HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
September 12th, 2017

Hatton Hall
34 East 7th Street, Tempe, AZ  85281
6:00 PM

Call to Order

Roll Call

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 April 11th, 2017 Meeting Minutes

3. Approval of August 8th, 2017 Meeting Minutes

4. Hayden Flour Mill Redevelopment Project (Phase One) Presentation – David Baum, Baum Revision, LLC

5. Introduction of Tempe Community Development Department Director Chad Weaver

6. Tempe Streetcar Project Update – Eric Iwersen, Principal Planner, City of Tempe

7. 5th Street Streetscape Project Update – Eric Iwersen, Principal Planner, City of Tempe

8. Hayden House Update – John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

9. Discussion and possible action regarding formation of a subcommittee to evaluate City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office and Historic Preservation Commission standards and practices

10. Election for Chair and Vice-Chair Positions

11. Chair / Staff Updates

12. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
   - Member Announcements
   - Staff Announcements

Adjourn

For further information on the above agenda items, contact Community Development, Planning Division (480) 350-8331. Agenda items may not be heard in the order listed. The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-8331 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting.
Agenda Item 2
Chair Gregory called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

1. Call to Audience: No response

2. Approval of March 14th, 2017 Meeting Minutes

   Commissioner Nucci moved the Commission approve the March 14th, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Buss and passed with a vote of 5-0.

3. Introduction of New Member – John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
   a. John Southard introduces new commission member Chris Garraty
   b. Commissioner Garraty briefly shares about his professional background

7. Discuss and Consider One Hundred Mill Project / 1873-1924 Charles T. Hayden House
   a. Supplemental information is introduced to the Commission by staff
   b. Question about the status of the conditions of approval
   c. Michael Brekka of Douglas Wilson provides a project update
      i. Update on timeline
         • What has been done to date
         • What is currently being done
         • What will be done in the future
      ii. Mentions that the land was subdivided and a HABS report and monitoring was also done
         • Archaeological plan has been approved
      iii. Speaks to the series of investors that are disparate with the three different parcels
         • 3 phases – prep (archaeological work, shoring), demolition, movement of utilities
      iv. Mentions it will take approximately 24-26 months from archaeological work to completion
      v. Currently actively involved in preservation with various activities from assessment of the condition of the adobe to security and fire suppression
   d. Mention of the cracking in the walls, the sinkhole in the parking lot and transient activity on the site
e. Mention of the PAD condition which says the building shall not fall in to a state of disrepair.
   i. Project needs to not be demolished through neglect
   ii. Wants to have a commitment from the developer to fix and not allow things to get worse
f. Questions about what the request from the Commission is at this point
   i. Project team will ask City Council for an extension of the PAD. HPC could provide input in
to the extension process if it feels necessary
g. Question about whether a building condition report has been completed which would direct how
repairs are done
   i. It was supposed to be attached to Phase II but that was to happen quicker than it has
h. Request to move Building Condition Assessment Report completion up in the process.
   i. Needs to come sooner as the project is lacking baseline data to make informed decisions
i. Concern about transient population causing problems on the property
   i. Project team is taking a more active role. Has hired a private security team to monitor
property daily.
   j. Consensus for Chair to draft letter to City Council conveying the concerns of the Commission and
recommending that the timely completion of a Building Condition Assessment Report be a
condition of extension of the PAD

4. Consideration of City Council Chambers Naming Request
   a. Staff recommends denial for the City Council Chambers Naming Request
   b. Commission consensus to deny the City Council Chambers Naming Request

5. Tempe Streetcar Presentation – Eric Iwersen, Principal Planner
   a. Eric Iwersen gives presentation on current status of Tempe Streetcar
      i. Currently in the process of procuring six vehicles with alternative propulsion technology
         from Brookville Equipment
         • Settled on battery capability with four off wire scenarios
         • Scenarios 1-3 are acceptable whereas scenario 4 is not an acceptable use of
           power and costs
         • City Council moved on scenario 3
         • Looking at Gammage curve as battery operated as well
         • Question about why we need the batteries
            a. Answer: the city invested in undergrounding wires and they don’t want
to go back on that
      ii. Working with stakeholders for the south side of Rio Salado due to APS powerline making
          the central location on Rio Salado untenable
      iii. Discusses advantages to the south side configuration
          • Improves traffic and streetcar travel
          • Avoids APS line
          • Confines construction
          • Limits impact to major events
          • Formalizes Hayden Preserve because it makes a nice edge
   b. Commission mentions that if it is beyond the right of way it is entirely within the 4(f) provisions
      i. Streetcar team looking to get FONSI modified
   c. Question about the Streetscape and whether the cross-section grown;
      i. Cross section has not grown
   d. Question about what the conflict is that is forcing the realignment
      i. APS says that the track cannot be on top of their 240kw line; maybe if it were battery
operated but that won’t work because it needs to charge during that section

e. Question whether the sidewalk would remain or if a new one would be constructed in a different location
   i. New sidewalk would be built but alignment avoids 1,180 line

f. Next steps are to continue working with interested parties
   i. Public meeting on April 19
      • 5 artists developing art for each stop
      • Design process
      • Vehicle design information

g. Question about funding for the project from the Federal government
   i. Need to add more funding – have 111 million and they need 75 million from the Federal government

6. Tempe (Hayden) Butte Master Plan Presentation – Bonnie Richardson, Principal Planner
   a. John Southard introduces Master Plan
   b. Presentation by Bonnie Richardson (City of Tempe) and Kevin Moore (Moore / Swick Partnership)
      i. Kevin Moore describes the intent of the document
         • Still in the draft stage because they are still taking advice
      ii. Its Tempe’s first preserve and first park with a management plan
         • First in a line for all of Tempe’s parks
         • Manage of what is there and how they’re going to take care of it
         • Will be “preserving” Hayden, Double, Papago, Papago Regional Park (which is a City of Scottsdale and City of Phoenix partnership)
         • Pushing preservation, education, management, enforcement
      iii. Discusses what “Management Plan” means
         • Enhance the beauty and how to manage it
         • Geology and soil
         • Wanted to make a working document
         • Making an analysis of history and geology
      iv. Describes the 1180 line and boundaries of the preserve
         • Concern because 1180 is incorrect and does not agree with the Tempe Documents including Ordinance 2015.16 that creates the official boundary
         • Recommendation to change the text to reflect what the ordinance says
         • Discussion about the boundary line versus line of no disturbance
      v. Talking with ASU to declare their side of the Mountain a preserve
         • They’re slow to commit
      vi. Issue of policing and enforcement raised
         • Potential for Park Rangers
      vii. Potential for radio equipment to be moved from top of Butte to W6
      viii. Additional discussion about the challenges
         • Erosion
         • Off trail activity
         • Urban Camping
         • Graffiti
      ix. Question about whether the Tribe has been involved in the conversation
        • Talks are happening at a "very high level"
     x. This meeting opens the public comment period
        • Public comment goes until the end of May
Historic Preservation Commission comments will be compiled during the May meeting

8. Discussion and Possible Direction on Preservation-Related General Plan 2040 Elements
   a. Historic Preservation Office is seeking direction but will work with Commission Chair on language
   b. Consensus for Historic Preservation Officer to work with Commission Chair on General Plan 2040 Elements

9. Chair / Staff Updates
   a. Staff updates:
      i. Reminder about the HP Awards being presented at the Neighborhood Awards on April 22, 2017. Event details will be sent out.

10. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items

Meeting adjourned at 8:27pm

Prepared by: City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office

Andrea Gregory, Chair
Agenda Item 3
Chair Gregory called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Audience: No response

2. Approval of May 09th, 2017 Meeting Minutes

   Commissioner Nucci moved the Commission approve the May 09th, 2017 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Garrison and passed with a vote of 7-0.


   a. Staff provides the Commission with some background information about the Hayden House Project
   b. Staff notes that due to timing of the BCAR submittal there is not a formal staff recommendation
   c. Manjula Vaz informs the Commission that Hensel-Phelps will not be the lead on the project and introduces Harmon Andersen
   d. Mr. Andersen speaks the Hensel-Phelps background on the project and their vision for the project moving forward
      i. Speaks to positive changes that will occur in the coming months
   e. Bob Graham of Motley Design Group give an overview of the BCAR for Hayden House
      i. Mentions that a structural engineer has not looked at the building yet
      ii. Building is not in immediate danger of falling down
      iii. Mentions that there are 3 coats of plaster on the building
      iv. There is evidence of patches around the building
      v. Mentions that there are two items they deemed to be critical
         1. Crack in the exterior stucco
         2. There is a hole in the roof. The roof system is a long lasting roof system.
   vi. Mentions serious priority items
      1. Vertical load systems. There are a few areas where adobe repairs may be needed at the wall bases
      2. Removal of built up coats of plaster. Mentions that should probably be removed from the serious category
      3. Adobe gate wall. Has been stabilized and is now tarped to prevent driving rain from
f. Question about whether or not the fire protection was looked at for this report
   i. Mr. Graham states he did not as he is not qualified to do so

h. Comment about having something quantifiable that would tell the extent of the repairs that need to be
done on the exterior skin
   i. Mr. Andersen has states that Hensel-Phelps has experience with site development including
   site with historic structures on them. However, adobe is not something they have worked with
   before
   ii. Open for suggestions and the sprinkler system is functional and operating

j. Questions about what has changed since Hensel-Phelps took over? Is the Scope the same?
   i. The scope of work is yet to be determined

k. Comment about Phase 2 work being mixed in the report
   i. Anything that has to do with Phase 2 is the opinion of the Historical Architect

l. Comment that the justifications for any period of significance have not been made and that anything
   built 1967 and prior should be taken in to consideration.
   i. Mr. Andersen objected to such a notion and also stated that keeping things from the Robert
   Evans era is also a stretch.

m. Ms. Vaz states that the objective today is to get the critical and serious priorities approved so that the
   team can begin to address them and will also provide monthly updates about the condition of the
   property

n. Ms. Vaz also states that Phase 2 and historic significance will be discussed at a later date

o. Staff states that a plan is in place for the property owner to take over security and daily monitoring of
   the site.

p. Staff suggests that the Commission focuses on the Critical Priority and Serious Priority items on page 2
   of the BCAR

q. Commission discusses the Critical Priority items
   i. Question about cracks being primarily in vertical surface or if they go in to the parapet
      1. Crack are entirely vertical

r. Question about whether approval should be done in one motion or in multiple.
   i. Staff suggest that it should be done however the Commission is comfortable

s. Suggestion to remove B-02 - Exterior Skin: Remove built up coats of plaster, refinish with lime plaster
   from the list of serious priorities. Should be done at a later time when something more significant will be
   done.

t. Question for Mr. Andersen about whether or not this report provides the team what they need to
   address the condition of the building

u. Question about whether 90 days is enough time to complete serious priority A-02 - Vertical Load
   Systems: Structural engineering analysis, adobe repairs at wall bases as discovered to be necessary

v. Commission discusses the need for serious priority A-02 - Vertical Load Systems: Structural
   engineering analysis, adobe repairs at wall bases as discovered to be necessary

w. Ms. Vaz suggests starting the critical priorities immediately and then looking to get the engineer out to
   complete structural analysis

x. Question to clarify adobe repairs at wall bases as opposed to adobe repairs in general
   i. Mr. Graham states that the wall bases were the only places that he saw problems; that does
   not mean there are not more.

y. Staff reads the conditions of approval from the PAD extension to clarify exactly what it is the project
   team was required to complete
   i. Comment regarding the structural engineer; while one was not required per the condition of
approval it has been identified as being a serious priority in the BCAR and thus should be
taken in to consideration

ii. Chair suggests amending A-02 to simply state Vertical Load Systems: Structural engineering
analysis

z. Commissioner Garrison suggests approving both Serious Priorities and Critical Priority A-02 within 90
days

Commissioner Nucci moves to approve the critical priority items identified in the building
condition assessment report submitted by motley design and dated July 2017. The motion was
seconded by Commissioner Garrison and passed with a vote of 7-0.

aa. Commissioner Nucci asks Mr. Andersen what the Commission can do to help him out and partner with
Hensel-Phelps
i. Mr. Andersen suggests that they are ready to go to work to protect what is valuable to them
and to the community
ii. Ms. Vaz clarifies that Hensel-Phelps is not going to do anything to change the house without
the Commissions consent but they are allowed to change their property as they would like.
iii. Staff clarifies that changes to the house do need to go through the Commission per the
designation.

bb. The Chair suggests adding a precision to the structural engineering analysis in order to clarify that a full
analysis of the property is not expected

Commissioner Nucci moves to exclude serious priority items b-02 and g-08 and approve serious
priority item a-02 amended to read as follows: vertical load systems: structural engineering
analysis including, but not limited to, analysis of adobe repairs at wall bases. The motion was
seconded by Commissioner Garrison and passed with a vote of 7-0.

cc. Staff states for the record that had there been time to write a full report it would’ve stated the
appreciation and thoroughness of the work that was completed.

4. Review and Possible Action on Previously Adopted Lists of Projects Requiring a Certificate of No Effect or
Certificate of Appropriateness

a. Staff gives brief overview about previous Commission action in June 2010 which approved guidelines
for activities that do not require review by the HPO or HPC
b. Staff is looking for guidance from Commission on whether or not the guidelines previously approved are
still adequate or need updated.
c. Question about requests received in the past
d. Staff clarifies that this is an opportunity to ensure clarity about what needs to be reviewed and what
projects are considered “minor in nature”
e. Commissioner Gregory mentioned she had reached out to the City of Phoenix for information about
their list
f. Commissioner Nucci stated that when this list was adopted in 2010 it was derived from the City of
Phoenix list and the Secretary of the Interior’s standards
g. Chair mentions potential review by a subcommittee
h. Commissioner Ball states that list seems appropriate. Moving forward incorporate at much detail about
cultural resources on the site early on in the project.

Direction to agendize the formation of a subcommittee to review Previously Adopted Lists of
Projects Requiring a Certificate of No Effect or Certificate of Appropriateness
5. Possible Action on Certificate of Appropriateness Review Standards
   Staff seeks feedback as to whether the Commission wishes to adopt a more comprehensive set of standards and guidelines in order to better guide applicants and facilitate consistent, defensible review of proposals

   **Direction to agendize the formation of a subcommittee to review Certificate of Appropriateness Review Standards**

6. Chair / Staff Updates
   a. Staff provides update on the Tempe Streetcar project and the potential alignment along the south side of Rio Salado
      i. Staff mentioned that it has been determined that the south side alignment is no longer an option that is being pursued
   b. Hayden Flour Mill team wishes to present to the HPC in September. Will be seeking approval for Phase 1 in October.
   c. Commission will hold neighborhood meeting for the Hayden Flour Mill THPR nomination in September.
   d. Staff received a report that there was some damage to the plaster at the Eisendrath House. Staff will keep the Commission updated on the condition.
   e. There is a rat infestation at the B.B. Moeur house that the HPO will consult on
   f. Site steward agreement needs to be renewed. Staff will discuss the best way to go about that.
   g. ADOT webinar about their proposal to take over NEPA responsibilities from FHWA
   h. Papago Park Preserve initiative will be discussed at the Council Work Study session in September. There is a survey online for public input until August 27th.
   i. 8th Street Streetscape Archaeology Update – Logan Simpson completed a Class 3 survey and sent it out for consultation
   j. The treatment plan for the Western Canal Multi-Use path is out for consultation
   k. Staff has been working with the City Manager and City Attorney to ensure a significant Historic Property is properly managed

7. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items

   Meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

   Prepared by: City of Tempe Historic Preservation Office

   Andrea Gregory, Chair
Agenda Item 4
HAYDEN FLOUR MILL – PHASE ONE
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission Mtg. – September 12, 2017
SMITHGROUPJJR

Founded 1853
Longest Continuously Running Firm in the U.S.

1,000+ Professionals in Ten Offices

30 Years in Arizona

2015 AIA Firm of the Year
Western Mountain Region

2011 ASLA Firm of the Year
American Society of Landscape Architects

Leader in Sustainability
Arizona's first net-zero-energy office building

Multiple 2016 Arizona Forward Awards
Commitment to Healthier Communities
MacRostie Historic Advisors LLC

National experience with regional offices across the country

For over two decades our professionals have been national leaders in historic tax credit consulting

Completed more than 1,000 federal historic rehabilitation tax credit certification applications

Extensive experience in Historic Mills:

Garver Feed Mill in Madison, WI
The Cigar Factory in Charleston, SC
Chatham Mill in Durham, NC
Cottage Square Apts in Easthampton, MA
LOOKING SE FROM MILL AVE. AND RIO SALADO PKWY.
EXISTING SITE CONDITION
REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Phase One
- Preservation and rehabilitation of Mill Building to accommodate street-level retail/restaurant space and three floors of office space;
- New one-story addition to Mill Building to accommodate restaurant/retail uses along Mill Avenue;
- New one-story addition Mill Building to accommodate an office lobby and back-of-house support space for restaurant/retail uses;
- New outdoor seating patio, including accessory outdoor entertainment, for restaurant patrons and new outdoor lawn along Mill Avenue;
- New trailhead access and service road
- Reuse of existing rail line as pedestrian path
- Associated landscape improvements

Phase Two (requires processing and approval of additional entitlement apps.)
- Preservation and rehabilitation of Grain Elevator and Silos to accommodate future hotel
- New five-story hotel and parking courtyard at northeast corner of site
- New outdoor multi-purpose/entertainment space at northwest corner of site
- Associated landscape improvements
PHASE ONE REQUESTS

1. Approve Zoning Map Amendment to rezone approx. 4.6 acres from Mixed-Use, High-Density (MU-4) to City Center (CC)

2. Approve Amended Planned Area Development (PAD) Overlay to establish site specific development standards

3. Approve Development Plan Review (site and landscape plans and building elevations and materials)

4. Approve Use Permit to allow entertainment, including outdoor entertainment, as an accessory use to a restaurant
MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN
PHASES ONE AND TWO
NEW HOTEL

PHASE ONE IMPROVEMENT AREA

1. EXISTING GRAIN ELEVATOR
2. TRAILHEAD ACCESS & SERVICE RD.
3. NEW SUPPORT SPACE
4. EXISTING MILL BUILDING
5. EXISTING RAIL LINE USED IN PLACE AS NEW PEDESTRIAN PATH
6. NEW OUTDOOR SEATING
7. NEW OUTDOOR SPACE
8. NEW RESTAURANT

PHASE ONE

IMPROVEMENT AREA
MILL AVE. STREET ELEVATION

PHASE ONE
LOOKING NE FROM MILL AVE.

PHASE ONE
LOOKING SE FROM MILL AVE.

PHASE ONE
VIEW FROM MILL AVE. SIDEWALK
PHASE ONE
INTERPRETIVE ELEMENT AT STONE ARCH
PHASE ONE
RAMPS AT SOUTH ENTRY
PHASE ONE
Agenda Item 8
All,

Update for Hayden House below.

Thanks,

Manjula

---

From: Anderson, Harmon C. [mailto:HAnderson@henselphelps.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 4:46 PM
To: john <Southard@tempe.gov>
Cc: Burghardt, Greg L. <GBurghardt@henselphelps.com>; Watson, Mark P. <MWatson@henselphelps.com>; Manjula M. Vaz <mvaz@gblaw.com>
Subject: Hayden House Update for August 2017

John,

I believe you and your group has been in the loop regarding Development activities at the 100 Mill site since Hensel Phelps has taken over the management of HHT, llc. and subsequent departure of DWC from any Ownership in the property. Activities which occurred last month include the completion of the requested HABS report by Motley Design Group led by Robert Graham. Several action items have come from that effort which are being pursued and monitored by our team.

We have received quotes to repair the roof of the Hayden House as described in Mr. Graham’s report as well as several other recommended maintenance activities to ensure the roof drains as well as it can. The roof drains will be cleaned to help prevent standing water, these drains are south of the Warehouse wall. We are awaiting a hard date for the start of those activities on the roof. The stucco repair above the window area should be completed by September 15th as well as a good cleaning of the site to remove accumulated landscape debris. We have approved Robert Graham’s proposal to evaluate the structural condition of the Adobe Walls and expect the physical site activities to be completed by the 15th of September as well.

As the site goes; we have contracted with ON Site Commercial Services to twice monthly clean our property to help improve the appearance and odor around the property. This is the same group that Downtown Tempe uses for their cleaning. Throughout the month of September we will be improving some of the locks and access points to hopefully reduce the opportunity for homeless
hideaways.

Also, as part of our site maintenance we excavated a depression in the parking lot along the north property line. Prior to that exploratory work we contacted Deil Lundin with Aztec TYPSA Group to Archaeologically monitor the activities as noted in our monitoring plan. As I believe you have heard they encountered an old foundation along with timber framing. This would explain the subsidence of the asphalt. Their report is forthcoming as of this date; we will distribute to you and your office as we receive the information.

Related to the project, our group has reviewed the proposed Streetcar Agreement for adjacent property owners and forwarded comments to the City of Tempe. Additionally, as we advance design of the entire project we will be promoting the property to the entertainment, food and beverage groups that are interested in Tempe to help establish a Phase 2 plan that will complement the new development as well as respect the historic elements already identified.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Harmon Anderson
Development Manager
Development Group
420 Sixth Avenue
Greeley, CO 80631
970.346.7225 (O)
970.396.1587 (M)
HAnderson@henselhelps.com
Harmon Anderson  
Development Manager  
Development Group  
Hensel Phelps  
420 Sixth Avenue  
Greeley, CO 80631  

Dear Mr. Anderson,

Using private funds, Hensel Phelps is planning to construct a new facility on a 2.51-acre parcel bounded by Mill Avenue, Rio Salado Parkway, Maple Avenue, and Second Street in Tempe. This privately owned parcel is situated in Township 1 North, Range 4 East, Section 15, Gila and Salt River Base Line and Meridian. The project will involve the demolition of a parking lot and portions of the Monti’s La Casa Vieja restaurant building, relocation of underground utilities, and the construction of buildings with a basement, parking lot, and associated infrastructure. The Charles T. Hayden House, located on the northeast corner of the parcel, is among the most significant historic properties in Tempe, and is listed on the Tempe Historic Property Register and the National Register of Historic Places. An agreement with the City of Tempe requires the presence of an archaeologist on-site during any demolition and excavation activities.

On August 14, 2017, Harmon Anderson, Development Manager for Hensel Phelps, contacted AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. (AZTEC) to arrange for an archaeologist to be on site to monitor limited excavation to investigate the nature of a sinkhole that had appeared under the asphalt at the northern edge of the parking lot located west of the Charles T. Hayden House. The excavation work was conducted on August 18, 2017. Scott Solliday, AZTEC architectural historian/archaeologist, monitored the work according to the previously developed Monitoring and Discovery Plan for the Charles T. Hayden House Project (Macnider 2015). The project scope outlined in this plan entails monitoring for human remains and profiling prehistoric and historic features, as well as addressing the "existence of any extraordinary prehistoric or historic artifacts not funerary in nature" (City of Tempe 2015:5). Such artifacts could be associated with archaeological features, such as prehistoric pithouses or canals and historic foundations or privies.

In 1871 Charles T. Hayden built his first store, a willow-pole and adobe-covered building, on public land west of Tempe Butte and south of the Salt River. A permanent store and house, both built of adobe brick, were constructed in 1873 (Graham and Solliday 2016). He filed his application to the General Land
Office for a Cash Entry purchase of 160 acres in the south 1/2 of the northwest 1/4 and the north 1/2 of the southwest 1/4 of Section 15, Township 1 North, Range 4 East. In 1887 the Tempe Land and Improvement Company bought the bulk of Hayden's land and subdivided it in 1887. At that time the parcel with the store and home was designated Block 66 (and later Block 7). A series of Sanborn Insurance maps show the distribution of buildings on the block changed little through time (Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3). Structures were built along the edges of the block, especially in the northern half. Building foundation may still be present in these locations. Privies and trash pits, features commonly filled with discarded material, would have been dug between the buildings. Historic-period features with abundant artifacts could provide information relating to the early history of Tempe as well as information about Hayden's business. Both prehistoric and historic archaeological resources have been documented near the Charles T. Hayden House parcel. The most relevant of these studies is Archaeology Consulting Services' (ACS) excavations across Mill Avenue at the Hayden Mill site, which was originally developed by Charles T. Hayden in the 1870s. (Stokes and Vargas 2008; Vargas et al. 2008). ACS found both prehistoric and historic features. Only a few prehistoric irrigation-related features were discovered. This suggests that few if any prehistoric remains should be present in the current project area.

On August 18, 2017, a small pit, approximately 7 ft x 11 ft, was excavated by backhoe at the northern edge of the west parking lot, about 120 ft west of the Charles T. Hayden House (Figure 4). At a depth of 2 ft below the surface, the crew began encountering a large amount of wood, including short posts and splintered fragments. This dense concentration of wood fill mixed with silty sand was observed throughout the pit, from a depth of 3.0–6.5 ft (Figure 5). The wood appeared to be deteriorating lumber in a broad range of dimensions. The largest pieces were measured in the field and had the following dimensions (in inches):

- 6.75 x 4.25 x 19
- 5.25 x 4 x 31
- 5.5 x 5.5 x 41
- 6.5 x 6 x 52
- 5.25 x 4.75 x 23.5
- 2.75 x 6 x 54
- 6.5 x 3.75 x 19
- 3.625 x 2.875 x 12

Other artifacts that were observed included a heavy fabric drive belt that may have been associated with the Hayden Flour Mill, and three porcelain fragments.

A feature, a flat concrete floor, was discovered at 6.5 ft below the surface (Figure 6). The floor appeared to be much larger than the dimensions of the excavated pit, as no edge was found. The floor was divided by expansion joints in an irregular rectilinear pattern.
Figure 1. Sanborn-Perris map overlain on a recent aerial photograph to show the location of buildings on Block 66 in 1893.
Figure 2. Sanborn-Perris map overlain on a recent aerial photograph to show the location of buildings on Block 7 (formerly 66) in 1911.
Figure 3. Sanborn-Perris map overlain on a recent aerial photograph to show the location of buildings on Block 7 (formerly 66) in 1927.
Figure 4. Overview of excavation, with the Charles T. Hayden House and the Hayden Flour Mill visible in the background.

Figure 5. Wood posts removed from the excavation site.
Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for 1893 and 1911 (Figure 1, Figure 2), show that the location where the exploratory pit was excavated had been where the original grain warehouse associated with the Hayden Flour Mill was located. The full size of the warehouse in 1893 and 1911 was approximately 60 ft x 120 ft. By 1911 a new grain warehouse had been built south of the Hayden House, and by 1927 (Figure 3) the warehouse west of the Hayden House had been demolished and a small adobe grocery store had been built on the northwest corner of Block 7. The concrete floor would appear to be a part of the grain warehouse. It is not known if the floor was below the existing grade at the time, or if the topography has changed considerably and the site of the warehouse was once slightly downhill from the house. There are many historic photographs of the Charles T. Hayden House, 1870s–1970s, in various archival collections, but no photographs have been found of the area immediately west of the house. A review of the earliest topographical map of the area (U.S. Reclamation Service 1903) (Figure 7) shows that there was some change in elevation from the base of Tempe Butte, which is located just east of the Hayden Flour Mill; however, the contour lines of the map are at 25-ft intervals and it cannot be conclusively determined why the floor is 6.5 ft below the current surface of the Hayden House property. The 1911 Sanborn map (Figure 2) indicates that the warehouse was of wood post construction, further confirming the identification of the feature. No piece of the floor was removed, and closer inspection not possible, but a piece of coarse lime cement with small embedded cobbles was removed during the excavation. This is consistent with late 19th century concrete construction (modern concrete was not perfected until after 1910), and it is likely that this specimen was a part of the wall of the building.
This very limited excavation of the warehouse site has provided important information that may be used for evaluating and revising the monitoring plan that will be implemented during excavation of the whole parcel prior to construction.
If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (602) 458-7482, or by e-mail at ssolliday@aztec.us

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Scott Solliday
Architectural Historian/Archaeologist
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Macnider, Barbara S.

Sanborn-Perris Map Company
1893 Tempe, Arizona.
1911 Tempe, Arizona.
1927 Tempe, Arizona.

Stokes, Robert J., and Victoria D. Vargas

U.S. Reclamation Service

Vargas, Victoria D., Thomas E. Jones, Scott Solliday, and Don W. Ryden
Agenda Item 9
ACTION: Formation of an ad hoc Preservation Standards and Practices tasked with reviewing all City preservation-related documents, standards, guidelines, policies, and practices, identify areas of concern and non-compliance, and suggested needed changes to current operating procedures as deemed necessary.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff – Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Section 14A-6 of the City historic preservation ordinance, titled “Guidelines, standards and process for review of alteration or new construction,” addresses processing of applications for “a building permit or other permit or approval… 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.” Per the ordinance, “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 [Historic Preservation Officer].” (§14A-6(a)) In 2010, the Historic Preservation Office and Historic Preservation Commission provided clarification as to what proposals qualify as “work obviously minor in nature” and work “of no effect to the property or district.” At the June 10, 2010 monthly meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission approved two documents formalizing its policy regarding work eligible for Historic Preservation Officer review and work not requiring review by either the Office or the Commission. Those documents, titled “Projects Eligible for Certificates of No Effect” and “Building Permit Activities That Do Not Require HPO Review,” respectively, are available to applicants on the Tempe Historic Preservation Office webpage. In July of 2010, the Commission approved the “Certificate of Appropriateness Application” for use with projects not included in the policy documents adopted the month prior. The Commission discussed the adequacy of said documents at the August 8, 2017 monthly meeting.

Following discussion of the above documents at the August 2017 meeting, the Commission directed staff to agendize formation of a subcommittee tasked with reviewing existing standards and guidelines and suggested revisions as needed. Subsequent to the August meeting, Chair Gregory directed staff to expand the proposed subcommittee scope of work to include review of all City preservation-related documents, standards, guidelines, policies, and practices. This broadened scope of work encompassing all City historic preservation and cultural resource management standards and practices will allow the subcommittee to evaluate current City preservation strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The subcommittee will present findings and suggestions to the Commission for consideration on an as-needed basis.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I move that we create an ad hoc Preservation Standards and Practices subcommittee to review all City preservation-related documents, standards, guidelines, policies, and practices, identify areas of concern and non-compliance, make suggestions relating to how the City can fulfill its varied preservation-related obligations, offer recommendations as to how to improve process efficiency and reduce the occurrence of non-compliant actions, and craft standards, guidelines, and other necessary standards and practices-related documents as needed for further consideration. Subcommittee members are to be [INSERT NAMES OF PROPOSED SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS].

ATTACHMENT(S): “City of Tempe Boards and Commissions Requirements and Guidelines for Subcommittees”

STAFF CONTACT(S): John Larsen Southard, Historic Preservation Officer (480) 350-8870
City of Tempe Boards and Commissions
Requirements and Guidelines for Subcommittees

Ordinance No. 2012.35 was adopted by City Council on August 9, 2012. The ordinance provides the authorization to City of Tempe Boards and Commissions to create subcommittees under the following conditions:

- Subcommittees shall only be created upon written notice to the City Council.
- Written notice shall state in detail the purpose of the subcommittee, the members of the board or commission who will comprise its membership, the reasons why the subcommittee will advance the purpose of the board or commission more effectively than a meeting of the full board or commission and anticipated staffing needs and resources.
- All subcommittees shall sunset within one (1) year of the date of creation. Subcommittees may be terminated by the City Council at any time in its sole discretion.
- All members of subcommittees must be current members of the board or commission that requested its creation.
- No board or commission may have more than two (2) active subcommittees in existence at the same time.
- Subcommittees must meet all requirements of state law, the Tempe City Charter and Tempe City Code.

Subcommittees must follow all requirements of the Arizona Open Meeting Law (OML). The following information provides OML requirements and guidelines to assist with holding subcommittee meetings:

- Meeting notices and agendas must be posted at least 24-hours in advance on the City's website and the City's official posting board located on the Garden Level of City Hall.
- Subcommittee meetings must be held in public places in locations with adequate space and public access and that meet ADA requirements for public meetings.
- If possible, meetings should be held before or after Board and Commission meetings for time savings and cost efficiencies.
- A quorum of the subcommittee is required for the meeting to be held. If the subcommittee consists of 5 members, then 3 members must be present to conduct business. If 3 members are not present, the subcommittee meeting cannot be held.
- Draft meeting minutes must be posted to the City's website within three business days after the subcommittee meeting.
- Approved meeting minutes must be posted to the City's website within two business days after approval.
- Approved meeting minutes must be forwarded to the City Clerk's Office for inclusion on a Formal City Council Meeting agenda for “acceptance” by the City Council as required by the City Council Rules of Procedure.
City of Tempe Boards and Commissions
Notification to City Council for Creation of a Subcommittee
Pursuant to Ordinance 2012.35 (adopted August 9, 2012; effective September 8, 2012)

Name of Board/Commission: ____________________________

Name of Subcommittee: ____________________________

Purpose of Subcommittee: ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Names of Subcommittee Members: ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Members required for a quorum: _________
(Quorum is required to hold a subcommittee meeting)

Creation date: ____________________________

Sunset date: ____________________________
(When intended purpose has been met or within one year of creation, whichever is less)

Name of Staff Liaison and Contact Information: ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Anticipated Additional Resources Required: ____________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Board and Commission Chairperson ____________________________ Date ____________

08/28/2012