meeting on November 21, 1985.

The following year, several milestones were reached as the city hired its first Historic Preservation Officer and listed its first property on the PHPR—the Corpstein Duplex. Owned by developer and future mayor Phil Gordon, the duplex was listed on the PHPR in April 1986. Fourteen more individual properties followed that year, as well as three historic districts—Roosevelt, Coronado and Phoenix Union High School.

In 1989, the City Council responded to concerns about demolitions by passing a provision requiring HP review of demolition permits for any structure over 50 years old anywhere in the city. However, this provision was removed a short time later because of the burden it placed on the preservation program and concerns over the loss of private property rights.

The year 1989 also saw one of Phoenix’s greatest preservation achievements as the city’s voters approved $15 million in bond funds for historic preservation purposes. Proposition 2, as it appeared on the ballot, was enthusiastically supported by the editorial staff of the Arizona Republic, which cited the recent loss of several historic buildings as evidence of the city’s “feebie” ability to halt demolitions and noted that the tactic of “persuasion usually loses out to profit.” The immediate effect of the bond’s approval was that the HP Commission had “a seat at the table” because it now had the funds to entice owners to protect their properties. Of the $15 million approved, $5 million was earmarked specifically for the acquisition and preservation of Tovrea Castle, and the remaining $10 million would be used for other city-owned historic buildings and made available to private property owners in the form of grants. The following year, three of the current HP grant programs were established—Exterior Rehabilitation, Demonstration Project and Affordable Housing (later renamed Low-Income Historic Housing Rehabilitation). The City Council also authorized two additional HP staff positions to help administer the bond programs.

By 1993, the fruits of the bond program were visible as the initial acquisition of 6.7 acres of land and emergency stabilization at Tovrea Castle had taken place. The HP Office also published Historic Homes of Phoenix: An Architectural Guide, which won a
Governor’s Award for Historic Preservation in the category of education. By this time, there were 22 historic districts listed on the PHPR, including 15 residential districts. Consequently, the HP Office was moved out of the Planning Department to the newly-created Neighborhood Services Department, since most of the properties listed on the PHPR and supported by the bond program were residential.

Over the next few years, the accomplishments continued as the pamphlet “A Walking Tour of Historic Downtown Phoenix” was published in 1995, and the 96-acre historic Indian School Park site acquisition was finalized in 1996. The HP Commission also published its 10-year anniversary report, “Ten Vital Years in the History of Phoenix,” which proclaimed that “Phoenix protects a full 40 percent of its historic architecture built before 1940—the highest percentage of any large city in the nation.” In 1997, the National Trust for Historic Preservation presented a National Preservation Honor Award to the city of Phoenix for its HP Bond Program, which was deemed the “largest municipal historic preservation fund in the nation.”

In 2001, the city's preservation fund was replenished when Phoenix voters approved an additional $14.2 million in bond funds for the HP Program. That same year, an Ad Hoc Historic Preservation Review Panel appointed by the City Manager recommended 30 program and process improvements, including moving the HP Office to the City Manager’s Office and reclassifying the HP Officer position as a function head. The following year, the City Council approved implementation of 11 of the Ad Hoc Panel recommendations, including the office move and HP Officer reclassification.

In 2004, the HP Office implemented another of the Ad Hoc Panel recommendations by completing the African American Historic Property Survey, the first of three surveys relating to ethnic heritage. Two years later, the Hispanic Historic Property Survey was completed, followed by the Asian American Historic Property Survey in 2007. These groundbreaking surveys helped identify 88 individual properties and 7 districts eligible for listing on the PHPR and NRHP due to their association with ethnic heritage. Also in 2004, a new HP staff position was created due to revenue received through interdepartmental charges for reviewing federal environment projects affecting historic properties.

In 2006, Phoenix voters approved bond funding for the HP Program for the third time. On this occasion, the total amount approved was $13.1 million. The three previous bond-funded grant programs continued, and a fourth program—the Warehouse & Threatened Building Program—was established to assist historic buildings in the city’s warehouse district and to preserve structures throughout the city that were endangered.

Two additional significant events occurred in 2011. First, the HP Office moved back to its original home in the Planning & Development Department as part of a larger city budget-saving consolidation effort. The HP Office also released the groundbreaking publication Midcentury Marvels: Commercial Architecture of Phoenix 1945-1975, which won a Governor’s Heritage Preservation Grand Honor Award.
IV. PHOENIX HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

A. HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY, SURVEYS & CONTEXTS

As of March 2014, the city of Phoenix’s inventory of historic properties consisted of 712 entries, made up of approximately 10,000 individual resources—buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts. The inventory includes properties listed on both the Phoenix Historic Property Register and the National Register of Historic Places. It also includes properties that have been recommended eligible for listing but have not yet been added to a historic register. The inventory is housed in a geodatabase, which is maintained by city staff and available to the public by request.

New properties are added to the inventory primarily through the completion of historic property surveys. These surveys may be conducted by city staff or by an outside entity. Each survey looks at properties within a specific geographical area, which may be as small as a single city block or as large as the entire city. Depending on the purpose of the survey, it may attempt to identify every eligible historic property in the survey area or it may focus on the eligibility of properties relating to a particular theme (such as commerce, agriculture, or ethnic heritage).

Historic property surveys generally fall into one of two types: reconnaissance-level surveys and intensive-level surveys. As the name implies, a reconnaissance-level survey is a preliminary survey to gain more information; it is a first step to identify areas and properties worthy of further study. For example, in 1990, the city conducted the Pre-1950 Residential Reconnaissance Survey, which identified neighborhoods built prior to 1950 and prioritized them for future study. Intensive-level surveys, on the other hand, provide more detailed information on each property, including information needed for determining which properties are eligible for historic designation. These surveys generally consist of a summary of the survey methodology, a written report with one or more historic contexts, and an inventory of the historic properties identified in the survey accompanied by maps, photographs, and recommendations of eligibility.

The historic context is a key component to the survey, as it provides the basis for evaluating the significance of properties identified in the survey. Each context is based on a specific theme and the geographical and chronological limits of that theme. For example, a context titled “Religious Architecture in Phoenix, 1910-1942” would focus on the design and construction of churches, synagogues and related buildings within the Phoenix city limits during the 32-year time period specified. A context titled “Education in Phoenix, 1871-1942” would focus on educational efforts in Phoenix during the years specified. Each historic context contains three parts:

1. It includes a narrative that “tells the story” of the given theme as it relates to the specific place, and time. For example, in the aforementioned education context, the history of education in Phoenix would be documented, starting with the earliest schoolhouse in the town and leading up to the numerous school buildings that were constructed in the years prior to World War II.
2. The historic context identifies the various property types that relate to the specific theme, place, and time. The education context, for example, would identify schoolhouses as the main property type but could also identify school district offices, gymnasiums, stadiums, and other educational buildings.
3. The historic context provides registration requirements, which are the specific requirements the properties must meet to be considered eligible for historic designation. For example, a schoolhouse may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A (broad patterns of events) if it retains its integrity of location, materials, feeling and association.

Historic contexts can vary considerably in their level of detail; some can be extremely detailed while others are more general, depending upon the amount of information available and how they will be used. However, historic contexts lose their effectiveness if they are defined so broadly that all historic resources are included in a single historic context or so narrowly that only one type of resource is covered by a historic context.

Historic property contexts and surveys are fundamental to sound preservation planning. In a 2000 article titled “Whither Historic Contexts? Their Role in 21st-Century Planning,” Susan L. Henry Renaud of the National Park Service states,

The historic context is the cornerstone of the planning process. It provides a mechanism, a process, for assessing and organizing information about patterns of prehistory and history, and about historic and cultural resources; for identifying a full range of associated property types; and for defining goals and priorities for the identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties.

Without historic contexts and their accompanying surveys, proper identification and evaluation of historic properties could not take place.

For a list of current historic surveys and contexts available in the city of Historic Preservation Office, please see Appendix C.
B. Designation

Qualifications:
Properties become designated historic resources by listing them in the local Phoenix Historic Property Register, and/or the National Register of Historic Places. Properties may be listed individually or as part of a larger historic district. To qualify for either register, a property must meet three eligibility criteria: the property must be at least 50 years old (rare exceptions are made); it must demonstrate significance or documented importance; and it must possess historic integrity, with its important historic features present and recognizable.

A property's significance can be at the local, state or national level and must be in one or more of the following categories:

A) It is associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
B) It is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
C) It distinctly represents a type, period or method of construction, is the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values;
D) It has the potential to yield information important in the understanding of our history or prehistory.

In determining historic integrity, seven aspects of a property's characteristics and environment are evaluated: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Although a property rarely retains all of its original character-defining features, it must retain the essential aspects of integrity to convey its historic significance. If the property has been substantially altered, then the historic integrity is lost and the property may not be eligible for listing.

When a property or district is listed, the resources contained therein are classified as contributors or noncontributors. A contributing building, site, structure, or object adds to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, relates to the documented significance of the property, and possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period. A Tudor-revival style house within a district that retains its half-timbering, wood shingle roof, 3-over-1 wood, double-hung windows and stucco that was constructed during the period of significance would be considered a contributor.

A noncontributing building, site, structure, or object does not add to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a property is significant because it was not present during the period of significance, or does not relate to the documented significance of the property due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period. A property within a district with a period of significance from 1917 to 1935 that was constructed in 1958 would be considered a non-contributor. A bungalow was constructed in 1925 that has had the porch filled-in, the window openings reduced and a second-story addition added to it would also be considered a non-contributor.

There are five (5) types of resources eligible for listing on the Registers.

Building: A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. "Building" may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn. Examples: houses, barns, stables, sheds, garages, courthouses, city halls, social halls, commercial buildings, libraries, factories, mills, train depots, stationary mobile homes, hotels, theaters, schools, stores, and churches.

Site: the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure. Examples: habitation sites, funerary sites, rock shelters, village sites, hunting and fishing sites, ceremonial sites, petroglyphs, rock carvings, gardens, grounds, battlefields, ruins of historic buildings and structures, campsites, sites of treaty signings, trails, areas of land, shipwrecks, cemeteries, designed landscapes, and natural features, such as springs and rock formations, and land areas having cultural significance.

Structure: The term "structure" is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter. Examples: bridges, tunnels, gold dredges, firetowers, canals, turbines, dams, power plants, corncribs, silos, roadways, shot towers, windmills, grain elevators, kilns, mounds, cairns, palisade fortifications, earthworks, railroad grades, systems of roadways and paths, boats and ships, railroad locomotives and cars, telescopes, carousels, bandstands, gazebos, and aircraft.

Object: The term "object" is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is
associated with a specific setting or environment. Examples: sculpture, monuments, boundary markers, statuary, and fountains.

District: Properties "relatively equal in importance, such as a neighborhood, or a large acreage with a variety of resources, such as a large farm, estate, or parkway." Examples: college campuses; central business districts; residential areas; commercial areas; large forts; industrial complexes; civic centers; rural villages; canal systems; collections of habitation and limited activity sites; irrigation systems; large farms, ranches, estates, or plantations; transportation networks; and large landscaped parks.

SIDEBAR (NEW) (with photos or diagrams) Using a COP building, describe the character-defining features. Include close-up images for illustration purposes.

Properties are listed on the Phoenix or National Register in part because they possess physical characteristics which should be preserved so that they may continue to convey their significance to the public. According to Lee Nelson, FAIA, in Preservation Brief 17: Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving their Character:

Every old building is unique, with its own identity and its own distinctive character. Character refers to all those visual aspects and physical features that comprise the appearance of every historic building. Character-defining elements include the overall shape of the building, its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details, interior spaces and features, as well as the various aspects of its site and environment.

Examples of Character-Defining Features of:

- Windows: Elements such as the size, shape and fenestration, the materials from which they are made and their placement in the walls of the building, proximity to one another and the number of windows.

- Walls: The type of brick, the pattern or patterns in which the courses of brick are laid, the way in which the mortar is finished (flush to the face of the brick, concave, or squeezed through so that it is “weeping” along the face of the wall), the height of the walls from grade to finished floor and to the ceiling plate

- Roofs: The pitch, the size of the overhangs, the treatment of the rafter tails or the size and shape of the fascia boards, the materials covering the roof,

- Special details: the shape, size and configuration of attic vents, the materials in the gable ends or on the ridgelines of the roof, quoins, “canales,” vigas

Phoenix Historic Property Register:

Properties listed on the Phoenix Historic Property Register are rezoned with a Historic Preservation (HP) or Historic Preservation-Landmark (HP-L) zoning overlay. The landmark designation is used to recognize exceptionally significant historic properties. The procedures to establish an HP or HP-L overlay are described in the city of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office handout “Requesting Historic Designation” and in Sections 807 and 808 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance. HP and HP-L rezoning applications are heard by the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Commission, and the City Council in a series of public hearings; the City Council makes the final decision to designate a property historic and list it in the Phoenix Historic Property Register. Once rezoning is approved, the properties are formally protected through a special permit review process administered by the city of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office. These properties are also eligible for financial incentives offered by the city of Phoenix.

National Register of Historic Places:

Properties are listed in the National Register of Historic Places through a nomination process. Information about preparing a National Register nomination is described in the "How to Complete the National Register Registration Form" bulletin published by the National Park Service. Nominations for properties located in the city of Phoenix are reviewed by the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office, the State Historic Preservation Office, the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee, and by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places (located in Washington D.C.) The Keeper ultimately determines whether a property is historic and should be listed in the register. National Register listing is honorary and places no regulations or obligations on the property owner.

C. Design Review

Design review is a critical part of protecting those elements of historic properties and districts which make them unique and important in the first place.
Design review serves many purposes. It educates the property owner or developer about the requirements for new construction, including additions and infill within the historic preservation overlay. In this way, projects can reflect new methods, materials and styles while meeting other criteria that make it well-suited to the district. Design review also offers the public an opportunity to comment on projects that may affect the district or adjacent properties.

The HPO recognizes that change is inevitable. Homes constructed in previous eras may not possess all of the amenities deemed necessary for modern life. Modifications to historic properties to include additional bedrooms or bathrooms improve the likelihood that the building will be retained for use by future generations. Buildings without tenants are more likely to become damaged, fall into disrepair and ultimately be demolished than those that have continuous use.

The design review process helps to ensure that the new construction reflects the character of the area, without prescribing the design elements of the construction. Compatible new construction, be it an addition to an existing building or a new building within a district, should not be identical to other properties within the area but should be related to it by elements such as size, scale, massing, proportions, orientation, surface textures and patterns, details and embellishments and the relation of these elements to one another.

**SIDEBAR – Using a building constructed within one of the districts, identify the ways in which it is compatible with the characteristics of the neighborhood while also conveying that it is new construction. Boxwell?**

Finally, and most importantly, design review protects the right to due process of individual property owners by providing fair and rational procedures established with the process to approve changes to historic properties.

For properties within an historic preservation overlay district, the HPO reviews all exterior work that requires a building permit. For construction projects, there are two types of approvals: a Certificate of No Effect (CNE) and a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

A CNE may be issued for minor work which does not materially change the historic character of the property, and the proposed work is clearly within the adopted design guidelines for historic properties, such as a small addition or rear patio cover that is not visible from the street. CNEs are frequently approved at the time of the initial request over the counter.

A COA must be applied for if the proposed work will make material changes that may alter, diminish, eliminate or affect the historic or architectural character of the property in any way. Larger additions and those that are street visible fall into this category. COAs require a pre-application meeting and a public hearing with an independent hearing officer to determine if the proposed project meets the [General Design Guidelines for Historic Preservation](#) and the [Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation](#) (Appendix E).

The HPO also reviews Requests for Demolition as part of its design review responsibilities. Applicants submit photos and a site plan and staff reviews these along with other information to determine the contributing status of the property, or building or buildings in question. The zoning ordinance states that the HP Officer will determine if a demolition approval can be issued based on whether or not the structure is of no historic or architectural value or significance and does not contribute to the historic value of the property, and loss of the structure would not adversely affect the integrity of the HP District or the historic, architectural or aesthetic relationship to adjacent properties and its demolition shall be inconsequential to historic preservation needs of the area.

In the event that the building or buildings do not meet this two criteria and the request is denied, the applicant either may wait until the restraint of demolition has expired (one year in most cases, three years in the case of buildings bearing the Historic Preservation-Landmark (HP-L) zoning overlay) or request a Certification of Economic Hardship hearing. To determine whether or not a hardship exists, staff reviews information regarding the condition of the building, cost estimates and scopes of work for rehabilitating it and for comparable new construction. Based on this information, staff evaluates how significant the condition problems are, how much of the historic fabric would be left if a rehabilitation project were to take place and how substantial the cost differences are and makes a recommendation to the independent hearing officer regarding whether or not to grant the Certification of Economic Hardship.

Decisions made at the public hearings are subject to appeal by the applicant or other interested parties within five days. The HPC holds a de novo hearing at its next available meeting to review the facts of the case and make a decision regarding whether or not to grant the COA or Certification of Economic Hardship. This decision may also be appealed. All appeals are heard by the City Council at its next available meeting. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of City Council may file a special action in Superior Court in accordance with the law, to have the court review that decision. There is no time restriction for filing a special action with Superior Court.
D. NHPA as amended, 2004, Section 106 Review

In the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), Congress established a comprehensive program to preserve the historical and cultural foundation of the nation as a living part of community life. All federal agencies under the executive branch of the U.S. government are subject to the requirements of Section 106, including independent regulatory agencies.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects on historic properties of projects they carry out, assist, permit, license, or approve (undertakings). Agencies comply with Section 106 through the process in the implementing regulations, “Protection of Historic Properties” (36 CFR Part 800). The regulations implementing Section 106 can be found on the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation’s Web site at http://www.achp.gov/regs-rev04.pdf. A fundamental goal of the Section 106 process is to ensure that federal agencies consult with interested parties to identify and evaluate historic properties, assess the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, and attempt to negotiate an outcome that will balance project needs and historic preservation values.

Section 106 review encourages, but does not mandate, a preservation outcome and recognizes that sometimes there is no way for a project to proceed without affecting historic properties. Based on the information gathered through the Section 106 process, a federal agency may make an informed decision to approve, change, or deny a project. Therefore, the outcome of Section 106 reviews can range from avoidance of historic properties to the acceptance of extensive adverse effects to historic properties. The Section 106 process ensures that a federal agency assumes responsibility for the consequences of its undertakings on historic properties. In cases where an adverse effect is determined, the agency may agree to some means, such as documentation, that mitigates the adverse effect.

In terms of federal compliance, properties included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places, are considered historic. The city of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office completes these assessments when federal funds, licenses or permits are part of a project. These types of reviews can include storm drain replacement in historic districts; cell tower installation on South Mountain; energy upgrades to an eligible, turn of the 20th century home; pedestrian bridges over Valley canals; and runway expansions at a city-owned airport.

In the event that a project results in an adverse effect to a historic property, the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office works to mitigate the adverse effect through various methods. These include documentation (in the case of imminent demolition), a historical resource survey of the locale to be impacted, or in many cases, the research and production of interpretive signage. These methods provide information to researchers and the general public that might not have been known previously. Interpretive signage, specifically, provides an opportunity to educate the public about the impacted historical resource by providing a brief history of the building or site along with historical photographs.

The city of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office reviews thousands of these projects every year and coordinates with other city departments such as Neighborhood Services, Housing, Street Transportation, and Aviation in order to complete the reviews. The office also works closely with county, state and federal agencies, as well as private entities with an interest in, or ownership of, historic properties. The completion of these reviews ensures the city’s future access to federal funding opportunities and maintains the city’s compliance with Section 106.

E. Grants and Incentives

An important part of what makes Phoenix a special place to live is its unique historic properties. Preservation of these resources fosters community pride, investment and redevelopment. There are several financial incentive programs available to preserve and rehabilitate historic buildings and properties:

**Exterior Rehabilitation Assistance Program**

This program helps residents to sensitively rehabilitate the exteriors of historic homes while promoting reinvestment in Phoenix's historic neighborhoods. Owners of historic homes, either in city-designated historic districts or individually listed on the Phoenix Historic Property Register, are eligible to apply. The program reimburses owners on a 50/50 matching basis for pre-approved work with grant funding between $5,000 and $10,000 per project. Owners apply for funding during grant cycles offered every 12 to 18 months. In exchange for receiving financial assistance, the owner sells the city a conservation easement to protect the building's exteriors.
**Low-Income Historic Housing Rehabilitation Program**
The Low-Income Historic Housing Rehabilitation Program was created to encourage the exterior repair and rehabilitation of historic residences housing income-qualifying individuals and families. The city will pay 70 percent for eligible exterior work when the 30 percent match is paid by a non-profit organization, an outside agency or other city assistance program. The city pays 80 percent for eligible exterior rehabilitation work on projects where individual grant recipients are providing the match. The minimum request the city will consider is $3,000 and the maximum funding amount is $30,000. In exchange for receiving funding assistance, owners also convey a conservation easement to the city. Applications are received on an ongoing basis, but project funding is provided on a first-come first-served basis and, at times, there is a waiting list for projects to move forward.

**Demonstration Project Program**
The Demonstration Project Program was created to encourage the exterior rehabilitation of significant historic properties used for multi-family, commercial or institutional purposes. The program provides funding on a reimbursement basis for exterior work that preserves and rehabilitates historic buildings and supports adaptive use projects that keep a historic building economically viable. The program reimburses owners on a 50/50 matching basis for pre-approved work with grant funding award amounts based on costs required to address physical needs and funding availability for the program. In exchange for receiving financial assistance, the property owner agrees to sell the city a conservation easement to protect the historic character of the property’s exteriors. Applications are received on an ongoing basis, with projects moving forward individually on a case-by-case basis.

**Threatened Historic Building and Warehouse Program**
This program is available to help property owners rehabilitate the exteriors of threatened historic buildings and historic downtown warehouses and to return them to a viable use. Eligible buildings are either historic commercial buildings located in the downtown warehouse overlay district OR are city-designated historic buildings located elsewhere in the city which are severely threatened either by their deteriorated condition or by possible demolition. The program pays 100 percent for grant eligible work items provided that the property owner is funding an equal amount of work for non-grant eligible work items (such as plumbing, mechanical, electrical repairs). Applications are received on an ongoing basis, with projects moving forward on a case-by-case basis.

**State, Federal and Other Incentives**
Because the preservation of historic buildings is an important public benefit, the state and federal governments as well as public and private foundations have developed some incentives to assist in the restoration, maintenance and rehabilitation of historic resources.

**Arizona State Historic Property Tax Reduction Program**
The State of Arizona maintains a property tax reduction program for non-income-producing properties listed on the National Register and a property tax incentive program for income-producing properties listed on the National Register. The Arizona State Historic Preservation Office in conjunction with the county assessors administers this program. For more information, call (602) 542-4009 or go to the web at: azstateparks.com/shpo/propertytax.html.

**Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentive**
The National Parks Service administers financial incentive programs for historic buildings in partnership with the Internal Revenue Service. This includes a 20 percent rehabilitation tax credit on federal income taxes for certified historic building rehabilitation projects. For these projects, buildings must be listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. For more information, call (602) 542-4009 or go to: azstateparks.com/shpo/propertytax.html.

**National Trust for Historic Preservation**
The National Trust, through its financial assistance programs, demonstrates that preserving our heritage improves the quality of life in American communities. The National Trust’s grant and loan programs have assisted thousands of innovative preservation projects that protect the continuity, diversity and beauty of our communities. For more information, go to: preservationnation.org/resources/find-funding/

**F. Technical Advice**
The Phoenix Historic Preservation Office offers information about preserving, rehabilitating and restoring historic buildings. Staff provides technical advice on preservation project matters to help identify and determine the best approach for resolving common issues prior to beginning work. The office also has publications available to help guide historic property owners on the appropriate treatment for historic window repairs, masonry cleaning and repointing, paint removal, and wood shingle roofs. In addition, the National Park Service publishes “Preservation Briefs” that address treatment of various traditional...
building materials, specific architectural features, the reuse of particular building types, and broader themes such as how to understand architectural character and make historic buildings accessible.

G. Outreach
Outreach is an important part of any healthy historic preservation program. The city of Phoenix has provided outreach as resources have permitted. These efforts have included the following:

- Preservation Publications such as books, brochures, newsletters and pamphlets
- Preservation Workshops such as proper rehabilitation techniques for a historic home
- Presence at Historic Home Tours through staffing of booth at the event
- Attendance at Neighborhood and Preservation Organization meetings
- Information on the city website
- Use of Social Media such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram
- Preservation Celebrations such as National Preservation Month events

The city also relies on community partners for outreach. The following organizations each play an important part of preservation in Phoenix.

- The Arizona Preservation Foundation is a statewide non-profit historic preservation organization that started in 1979. The organization brings awareness of historic preservation issues through their Arizona 25 Most Endangered Historic Places list each year and most recently through the publication of the Historic Preservation Referral Guide.
- The Phoenix Historic Neighborhood Coalition works with the 35 Historic Neighborhoods in Phoenix to create awareness of programs such as the State Historic Property Tax Reduction Program, the Phoenix Exterior Rehabilitation Grants and other historic property incentives. They also publish the enDangered Dozen list and the Historic Neighborhoods of Phoenix Map.
- Modern Phoenix Neighborhood Network was created as an online archive of midcentury modern architecture and designs of Phoenix. In addition to the website, Modern Phoenix is known for Modern Phoenix Week that brings awareness and appreciation for midcentury Phoenix.
- Preserve Phoenix was created in 2012 partly due to the urgency created by the threatened demolition of the David and Gladys Wright House. The non-profit organization is a grassroots network of advocates for the protection of historic places throughout Phoenix.

H. Archaeology
Since 1929, the city of Phoenix has had a city Archaeologist and a city Archaeology Office. The city Archaeology Office is located at the Pueblo Grande Museum and part of the Parks & Recreation Department. Archaeological investigations are required for development projects in the State of Arizona whenever there is state or federal funding, permitting, or licensing involved. In addition, state law (A.R.S. § 41-844 and 865) strictly regulates the removal and disposition of human remains and their associated funerary objects, both on private and public lands.

The city of Phoenix zoning ordinance (§802.A) acknowledges the significance of archaeological resources within the city:

> It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement and preservation of properties and areas of historical, cultural, archaeological and aesthetic significance are in the interests of the health, prosperity and welfare of the people of the City of Phoenix. It is further intended to recognize past needless losses of historic properties which had substantial value to the historical and cultural heritage of the citizens of Phoenix, and to take reasonable measures to prevent similar losses in the future.

It continues (§802.B.2):

> Therefore, it is the city’s policy:
  > With respect to archaeological resources:
    a. To encourage identification of the location of both pre-historic and historic archaeological resources.
    b. To assist with the preservation of these resources, within developments where appropriate, and with recovery of the resources where applicable.
    c. To encourage recognition of the fact that archaeological resources found on public land are the property of all citizens, and are not private property. Archaeological resources found on City-owned lands are the property of the City.
The city of Phoenix General Plan includes a policy that “encourages protection, preservation and designation of historic resources;” and requires that development is “compatible with architectural and historic resources and their setting.” The General Plan also encourages the preservation “of archaeological resources found at development sites of public and private projects.”

The city archaeology office reviews and evaluates proposed development projects for potential impacts to archaeological resources for all city departments, private developers that request city approval of zoning changes or building permits, and state and federal agencies sponsoring projects through funding, licensing or permitting.

Responsibilities of the city archaeology office are:

- Assess all development projects – those that are city sponsored, on city land, or are undergoing planning review (including private development) – for potential impacts to archaeological resources.
- Coordinate the development of treatment plans if archaeological resource impacts are identified; treatment plans may involve excavations to examine and document subsurface deposits.
- Assist private development projects with the archaeology process required for construction permit stipulations.
- Manage all city-sponsored archaeological projects, including those that involve federal agencies (e.g., HUD, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration) and state agencies (e.g., Arizona State Land Department).
- Coordinate projects that involve state or federal agencies with the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
- Prepare scopes of work for city projects, evaluate responses, and assist with the hiring of archaeological consulting firms.
- Manage the city-wide annual services contracts for on-call archaeological services.
- Review archaeological fieldwork, reports, and collection submittals to Pueblo Grande Museum, the city repository for archaeological collections.
- Manage the Pueblo Grande Museum publication series, including Anthropological Papers, Occasional Papers, and Technical Reports.
- Coordinate the Arizona Site Steward Program for the city of Phoenix. The Arizona Site Steward Program is managed by Arizona State Parks; it involves volunteers that monitor and act as stewards of specific archaeological sites for various land-managing agencies across the state. The stewards document site vandalism, damage, and other disturbances, and report it to the city archaeologist, who then follows up by conducting a field visit and taking appropriate actions to prevent further damage.
- Coordinate the Pueblo Grande Platform Mound Stabilization Program. The Pueblo Grande platform mound is one of a few similar prehistoric resources that are preserved in the Salt River Valley. It is subject to erosion and destruction from wind and rain, and requires routine stabilization activities that meet with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. These activities are conducted by a team of volunteers.
- Coordinate the city of Phoenix Burial Repatriation Program with Native American Communities in Arizona. Under the Arizona State Burial Law (A.R.S. § 41-844), the city of Phoenix has a city-wide burial agreement with the Arizona State Museum and Tribal communities that claim cultural affiliation with the Hohokam. The city archaeologist, under this agreement, is responsible for notification, protection, treatment, and repatriation of prehistoric human remains discovered on city projects.
- Conduct research for public exhibits and publications, and interact with the media. Pueblo Grande Museum produces exhibits and publications that require review, research and written material from the city archaeologist. Media queries regarding archaeological projects within the city or other news stories that involve archaeology are directed to the city archaeologist.
V. Moving Forward

A. Vision Statement

B. Mission Statement

C. Goal Areas

To be consistent with the General Plan update underway (known as PlanPHX), each goal area will have associated initiatives (the plan for accomplishing the goals) and metrics (the method of measuring whether or not the goals have been met.

The goals listed below are based on a survey of other western cities’ and state’s historic preservation plans and HP and City Archaeologist input and are meant as a starting place for creating the plan’s goals.

1. Protect archaeological resources
   a) Inventory
      (1) Conduct archaeological survey
      (2) Inventory at mountain preserves and places that we are charged with protecting/overseeing
      (3) Update PHPR listings of parks and preserves that include archaeological resources so that those resources are a part of the period of significance
      (4) Traditional Cultural Places
   b) Formalize policies related to archaeology
   c) Increase understanding of alternatives
   d) Encourage data recovery prior to disturbance of archaeological sites
   e) Incorporate Archaeology into city processes as appropriate
      (1) Establish a set of sound historic preservation goals and policies that can be better integrated within the City’s planning, economic development, capital development and code enforcement operations
      (2) General Plan update
   f) Staffing
      (1) Increase staff levels
      (2) Continuing Education
      (3) Cross-training

2. Protect historic resources
   a) Surveys
      (1) Complete survey of Single-family Detached Development Post World War II
      (2) Survey other Post World War II property types: Single-family Attached, Multi-family and Institutions
      (3) Seek resources to hire consultants to prepare Post World War II Property Surveys
   b) Designations
      (1) Designate Post World War II properties.
      (2) Address Proposition 207.
      (3) Increase staffing as number of designated properties increase.
   c) Design Review
      (1) Update design guidelines.
      (2) Evaluate design review process and update ordinances and procedures.
      (3) Improve communications regarding potential demolitions.
      (4) Increase understanding of demolition alternatives.
      (5) Explore ideas to decrease demolitions without permits.

3. Explore preservation incentives.
   a) Support additional preservation bond funds.
b) Seek grants for preservation activities.

c) Development incentives that encourage and facilitate the rehabilitation and adaptive use of historic buildings and structures

d) Encourage state level incentives

4. Develop community awareness.

   a) Education
      
      (1) Update website to include more maps, brochures and relevant links.
      
      (2) Create preservation activities for grade school students in Phoenix schools.

   b) Outreach
      
      (1) Use social media to communicate with the public.
      
      (2) Prepare newsletter articles on preservation topics.
      
      (3) Celebrate preservation successes through events, awards and other recognition methods.

5. Promote partnerships.

   a) Provide opportunities internal to the city to learn more about preservation and its benefits.

   b) Increase communications with other government agencies to promote good preservation practices.

   c) Provide outreach to Tribes and Tribal Organizations to protect all cultural resources.

   d) Partner with community organizations and preservation professionals to better protect historic and cultural resources

VI. Implementation Matrix & Timeline
VII. Appendices

A. Appendix: Bibliography and Further Reading

**Purpose of the Plan**

http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/pad/index.htm


**Plans Reviewed:**


**Legal Basis for Historic Preservation: Federal**


http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/hisnps_NEW.htm

**Legal Basis for Historic Preservation: State**

**Legal Basis for Historic Preservation: Local**

**Benefits of Historic Preservation: Economic**


Benefits of Historic Preservation: Cultural

**Benefits of Historic Preservation: Environmental**

http://www.nps.gov/tps/sustainability.htm

**History of Phoenix (includes Arizona History)**


**African American Historic Property Survey**

**Hispanic Historic Property Survey**

**Asian American Historic Property Survey**

**History of Preservation in Phoenix**

Ten Vital Years in the History of Phoenix


**Historic Property Inventory, Surveys & Contexts**
http://nysparks.com/shpo/survey-evaluation/  
http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=23317  
http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_1.htm  
http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb24/

**Designation to the Phoenix Historic Property Register & the National Register of Historic Places**

**Design Review**

**National Historic Preservation Act As Amended, 2004, Section 106 Review**

http://www.achp.gov/work106.html  
http://www.achp.gov/docs/Section106Primer2010.pdf

http://www.achp.gov/docs/CitizenGuide.pdf
Grants & Incentives
http://www.nps.gov/tps/tax-incentives.htm

Technical Advice
http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs.htm
http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/tech-notes.htm

Education & Outreach

General Preservation Information

B. Appendix: Glossary

Abbreviations
ACHP    Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ASM    Arizona State Museum
ASP    Arizona State Parks
CLG    Certified Local Government
HP    Historic Preservation
HPO    City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office
NHPA    National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 2004
NPS    National Park Service
NRHP    National Register of Historic Places
SHPO    State Historic Preservation Office of Arizona

Terms

C. Appendix: Pre-historic & Historic Property Inventories, Surveys and Contexts

D. Appendix: Public Participation & Summary of Results
E. Appendix: The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

The following Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

(1) A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

(2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

(3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

(4) Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

(5) Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

(6) Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

(7) Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

(8) Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm
Chapter 14A

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Sec. 14A-1. Purpose and intent.

The intent of this chapter is to provide protection for significant properties and archeological sites which represent important aspects of Tempe's heritage; to enhance the character of the community by taking such properties and sites into account during development, and to assist owners in the preservation and restoration of their properties. Reasonable and fair regulations are included in this chapter as a means of balancing the rights of property owners and the value to the community of these significant properties and sites. The designation of any property or district shall not inhibit uses as permitted by the Zoning and Development Code, as adopted and amended by the city council. (Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 2004.42, 1-20-05)

Sec. 14A-2. Definitions.

The language of the definitions in this chapter shall be interpreted so as to convey the same meaning as in common usage, thereby giving this chapter its most reasonable application.

*Alteration* means any aesthetic, architectural, mechanical or structural change to the exterior surface of any significant part of a designated property.

*Archeologically sensitive* means a property which includes known or suspected archeological sites.

*Archeological site* means a site that has yielded, or exhibits the promise of yielding, information important in the understanding of human prehistory or history. Such information may consist of evidence of past human life, habitation or activity, as well as material remains.

*Arizona register of historic places* means the list of Arizona's historic properties worthy of preservation which serves as an official record of Arizona's historic districts, archeological sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in this state's history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-511.04(9), the Arizona state parks board, state historic preservation office is authorized to keep and administer an Arizona register of historic places composed of properties which meet the criteria established by the board, see below, or which are listed on the national register of historic places. Entry on the register requires nomination by the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) and owner notification in accordance with rules which the board adopts. The criteria for evaluation of potential Arizona register properties generally encompass the quality of significance in Arizona history, architecture,

---

1 Cross references—Buildings and building regulations, Ch. 8; Planning and development, Ch. 25.

State law reference—A.R.S. § 9-462.01

2 Arizona register of historic places definition and criteria as published by Arizona state parks, state historic preservation office.
archeology, engineering and culture. Such qualities may be present in districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association; and also:

1. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;

2. Are associated with the lives of historically significant persons;

3. Are the embodiment of a distinctive characteristic(s) of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Building** means any structure created to shelter any form of human activity, such as a house, church or hotel; may also refer to a related complex such as a courthouse and jail, or a house and barn.

**Certified Local Government (CLG)** means a federal program, the aim of which is to decentralize the national historic preservation program by assigning decision-making to the states and, ultimately, to local governments. Applications for certification are reviewed by the state historic preservation officer and must document, at a minimum, establishment of an historic preservation commission with specific membership and duties, adoption of an historic preservation ordinance and development of an historic preservation plan.

**Commission** means the historic preservation commission of Tempe.

**Compatibility** means a pleasing visual relationship between elements of a property, building, or structure, or among properties, buildings and structures, or with their surroundings. Aspects of compatibility may include, but are not limited to, proportion, rhythm, detail, texture, material, reflectance and architectural style.

**Contributing property** means a classification applied to an individual property within a designated historic district, signifying that the property contributes generally to the distinctive character of the district; or an archeological site.

**Demolition** means the act or process that destroys a designated property.

**Designated property** means any property which has been classified as a landmark, historic property or contributing property within an historic district.

**Distinctive character** means the distinguishing architectural and aesthetic characteristics of a landmark or historic property, or those generally found throughout an historic district, which fulfill the criteria for designation.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

_Historic district_ means a designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to all properties within an area with defined boundaries, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which express a distinctive character worthy of preservation. An historic district may also include or be composed of one or more archeological sites.

_Historic eligible_ means a property which appears to meet the criteria for designation.

_Historic preservation officer (HPO)_ means a city staff member appointed by the community development director to serve as secretary to the historic preservation commission, maintain the Tempe historic property register and otherwise perform such tasks and duties as assigned by this chapter.

_Historic preservation plan_ means a document, formally adopted by the city council, containing goals and policies regarding historic preservation within the city.

_Historic property_ means a designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to an individual property, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation, or an archeological site.

_Landmark_ means a designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to an individual property, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which has achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years and which expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation and which otherwise fulfills or exceeds the criteria for designation as an historic property.

_National register of historic places_ means the national register of historic places as established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. § 461 et seq.) and expanded by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, (16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.) as amended. It is the nation's official listing of prehistoric and historic properties worthy of preservation. It affords protection and recognition for districts, sites, buildings and structures significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. This significance can be at the local, state or national level. The national register serves both as a planning tool and as a means of identifying buildings, sites and districts that are of special significance to a community and worthy of preservation. The criteria for evaluation of potential national register properties generally encompass the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture. Such qualities may be present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association; and preservation office, and as found in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 60.

(1) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

(2) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
(3) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(4) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Noncontributing property** means a classification applied to an individual property located within a designated historic district, signifying that the property does not contribute to the distinctive character of the district. Such properties are subject only to the provisions of this chapter regarding new construction, including general landscape character, and only when the amount of new construction equals or exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the land area or building ground floor area of the property at the time of its identification as noncontributing.

**Ordinary maintenance and repair** means regular or usual care, upkeep or replacement of any part, or putting back together that which is deteriorated or broken, of an existing property, building or structure to effect the maintenance of a safe, sanitary and stable condition.

**Owner** means the legal ownership entity of an individual parcel or property, as recorded with Maricopa County. For purposes of this chapter, each such parcel or property shall be considered to have one owner.

**Parcel** means land identified as a separate lot for purposes of the subdivision and zoning regulations of the city and so recorded with Maricopa County.

**Preservation covenant** means a deed restriction, filed with Maricopa County, which limits the owner's use of a designated property in order to effect the preservation of the distinctive character of the property.

**Preservation easement** means the nonpossessory interest of a holder in real property, said property being a designated property, imposing limitations or obligations to preserve the distinctive character of that property, or a specified portion thereof.

**Property** means building(s), structure(s) or other improvements, or an archeological site, associated with a particular parcel or location.

**Secretary of the interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties** means standards developed and adopted, as amended, by the secretary of the interior of the United States to guide work funded by, or otherwise conducted under the auspices of, the federal government on historic properties and archeological sites. Guidelines are given for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.

**Significant** means having aesthetic, architectural or historical qualities of critical importance to the consideration of a property, building or structure for classification as a designated property.
Structure means anything built, constructed or erected, or any piece of work artificially built-up or composed of parts joined together in some definite manner, the existence of which requires a permanent or semi-permanent location on or in the ground, including, but not limited to: bridges, dams, walls, fences, gazebos, garages, advertising signs, communications towers, sculpture, monuments, recreational facilities and water distribution systems.

Tempe historic property register means a document listing all designated properties and districts in the city.

Sec. 14A-3. Historic preservation commission; historic preservation officer.

(a) The Tempe historic preservation commission is hereby established. The commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the city council in all matters concerning historic preservation. The commission shall make recommendations to the development review commission regarding designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts. Other actions of the historic preservation commission, as set forth below, shall be subject to appeal to the city council, as described in § 14A-8 of this chapter.

(b) The commission shall consist of seven (7) members and no more than two (2) alternates, meeting certain qualifications as set forth below, appointed by the mayor and approved by the city council.

(1) All members shall be Tempe residents with a demonstrated interest in or knowledge of historic preservation; and

(2) The commission shall be composed of three (3) at-large members and four (4) professionals, drawn from the following disciplines, with no more than two (2) such professionals from the same discipline: architecture, architectural history, archeology, historic preservation law, history, landscape architecture, planning, building construction, or other related field.

(c) Members shall serve a term of three (3) years, except that two (2) of the initial members shall, upon appointment, be designated to serve terms of two (2) years each. In addition, two (2) other initial members shall be designated to serve first terms of one year. Those subsequently appointed shall serve regular terms of three (3) years. Members may be reappointed, but shall serve not more than two (2) complete, consecutive terms. If a commission member accumulates three (3) consecutive unexcused absences, the matter will be referred to the mayor's office for resolution. Members of the commission shall serve voluntarily and without compensation.

(d) The Tempe historical museum administrator, or designee, shall serve ex-officio, with no vote, except as specified.

(e) Whenever a member is unable to attend or must decline participation due to a conflict of interest, that member shall give timely notice to the HPO or chair of the commission. In the event that a sufficient number of members, including alternates, are not available to constitute a
quorum, the HPO or the Tempe historical museum administrator or designee is authorized to act as a member on consent agenda items only, and only to the extent that this presence constitutes a quorum.

(f) Four (4) members shall constitute a quorum of the commission; the concurring vote of four (4) members shall be necessary for any action of the commission on any matter.

(g) Conflict of interest of commission members is governed by Arizona Revised Statutes, applicable judicial decisions and opinions of the city attorney.

(h) The commission shall elect, from within its own membership, a chair and vice-chair.

(i) The commission shall hold a minimum of four (4) public meetings/hearings per year. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the commission chair or four (4) or more members of the commission. The minutes of its proceedings, indicating the vote of each member and records of its examinations and other official actions shall be kept and filed in the offices of the community development department and the city clerk as part of the public record.

(j) The commission shall adopt rules of procedure consistent with the provisions of this chapter for the performance of its duties.

(k) Commission duties and activities shall include the following:

(1) Reviewing applications for the designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts and making recommendations to the development review commission, such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in § 14A-4 of this chapter;

(2) Reviewing and making decisions on applications for proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties or properties located within an historic district; such review shall be based on the criteria as specified in § 14A-6 of this chapter;

(3) Making recommendations to the city council concerning the use of federal, state, city or available private funds to promote the preservation of properties and districts within the city, including acquisition, the awarding of such sub-grants as may become available and the requiring of preservation covenants, as well as the acquisition of preservation easements;

(4) Recommending to the city council and other applicable boards and commissions, changes in the Zoning and Development Code, building code, general plan or other local laws as may enhance the purposes of this chapter;

(5) Cooperating with representatives designated by the property owners of the district from designated historic districts to formulate design guidelines for alterations and new construction within their districts;
(6) Initiating and conducting detailed studies and surveys of properties, structures and areas within the city and assess their potential for designation, and in order to formulate an historic preservation plan for the city; and

(7) Developing and participating in public information activities in order to increase public awareness of the value of historic preservation, and perform other functions that will encourage or further the interests of historic preservation.

(l) The Tempe historic preservation officer (HPO) is hereby established. The HPO shall be appointed by the director of the community development department, have a demonstrated interest in historic preservation and be a qualified professional in one or more pertinent fields such as archeology, architecture, cultural geography, landscape architecture or planning. The duties of the HPO shall include:

(1) Serving as secretary to the historic preservation commission, facilitating its efforts and, with other city staff as necessary, providing administrative support;

(2) Accepting applications for designations and proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal;

(3) Acting as intermediary between the commission and other city regulatory functions;

(4) Providing technical and background information to the commission and public, as required;

(5) Approving proposed alterations, new construction, demolition or removal affecting landmarks, historic properties and properties within historic districts, in the instance of such work being obviously minor in nature and impact, or in cases of imminent public hazard, and reporting such approvals to the commission;

(6) Preparing annual written reports of commission activities that are submitted to the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) and made available to the public. The reports shall contain, at a minimum, minutes of meetings, decisions made, special projects and activities, the number and type of cases reviewed, current resumes of commission members and member attendance records; and

(7) Maintaining the Tempe historic property register and lists of historic eligible and archeologically sensitive properties.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 97.20, 4-10-97; Ord. No. 2000.25, 6-15-00; Ord. No. 2001.17, 7-26-01; Ord. No. 2004.42, 1-20-05; Ord. No. 2005.18, 4-7-05; Ord. No. 2006.01, 1-5-06; Ord. No. 2010.02, 2-4-10)
Sec. 14A-4. Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts.

(a) The following criteria are established for designation of an individual property, building, structure or archeological site:

1. It meets the criteria for listing on the Arizona or national register of historic places;

2. It is found to be of exceptional significance and expresses a distinctive character, resulting from:
   a. A significant portion of it is at least fifty (50) years old; is reflective of the city's cultural, social, political or economic past; and is associated with a person or event significant in local, state or national history; or
   b. It represents an established and familiar visual feature of an area of the city, due to a prominent location or singular physical feature; or

3. If it has achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years, it shall be considered eligible for designation as a landmark if it is an integral and critical part of an historic district or demonstrates exceptional individual importance by otherwise meeting or exceeding the criteria specified in paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection above. At such time as a landmark becomes fifty (50) years old, it will automatically be reclassified as an historic property.

(b) The following criteria are established for designation of an historic district:

1. The district consists of an area in which are located a substantial concentration of properties, buildings or structures which individually meet the criteria in subsection (a) of this section above, as well as others which contribute generally to the overall distinctive character of the area, and are united historically or visually by plan or physical development; district boundaries coincide with documented historic boundaries such as early roadways, canals, subdivision plats or property lines; other district boundaries coincide with logical physical or man-made features and reflect recognized neighborhood or area boundaries; and other noncontributing properties or vacant parcels are included where necessary to create appropriate boundaries; or

2. A district may also include or be composed of one or more archeological sites.

(c) The designation process is as follows:

1. Application for the designation of a landmark, historic property or historic district shall be made by the owner of such real property, or of property located within the boundaries of such proposed district, situated in the city, or by any officer, department, board, commission or the city council, with the HPO at the community development department, on such form(s) and accompanied by such fee(s) as may be adopted;
(2) Any such application for designation, as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection above, shall also be accompanied by:

a. A vicinity ownership map showing all parcels in the vicinity adjacent to, including and surrounding the proposed designated property or district, within a radius of three hundred (300) feet from the external boundaries of the property or district; each such parcel shall be designated by a number to correspond with the ownership/tenant list described in subparagraph b. of this paragraph below;

b. A typed or legibly printed list containing names and mailing addresses, including zip codes, of owners of parcels as described in subparagraph a. of this paragraph above, and identified by the same number as on the vicinity ownership map, and the names and addresses, including zip codes, of any tenants associated with the described parcels;

c. An accurate legal description or parcel number(s) as recorded with Maricopa County, of the proposed designated property or properties within the proposed historic district; and

d. A written description of the proposed designated property or historic district, addressing the pertinent criteria, as described in subsections (a) and (b) of this section;

e. Applications for creation of historic districts shall include signed waiver forms (holding the City of Tempe harmless of any property rights issues) from at least 50% + 1 of the property owners in the proposed district boundaries as demonstration of a majority commitment. Property owners who do not submit waiver forms will be left out of historic designation with their property rights remaining the same as before creation of the district. (Zoning Waivers Charles Buss Tue 4/08)

(3) The HPO shall then place the request on the next available agenda of the commission for a public hearing. Upon request by the applicant, a special meeting may be called at the discretion of the chair of the commission, or by four (4) or more commission members;

(4) Upon receipt of an application and placement on the next available commission agenda, the HPO shall compile and transmit to the commission a complete report on the subject property or district. This report shall address the location, condition, age, significance and integrity of historic features and identify potential contributing and noncontributing properties and other relevant information, together with a recommendation to grant or deny the application and the reasons for the recommendation;

(5) At a public hearing, the commission shall review the application based on the applicable criteria in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, together with the HPO report, and make a recommendation to the development review commission. Any recommendation for approval may be subject to such conditions as the historic preservation commission deems applicable in order to fully carry out the provisions and intent of this chapter;
(6) Once forwarded to the development review commission, a public hearing shall be set and conducted according to the applicable procedures for amendment, as described in Section 6-304 of the Zoning and Development Code;

(7) After such public hearing, the development review commission shall make a report and recommendation to city council. The city council shall then set a public hearing on the application in accordance with subsection (e) of this section; and

(8) The recommendation of approval of any designation by the historic preservation commission shall be void if the designation has not been adopted by the city council within one year of the commission's action.

(d) Notification of public hearings is established as follows:

(1) For a designation request, the community development department shall deposit in the U.S. mail, not less than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the date of each public hearing of the historic preservation commission, a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing, and a summary of the request, to each affected property owner and tenant, per a list provided by the applicant. Final delivery of such notices shall not be the responsibility of the city. Notice shall be given as follows:

a. For a landmark or historic property request, "affected property owners and tenants" shall be those within three hundred (300) feet of the subject property; or

b. For an historic district request, "affected property owners and tenants" shall be those within the boundaries of the proposed district and within three hundred (300) feet external to those boundaries;

(2) The community development department shall erect, not less than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the date of the public hearing, a notice, visible from a public way and clearly legible, of the date, time and place of the hearing, and a summary of the request. It shall not be the responsibility of the city to maintain the notice after it has been placed. Notice shall be given as follows:

a. For a landmark or historic property request, such notice shall, wherever possible, be placed adjacent to the subject property in the right-of-way of a public street or road; or

b. For an historic district, such notice shall, wherever possible, be placed at no fewer than four (4) conspicuous locations within the district and at its external boundaries;

(3) The community development department shall submit the request for publication in the official newspaper at least once, no fewer than fifteen (15) days prior to the public hearing of the commission; and

(4) Notification pertaining to a proposed text amendment to this chapter shall comply with paragraph (3) of this subsection above, only.
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(e) The city council will, upon receipt of an application and accompanying decision and report from the development review commission, hold a public hearing to consider the application. Notification for such hearing shall be as specified in subsection (d) of this section above. At the public hearing, the city council may do one of the following:

1. Adopt the request per the recommendation of the development review commission;

2. Modify the recommendations and adopt the request as modified;

3. Deny the request; or

4. Remand the request to the development review commission for further proceedings.

(f) If the owners of twenty percent (20%) or more either of the area of the parcels included in a proposed historic district, or of those immediately adjacent in the rear or any side thereof extending one hundred fifty (150) feet therefrom, or of those directly opposite thereto extending one hundred fifty (150) feet from the street frontage of the opposite parcels, file a protest in writing against a proposed designation, it shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of three-fourths (3/4) of all members of the city council. Such protest shall be filed with the city clerk prior to or at the time of the public hearing of the council. If any members of the city council are unable to vote on such a question because of a conflict of interest, then the required number of favorable votes for passage of the question shall be three-fourths (3/4) of the remaining membership of the council, provided that such required number of votes shall in no event be less than a majority of the full membership of the council.

(g) The effects of designation are as follows:

1. If adopted by the city council, a landmark, historic property or historic district shall be designated by the application of the corresponding overlay zoning district and referenced by the "H" symbol on a map of the city, to be issued by the community development department;

2. Any uses permitted by the existing, underlying zoning classifications which apply to a landmark, historic property or historic district, shall be permitted. Such designated properties and districts are subject to the provisions of this chapter, as well as to applicable provisions of the Zoning and Development Code and the general plan; and

3. Subsequent to designation of an historic district, the historic preservation commission shall, in cooperation with representatives from the district, and in order to preserve and enhance the distinctive character of the district, adopt design guidelines which shall apply only to the exterior features and general character of contributing properties and alterations thereto, as well as any other new construction within the district as follows:
a. District design guidelines will address general aspects such as building materials, massing, scale and proportion of openings and other features, orientation and relative position of buildings and landscape character; as well as specific aspects such as roof forms, textures, color theme, character of signage, window and door types, and other details relative to architectural styles evident in the district;

b. District design guidelines will not regulate maximum building height, maximum lot coverage, minimum setbacks, required landscaping, required parking, allowable signs or other provisions of the Zoning and Development Code; and

c. Following designation of an historic district, and until such time as district-specific design guidelines can be adopted, the commission shall refer to such professional or commonly recognized standards as may be appropriate and available.

(h) The procedure to remove landmark, historic property or historic district designation and corresponding overlay zoning shall be the same as the procedure to designate, as specified in subsections (c), (d), (e) and (f) of this section.

(i) No landmark, historic property or historic district, having been nominated for designation, or removal of designation, shall be renominated within one year from the date of previous nomination.

(j) The procedure and effects of classification of a property as historic eligible shall be as follows:

1. The HPO shall prepare a list of proposed properties, with applicable supporting information, for consideration by the commission and schedule a public hearing; notification of such hearing is established as follows:

a. The community development department shall deposit in the U.S. mail, not less than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the date of the public hearing of the commission, a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing, and a summary of the proposed action, to each affected property owner, per currently available ownership information. Final delivery of such notices shall not be the responsibility of the city; and

b. The community development department shall submit the notice for publication in the official newspaper at least once, no fewer than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the public hearing of the commission;

2. At a public hearing, the commission shall review the proposed properties and assess their potential to meet the applicable criteria for designation, as described in subsection (a) of this section; and
(3) Upon approval by the commission, any properties classified as historic eligible shall be identified as such in the records of the community development department and subject to the requirements described in § 14A-6(f) and § 14A-7(j) of this chapter.

(k) The procedure and effects of classification of a property as archeologically sensitive shall be as follows:

(1) The HPO shall prepare a list of proposed properties, with applicable supporting information, for consideration by the commission at a regularly scheduled public meeting; and

(2) Upon approval by the commission, any properties classified as archeologically sensitive shall be identified as such in the records of the community development department and subject to the requirements described in § 14A-6(g) and § 14A-7(k) of this chapter.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 97.20, 4-10-97; Ord. No. 2000.25, 6-15-00; Ord. No. 2004.42, 1-20-05; Ord. No. 2005.18, 4-7-05; Ord. No. 2006.01, 1-5-06)


(a) The Tempe historic property register is hereby established for the purpose of listing the landmarks, historic properties and historic districts, as designated under the provisions of this chapter. This register, as may be amended from time to time, shall serve as the official record of all such designations and shall be maintained by the HPO and available for public reference at the community development department and the city clerk.

(b) Supplemental to the historic property register shall be the lists of properties classified as historic eligible and archeologically sensitive. These lists, as may be amended from time to time, shall be maintained by the HPO and available for public reference at the community development department and the city clerk.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 97.20, 4-10-97; Ord. No. 2000.25, 6-15-00; Ord. No. 2005.18, 4-7-05)

Sec. 14A-6. Guidelines, standards and process for review of alteration or new construction.

(a) When a building permit or other permit or approval is sought from the city to alter, remodel, build or otherwise develop or landscape property designated as a landmark, historic property, or that is located within a designated historic district, issuance of the permit or approval shall be deferred until after approval has been obtained from the historic preservation commission, or in the cases of work obviously minor in nature or of no effect to the property or district, the HPO. The issuance of such approval indicates conformance with the provisions and intent of this chapter only and does not imply approval by other city regulatory agencies.

(b) Review by the commission of a request for approval of proposed alteration or new construction shall require submittal to the HPO:TEMPE CODE 14A-14
(1) An application, on such form(s) and accompanied by such fee(s) as may be adopted;

(2) Photographs of the existing property;

(3) Drawings, to approximate scale, of the site plan, floor plan(s) and elevations of the proposed work, indicating materials and color scheme;

(4) If signage is part of the proposed work, drawings, to approximate scale, showing the size and location of proposed signage, type of lettering to be used and indication of color and type of illumination, if any; and

(5) Any other information which the applicant or the commission may reasonably deem necessary to review the proposed work.

(c) The commission shall consider the request at its next available regularly scheduled or special public meeting. Approval or denial shall be based on the following criteria:

(1) Proposed work on any portion of a landmark or historic property shall be compatible with the recognized distinctive character of the overall property;

(2) Proposed work on any portion of a contributing property within an historic district shall be compatible with the recognized distinctive character of the property itself, as well as with that of the overall district, as determined by conformance with adopted design guidelines of the district;

(3) Proposed new work within an historic district shall be compatible with the recognized distinctive character of the district, as determined by conformance with adopted design guidelines of the district; and

(4) If federal funds, in the form of grants, tax incentives or other programs, are employed, directly or indirectly, in financing proposed work, the secretary of the interior's standards for the treatment of historic properties shall be applicable, in addition to the criteria specified in paragraphs (1) through (3) of this subsection above.

(d) The commission shall act to approve, deny, conditionally approve or continue an application at the public meeting at which it is initially reviewed. The HPO shall issue and record a notice of approval or denial and specify the reasons for, and any conditions of, the commission's action.

(e) Approval of an application by the commission or HPO shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval.

(f) When a permit or other approval is sought from the city to alter, remodel, build or otherwise develop or landscape property classified as historic eligible, issuance of the permit or approval shall be subject to clearance by the HPO. Such clearance shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of application, during which time the HPO will assess potential
adverse impact, suggest alternatives, and may consult with the commission and city council. If, by the end of the thirty (30) day period, no clearance has been issued or no alternative, agreeable to the applicant, has been suggested, the original request shall be granted, provided all other applicable requirements have been met.

(g) When a permit or other approval is sought from the city to alter, remodel, build or otherwise develop or landscape property classified as archeologically sensitive, the applicant shall be advised as to the status of the property, potentially applicable state and federal requirements, and suggested course(s) of action. In the case of city-owned property or right-of-way, applicable state and federal requirements shall determine the appropriate course of action.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 2000.25, 6-15-00)

1. The City of Tempe (City) recognizes the importance of cultural resources, particularly human remains and funerary associated objects, to claimant Tribes of the City. Therefore, in an effort to assist with compliance of Arizona Revised Statute §41-865 for work conducted on private or municipal property, the property owner shall employ a trained archaeological monitor during ground disturbing activities within archaeologically sensitive areas that have a demonstrated affiliation with human remains. These archaeological monitoring efforts shall follow the direction of a professionally developed monitoring work plan and shall be conducted under a project-specific permit obtained from the Arizona State Museum; the City’s blanket burial agreement shall apply. Human remains monitoring shall be applicable to efforts associated with commercial development or other activities in which a zoning or other City action is requested. (Archaeological Monitoring Andrea Gregory Tue 4/01)

(h) An historic property can be adversely affected by the proximity of new construction, alteration of traffic patterns, or other activities that change the physical environment in the vicinity of the property. Such activities can cause indirect impacts such as introducing visually intrusive elements, restricting access, or increasing traffic, noise, or lighting that would diminish the integrity of the characteristics that make the property eligible for Historic designation. The City of Tempe shall consider the adverse impacts that nearby construction would have on historic properties and districts and any alternatives, such as design modification, use of landscaping or other barriers, or other approaches that would mitigate the adverse effects of a new project. (Proximity Effects Scott Solliday Tue 4/08)


(a) When a permit or other approval is sought from the city to demolish or remove a designated property, issuance of the permit or approval shall be deferred until after approval has been obtained from the historic preservation commission, or in the cases of work obviously minor in nature or involving an imminent hazard to public safety, the HPO. The issuance of such approval indicates conformance with the provisions and intent of this chapter only and does not imply approval by other city regulatory agencies.

(b) Review by the commission of a request for approval of proposed demolition or removal shall require submittal to the HPO of:
(1) An application, on such form(s) and accompanied by such fee(s) as may be adopted;

(2) Photographs of the existing property;

(3) A preliminary plan of redevelopment for the parcel indicating an intended use that is in compliance with the general plan and existing or proposed zoning and other applicable regulations, as well as with §14A-6 of this chapter;

(4) If economic relief is requested, supporting documentation necessary to demonstrate applicability of the standards as described in subsection (d) of this section; and

(5) Any other information which the applicant or the commission may reasonably deem necessary to review the request.

(c) The commission shall consider the request at its next regularly scheduled or special public meeting. Approval or denial shall be based on the following criteria:

(1) The property which is proposed for demolition or removal is of no historic or architectural value or significance and does not contribute to the distinctive character of the property;

(2) Loss of the property would not adversely affect the integrity, nor diminish the distinctive character of an historic district; and

(3) If economic relief is requested, applicability of the standards as described in subsection (d) of this section below.

(d) An application for demolition may be accompanied by a request for economic hardship relief. Separate standards for granting economic hardship relief to allow demolition or removal of a designated property are hereby established for investment or income producing properties, and for non-income producing properties. Non-income producing properties shall consist of owner-occupied single-family dwellings and non-income producing institutional properties. Economic hardship relief shall be granted as follows:

(1) In regard to an income producing property, when the applicant demonstrates that a reasonable rate of return cannot be obtained from a property which retains features which contribute to its distinctive character in its present condition or if rehabilitated, either by the current owner or a potential buyer; or

(2) In regard to a non-income producing property, when the applicant demonstrates that the property has no reasonable use as a single-family dwelling or for an institutional use in its present condition, or if rehabilitated, either by the current owner or a potential buyer.

(e) Economic hardship relief shall not be granted due to any of the following circumstances:
HISTORIC PRESERVATION

(1) Willfully destructive acts by the owner;

(2) Purchase of the property for substantially more than the market value;

(3) Failure to perform ordinary maintenance and repair; or

(4) Failure to diligently solicit and retain tenants or provide normal tenant improvements.

(f) The commission shall act to approve, deny, conditionally approve or continue an application at the public meeting at which it is initially reviewed. The HPO shall issue and record a notice of decision and specify the reasons for, and any conditions of, the commission's action.

(g) Approval of an application by the commission or HPO shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval.

(h) If a request for a proposed demolition or removal is denied by the commission, no demolition or removal will be permitted for a period of no more than one hundred eighty (180) days from the date on which the request was denied. During the period of restraint of demolition or removal, the commission and HPO will attempt to secure whatever assistance as may be feasible to effect the preservation of the property, such as economic assistance, acquisition, purchase of a preservation easement, or location of a buyer who, upon purchase at terms agreeable to the owner, will enter into a preservation covenant with the city for period of at least five (5) years. If the commission or HPO is unable to secure such assistance within the period of restraint, the proposed demolition or removal will be allowed, subject to the issuance of the appropriate permit by the building official of Tempe.

(i) If the building official finds that a designated property is an imminent hazard to public safety and, together with the HPO, determines that repairs or relocation would not be appropriate or feasible, the HPO shall approve the necessary demolition or removal, subject to issuance of the appropriate permit by the building official.

(j) When a permit or other approval is sought from the city to demolish or remove a property classified as historic eligible, issuance of the permit or approval shall be subject to clearance by the HPO. Such clearance shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of application, during which time the HPO will assess adverse impact, suggest alternatives, and may consult with the commission and city council. If, by the end of the thirty (30) day period, no clearance has been issued or no alternative, agreeable to the applicant, has been suggested, the original request shall be granted, provided all other applicable requirements have been met.

(k) When a permit or other approval is sought from the city to demolish or remove a property classified as archeologically sensitive, the applicant shall be advised as to the status of the property, potentially applicable state and federal requirements, and suggested course(s) of action. In the case of city-owned property or right-of-way, applicable state and federal requirements shall determine the appropriate course of action.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 97.20, 4-10-97; Ord. No. 2000.25, 6-15-00)

(a) The applicant for approval of proposed alteration, new construction, demolition or removal, or designation, or classification as historic eligible, or the owner of any such property, or the community development director, or any member of the city council, may appeal any decision of the historic preservation commission to the city council by filing written notice of appeal and any applicable fee, as may be adopted, with the city clerk within ten (10) working days of the date of the commission's action, in accordance with Rule 6 of Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure of the State of Arizona.

(b) Notice of an appeal and the date set for its review by the city council shall be published at least once, not less than seven (7) days prior to the council meeting at which such appeal is to be heard.

(c) The city clerk shall set the date for a public hearing of the appeal by the council within thirty (30) days of the filing of the appeal.


(a) Ordinary maintenance and repair of a designated property shall be performed by the owner and shall not require specific approval from the HPO or commission, provided that such maintenance or repair does not significantly alter the features which contribute to the distinctive character of such a designated property.

(b) The owner of a designated property shall not permit the property to fall into a state of disrepair so as to result in the deterioration of any significant exterior feature which would have a detrimental effect on the distinctive character of the property itself or, that of the overall district, if located within an historic district.

(c) The condition of the property at the time of its designation shall be the standard of reference for the evaluation of future deterioration.

(d) Examples of deterioration which shall be prevented by the owner of the designated property by means of ordinary maintenance and repair shall include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Excessive erosion, reverse drainage and other preventable site conditions which may adversely affect significant buildings and structures;

2. Loss of structural integrity due to deterioration of footings, load-bearing walls or columns, beams, trusses or other support members;

3. Weathering or damage to exterior elements such as wall and roof surfaces, chimneys, balustrades, doors, windows and other architectural features;

4. Loss of weather-tightness or security due to any of the above; or

5. Deterioration of any feature so as to create a hazardous condition which could lead to the claim that demolition is necessary as a matter of public safety.
(e) In order to prevent demolition by neglect, resulting from deterioration as described in subsection (d) of this section above, the city may effect repairs to a landmark, historic property or contributing property within an historic district and treat the cost of such repairs as a lien against the property.

(f) Enforcement of this section shall be the responsibility of the city manager or designee.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95)

Sec. 14A-10. Incentives.

It is the intent of the city to make ownership of a landmark, historic property or property within an historic district as beneficial as possible. In addition to the intangible benefits of owning a property recognized as an important community resource, the HPO or commission may, when applicable and possible, provide such owners with the following:

1. Assistance in locating potential sources of financial assistance and tax credits;
2. Assistance in preparing grant applications and potential third party sponsorship;
3. Technical information and referrals;
4. Assistance in locating buyers or sellers;
5. Assistance, through the neighborhood programs office, in the formulation and operation of a neighborhood association; and
6. Assistance in obtaining other benefits as may become available through the city or other sources.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95)


(a) Any person who constructs, alters, neglects, demolishes or removes a property or portion thereof in violation of the provisions of this chapter may be required to restore the property to its appearance prior to the violation.

(b) Enforcement of this section shall be the responsibility of the city manager or designee. Any resulting action regarding a violation of any provision of this chapter shall be brought by the city attorney. The civil remedy shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any criminal prosecution and penalty.

(c) Any person found to be in violation of any provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable in accordance with § 1-7 of this code.

(Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95)