HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
February 9th, 2017
Hatton Hall
34 E 7th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
6:00 PM

Commission Present:
Andrea Gregory, Chair
Chuck Buss, Vice-Chair
Matthew Bilbarrow
Jim Garrison
Joe Nucci
Lauren Proper
Scott Soliday
Korri Turner

Commission Absent:
Sara Ferland

City Staff Present:
John Larsen Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
Hunter Hansen
Robbie Aaron
Ambika Adhikari
Karen Stovall
John Horan, Intern
Taylor Espinoza, Intern
Brenda Abney, Museum Manager

Chair Gregory called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Audience: No response

2. Approval of January 12th, 2017 Meeting Minutes
   - Corrections: Typographical errors

   Commissioner Nucci moved the Commission approve the January 12th, 2017 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garrison and passed with a vote of 7-0, 1 abstention.

3. Farmer – Goodwin Townhomes
   - Request to have an attorney present declined – but legal questions should be recorded and sent to the City Attorney’s office
   - Presentation given by architect Benjamin Vogel
     - Energy efficiency as part of the North West Tempe strategic plan 1998-2002 also one of the developer’s core values
     - Multiple story building
     - Not transient types – family friendly and owner occupied
     - Residential in nature and abuts the Farmer-Goodwin home
     - New construction will be taller than the historic house – distinct yet compatible
     - Notes that at the moment the best views of the house are through the gates – as a result the ideal viewsheds will not be blocked by the new construction
     - Modern form – provide a family friendly, commercial residential development that attempts to fit in with the historic house and the neighborhood around it
     - Developer does plan to meet with the neighbors prior to DRC
   - An explanation of the design changes from the original PAD to the current iteration – including new
dormers
  o An attempt to make the new design more compatible with the Farmer-Goodwin home
  o Landscape design is largely similar to the 2005 proposal
  o 2005 condition of approval – Conservation easement for the Farmer-Goodwin House –
    Condition has not been satisfied
  • Staff reads staff report and recommends a continuance until the 2005 easement requirement has
    been satisfied
  • The Commission Comments
    o Reiteration that the conservation easement is necessary
    o A question of what the certificate of appropriateness would do in this instance – the
      answer is that this is a question of design but the certificate can be issued with the
      condition of the easement
    o The follow up after this commission where does the proposal go
      • If the Historic Preservation commission approves it – it will go on to Design
        Review Commission without coming back to the Historic Preservation
        Commission unless significant changes are made by DRC
    o The developer requests not continuing the application because it will create hardship for
      them
    o An amended easement agreement went to the City
    o A discussion of the loss of the trees on the southern elevation
      • Developer says that the trees do not have enough room to grow – smaller plants
        were used instead
      • The issue of loss of trees means a loss of character, shade, etc.
      • Developer describes the lack of room but added trees in other locations, but they
        are open to something taller or with a smaller footprint
      • Potential for the sidewalks to be reduced to accommodate trees
      • Potential for tree wells
    o Architectural question regarding the size and design of the windows that are small and
      seem inconsistent with the Farmer-Goodwin House
    o Question of the lightness of the colors – needs the colors to match the Farmer-Goodwin
      House
      • Developer responds that the paint is as light as it can be and that the small
        windows on the first floor are garage windows and the small windows elsewhere
        should have been removed
    o Architectural question of the arch over the driveway
      • The developer describes how archways tend to slow people down
      • Issue raised that it looks too monolithic – suggestion of adding vegetation
  • Public questions
    o Karyn Gitlis
      • 1206 S. Ash Ave., Tempe, 85281
      • Concerns:
        a. Postpone to next month to give the neighbors more time
        b. Asks what the process is for keeping a PAD open for more than 10
           years especially when things have changed around the proposed area
        c. Wants the development to come to the neighbors before things begin
        d. Stresses the implications of issuing a certificate of appropriateness
           without the easement in place
        e. South façade is monolithic
    o Taylor Espinoza
- Question of whether or not the developer is working with a landscape architect
- Developer wants xeriscape but that’s not the guidance from the city
- Question of what standard for efficiency
- Developer says it is not LEED (Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design) but HERS (Home Energy Rating System) – explains what average HERS ratings are and gives an example of their work
  a. Farmer-Goodwin Townhomes wants to achieve a HERS of 30 and with the addition of solar could be a net zero or better
  o Judy Tapscott
    - Highlights how the historic quality of the neighborhood has been whittled away – that the proposed building is blocky and without historical connection
  o Hansen
    - Question What’s behind the garage in the floorplan
    - Developer leaves it up to the resident – could be a gym or den or theater
    - Question about the code being setback from the sidewalk
- No requirement for public or community involvement only the commissions and the city with the developer and property owner
- Question of how much power the commission has – responded with free range for conditions, requests, etc. to be made
- Question of the timeline of the easement arises – repeat that the document is with the city – and it is with the attorney’s office but no speculation of the next steps can be made with regard to the timeline at this junction
- A summary of the concerns and the notion that they are not within the scope of this commission
- Discussion on whether or not this design is better than the previous one which was approved
  o Belief that this design is worse because it will reflect heat, it is monolithic and out of scale
- Concern raised that the certificate of appropriateness may be used to leverage the community and the community needs to have a say
  o Developer reiterated desire to meet with the neighbors
- The easement brought back up before the final vote and the notion that the new construction does not match
- Applicant was encouraged to engage with the neighborhood and take historic preservation in to consideration.

Commissioner Proper moved the Commission to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition a conservation easement for the Farmer-Goodwin House be executed and recorded prior to the issuance of Building Permits. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and passed with a vote of 5-3.

4. Discussion and Possible Action on Historic Preservation Award(s)
   - Five nominations are presented to the Commission for consideration
     o Additional nomination presented for Mark Vinson – Brief presentation given with his major highlights
   - Commission agrees that there should be a total of three awards
     o Discussion about the possibility of categories for the awards
     o Commission decided on the following award categories
       o Individual
       o Neighborhood
       o Site / Project
   - Commission discussed each of the six nominations and their merits
• The commission designated three award winners

Commissioner Bilsbarrow moved the Commission to award the “Tempe Historic Preservation Award” to Borden Homes, Mark Vinson, and the Eisendrath House. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nucci and passed with a vote of 6-1, 1 abstention.

5. Hayden House Update – John Southard, historic Preservation Officer
• Met with developers to discuss a new timeline which will begin in April or May and will happen in phases
  o Excavation will take approximately 3 months
  o Phase 1B will consist of the office space construction; Phase 2 will consist of construction of the hotel
• Mention of the steps the developer has taken in order to assure the site is secure
  o Private security visit the site once per day at various times
  o Posted no trespassing signs
  o Cut vegetation around the property and cleaned up the trash
• Potential for the streetcar to locate a trailer on the property – maybe using the house itself
  o Could bring more attention and security
  o But the discussion is still in the early stages
• Mention of the vertical and horizontal cracks in the adobe
  o Should have an assessment as the horizontal could be an issue
  o Developer agree that to arrange a site tour with various adobe experts to assess the structure
• Development agreement was approved in May 2015 – needs building permits within two years. Since they did not get those permits they will need to go back before the City Council to request an extension
• An update from the project team will be coming in March

6. Chair / Staff Updates
• Staff updates:
  o Hayden Butte Water Tank
    • Outer coating system (paint) is being applied to the east tank. Chinchilla chosen and applied but paint suppliers switched, but a similar color found
    • The tank to the east is beginning to be coated
    • The tank to the west is in the beginning stages of rehab
  o Hayden Flour Mill
    • The Part 1 application was approved by the National Park Service
    • The developer is aiming to submit the Part 2 by the end of the month
    • Question about the Mill being placed on the local register
  o Reminder that the meetings will be moving to the second Tuesday of the month beginning in March
  o Chair reminds the Commission about the Walk Through History tour
  o Taylor Espinoza gives update on the Solar Presentation and Archiving of Mitchell Park NA materials
  o John Horan gives update on the Adobe Brochure and presentation he is putting together
  o Brenda Abney provides update on Hayden Ferry Days and the Minder Binder Fundraiser

7. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
• Chair Gregory requests future agenda items with regards to Maple Ash’s Historic Eligibility
Meeting adjourned at 8:07pm

Prepared by: City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office

[Signature]
Andrea Gregory, Chair