HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
January 9th, 2019
Hatton Hall at the Governor Benjamin B. Moeur House Campus
34 E 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. Request for a one-year extension of an approved Certificate of Appropriateness for requested zoning map amendment, amended planned area development overlay, development plan review, and use permit for HAYDEN FLOUR MILL – PHASE ONE, located at 119 South Mill Avenue. The applicant is Iconic Mill, LLC. (PL107218)

3. Tempe / Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study Presentation

4. Urban Core Master Plan Presentation

5. Chair / Staff Updates

6. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
   • Member Announcements
   • Staff Announcements

Adjourn

For further information on the above agenda items, contact Community Development, (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
MEMORANDUM

TO: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
DATE: January 9th, 2019

SUBJECT: Agenda Item 2 – Request for Extension of Hayden Flour Mill Phase One Certificate of Appropriateness

The Historic Preservation Commission conditionally approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for phase one work at the Hayden Flour Mill on October 10th, 2017. Per §14A-6(e) of the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance, such approvals “shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval.” As many of the Certificate of Appropriateness conditions of approval called for National Park Service approval of a Part 2 application for proposed phase one work, the applicant required time to prepare and submit the documentation necessary to secure a Part 2 approval. The National Park Service conditionally approved the Part 2 for phase one work on August 7th, 2018.

The applicant has continued to demonstrate progress since that time, although phase one construction activities have not yet commenced. In order to maintain a valid Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed phase one work, the applicant has requested a one-year extension of the October 10th, 2017 Certificate of Appropriateness approval. Staff recommends Historic Preservation Commission approval of the request.

ATTACHMENTS:

A) October 10th, 2017 - Hayden Flour Mill Phase One Certificate of Appropriateness

B) August 7th, 2018 Part 2 Conditional Approval Documentation
Attachment A
REVISED – SEE HIGHLIGHTED AREAS ON PAGES 5, 6, 7, 14, AND 17

ACTION: Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for requested zoning map amendment, amended planned area development overlay, development plan review, and use permit for HAYDEN FLOUR MILL – PHASE ONE, located at 119 South Mill Avenue. The applicant is Iconic Mill, LLC.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve, subject to conditions

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: HAYDEN FLOUR MILL – PHASE ONE (PL170218) Rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the 1918 mill building at the Hayden Flour Mill site. The request includes the following:

1. Zoning Map Amendment to rezone +/- 4.6 acres to the CC zoning district
2. Amended Planned Area Development Overlay to establish development standards
3. Development Plan Review (site and landscape plans and building elevations and materials)
4. Use Permit for accessory entertainment, including outdoor entertainment, to a restaurant

Existing Property Owner: City of Tempe
Applicant: Iconic Mill, LLC
Gross / Net site area: 5.08 acres
Tempe Hist. Prop. Reg. Status: Designated¹
National Register Status: Eligible²


STAFF CONTACT(S): John Larsen Southard, Historic Preservation Officer (480) 350-8870

Department Director: Chad Weaver, Community Development Director
Legal review by: N/A
Prepared by: John Larsen Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
COMMENTS

This site is located on the northeast corner of Mill Avenue and Rio Salado Parkway.

Staff evaluation of the Certificate of Appropriateness request primarily employed the May 2017 Secretary’s Standards and research and recommendations found in the three-volume Archaeological Consulting Services report titled “Hayden Flour Mill: Landscape, Economy, and Community Diversity in Tempe, Arizona” as guidance when analyzing the proposal.

This Certificate of Appropriateness request includes consideration of the following:

1. Zoning Map Amendment to rezone +/- 4.6 acres to the CC zoning district
2. Amended Planned Area Development Overlay to establish development standards
3. Development Plan Review (site and landscape plans and building elevations and materials)
4. Use Permit for accessory entertainment, including outdoor entertainment, to a restaurant

The applicant is requesting the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for items one through four listed above.

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

Applicant has been coordinating proposal with the Tempe Historic Preservation Office, in addition to the State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service, for approximately two years. Substantive revisions made in response to feedback received from the Tempe Historic Preservation Office include:

- Eliminating proposed disturbance beyond the 1,180’ contour of Tempe (Hayden) Butte
- Retention of a clear line-of-sight to Tempe (Hayden) Butte from the 2nd Street alignment

PUBLIC INPUT

- Neighborhood meeting required
- Neighborhood meeting held: July 20, 2017 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 East 7th Street.
- See attached summary of meeting provided by the applicant (attachment 1F).
- Historic Preservation Office staff attended the meeting.
HISTORIC OVERVIEW

The Hayden Flour Mill is the oldest cast-in-place, reinforced concrete building in Tempe. The mill is significant as the longest continuously used industrial site in the Salt River Valley, for its association with the Charles Trumbull Hayden family, who founded and operated the mill for three generations, and as the most important community industry through the settlement and development periods of early Tempe history. The Hayden Flour Mill is significant as the oldest cast in place reinforced concrete building in Tempe and provides an excellent example of the daylight construction method. The Hayden Mills Silos is a landmark structure providing many with a tangible connection to community history by recalling the founding of the Tempe settlement.

The daylight-construction method used at the mill developed in response to the propensity of mill facilities everywhere to spontaneously combust. Before building codes existed, insurance companies underwriting various milling industries insisted their policy holders take steps to reduce the risks of explosion and fire inherent in milling. The daylight-construction method improved mill safety by specifying a high ratio of window to wall area along with large, unobstructed, structural bays to facilitate cross ventilation.

The existing mill began operations on July 10, 1918, and was built by prominent valley concrete contractor, J. C. Steele. Constructed of cast-in-place concrete post, beam and integral slab construction, the structure is the largest known construction effort in Steele’s career, and an excellent example of the daylight construction technique.

Association with events significant to broad patterns of history:

From the start of operations in 1874, the Hayden mill became one of the most widely known institutions in the Arizona Territory. In early territorial days the product of this mill was carried in freight wagons and by pack-trains to most of the mining camps and military posts in the Territory and its output was estimated in millions of dollars. Army and government contracts running into hundreds of thousands of dollars were filled from this mill and Hayden Flour was known in every town and mining camp in Arizona. The mill, along with Hayden’s store, warehouses, blacksmith shop, and ferry, became the trade center for the south side of the Salt River Valley.

For 50 years this location was the site of water-powered grain milling. A contract for electrification of the mill was approved by the Board of Governors of the Salt River Project Water Users Association on Thursday, June 7, 1923. On February 6, 1924, SRP began installing a 11,000 volt electric line along First Street at the Tempe Milling Company's plant to replace the water power which had operated the mill for half a century.

The Hayden Flour Mill was the larger of two such mills that existed in the state in 1981, when Bay State Milling took over operations and expanded production capacity. Bay State withdrew from retailing, becoming a "destination miller" to provide specially milled flour direct to wholesale bakers. The 4000-100 weight capacity pneumatically operated mill remained an important component of the local economy up until April 1, 1998, when Bay State Milling stopped operations.

Association with lives of persons significant in our past:

Charles Trumbull Hayden (1825-1900) is generally credited with being the founder of Tempe. He was the first to establish commerce and industry in the area, which made permanent settlement possible. When Hayden heard that settlers were building a canal on the south side of the Salt River, he brought his wagons up from Tucson and offered much needed tools and supplies for the workers. On November 17, 1870, he gave notice of the formation of the Hayden Milling and Farming Ditch
Company, and recorded his claim to portions of Section 15, stating work had begun on the project.

On December 6, 1870, the Hardy Irrigating Canal Company was formed by Swilling and others to provide water for other farming ventures south of the river, which by their prosperity would come to ensure the success of Hayden’s flouring mill operation. This company was quickly reorganized as the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company, which, when meeting on April 28, 1871, shareholder Jack Swilling moved to grant 2,000 inches of water or 17 shares stock to anyone building a grist mill. Hayden accepted and began his preparations for construction of a flour mill to be powered by an extension of the Kirkland McKinney Ditch. In 1872 he opened a store and laid the foundation for a flour mill. A canal was extended along the base of Tempe Butte to bring water to the mill to turn the grind stones.

On May 30, 1874, the Tucson newspaper, Arizona Citizen, reported “Judge Hayden has completed a flouring mill at his ferry on Salt River”.

Charles Trumbull Hayden was involved in the development of the community in many ways. He was a director of the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company, a member of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors from 1880 to 1882, a trustee of Tempe School District No. 3 in 1884, and president of the Territorial Normal School Board of Education from 1885 to 1888. Charles Hayden married Sallie Calvert Davis in Nevada City, California, on October 4, 1876. They had one son, Carl Trumbull Hayden, who would later serve as Arizona’s longtime Congressman and Senator, and three daughters; Sally, Anna, and Mary.

In 1918 a three and four-story rectangular brick and reinforced concrete structure measuring 40 feet by 140 feet was built in 1918 by prominent valley concrete contractor, J. C. Steele. Constructed of cast-in-place concrete post, beam and integral slab construction, the structure is the largest known construction effort in Steele’s career. The exterior walls have discrete awning window and large freight door openings. The marks of the six-inch wide rough-sawn boards used as wall forms are clearly evident. Roofs are flat with minimal parapets in multiple levels. The tallest 5 level section at the north is considered the “grain elevator”, the middle 4 level section the “mill”, and the 3 level section at the south was used as the “grain-bin” and for offices at ground level.

In 1951 a concrete grain elevator with seven silos was added to the site by the Mayer-Osborn Company of Denver Colorado. The silos added 18 million pounds of grain storage capacity and took eleven days to construct, pouring cement in slip-forms continuously around the clock. The grain
elevator at the south is 150 feet high and the silos, paired 15 foot diameter cylinders, are 117 feet high. A basement level where grain is collected and conveyed by tunnel is located under the main portion of the complex which is oriented slightly off the north-south axis in response to the railroad spur between the silos and the mill. The silos structure is the iconographic landmark of Downtown Tempe – widely recognized as the hallmark of Mill Avenue uniquely identifying the heart of our community.

In 1966 two additions were constructed on the top levels of the mill building. These additions are distinguishable by their sloping floors that were originally the mill roof. Constructed of 8-4-16 concrete block walls with wood-frame roofs, these additions can be visually identified from Mill Avenue by the projection of the original roof overhangs extending below. In 1966 permit applications were filed separately for these additions, at which time it is believed that a tower dating from 1918 was removed at level 5 on the north.

Likely to yield information important in prehistory or history:

The mill exists in an area known to be archaeologically sensitive and within known site boundaries. Despite extensive past archaeological remediation, some portions of the property may still contain buried cultural remains associated with the Hohokam and historic periods.

**PROJECT ANALYSIS**

Iconic Mill, LLC, a partnership of Baum Revision and Aparium Hotel Group, seeks to rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the Hayden Flour Mill property located at 119 South Mill Avenue. Per the development agreement, the applicant is obligated to process proposed changes as if the property is listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register. As such, a Certificate of No Effect or Certificate of Appropriateness for all proposed work is required prior to the issuance of any other City approvals or permits. The applicant is pursuing a 20% Federal historic rehabilitation tax credit. As specified by the Tempe historic preservation ordinance, projects with a Federal nexus such as pursuit of a Federal tax credit must be evaluated using the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (“Standards”). The findings presented in this report have been determined by using the May 2017 revised edition of the Standards as the basis of evaluation. **The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings (2017)**, the revised edition of the Standards used as a reference point for this report, may be found online at [https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf](https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf). In addition to the Standards, some project elements have been evaluated using Standards-derived recommendations found in the three-volume Archaeological Consulting Services report titled “Hayden Flour Mill: Landscape, Economy, and Community Diversity in Tempe, Arizona” (“Report”). When consistent with the revised Standards, the recommendations presented in that report are used as the guideline for determining appropriateness. Per the Standards, the overarching goal of rehabilitation is “making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.”

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are as follows:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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.8

The subject property presents challenges relating to parcel size and shape and boasts a complex prehistory and history that requires consideration of many contexts and recognition of the dynamism associated with an industrial setting over the course of more than a century. In addition, the presence of historically significant buildings and subsurface resources and the site’s location at the foot of Tempe (Hayden) Butte, a Tempe Historic Property Register and National Register-listed property identified as a Traditional Cultural Property by the Four Southern Tribes, further complicates planning efforts. Applicant will proceed with a phased work plan. Phase one of that plan, which is currently up for consideration, includes the area outlined on sheet L2.4 (“RENDERED SITE PLAN”). The planned phase two work area is also identified on that sheet. Phase two plans are to be submitted independent of the phase one plan and, per the development agreement, will also require HPC review and approval. Per the approved National Park Service Part 1 application, the period of significance for all phases of work is 1918-1966.

In addition to processing proposed changes as if the property were listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register and seeking State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service plan approval in order to receive Federal historic rehabilitation tax credits, the applicant is required to pursue Tempe Historic Property Register and National Register listing for the property and provide façade and airspace conservation easements for the mill and silos. Further protections include ongoing City ownership of the property without the option of transfer. The applicant is proceeding under the terms of a ninety-nine year lease with the City.

Overall, the phase one submittal is a sensitive proposal that allows for adaptive reuse of an historic resource in a manner that appears to be consistent with the Standards and is in keeping with the
recommendations spelled out in volume three of the Report. The planned usage is “a new use that requires minimal change to [the mill’s] distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships,” as required by Standard one. The proposal retains and preserves the historic character of the mill without removing distinctive elements, as dictated by Standard two. Upon completion of phase one work, the mill building will stand as “a physical record of its time, place and use,” in keeping with Standard three. Per Standard four, the proposal does not call for alteration of “changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right.” Standard five calls for preservation of distinctive materials, techniques, and craftsmanship, which this plan does accomplish. Standard six speaks to deteriorated and missing features. While the proposal does not provide the level of detail needed to determine compliance with Standard six, suggested conditions of approval address this Standard. The same is true of Standard seven, which deals with chemical or physical treatments, and the archaeological mitigation requirements outlined in Standard eight. The proposal appears to comply with the terms for new additions and exterior alterations found in Standards nine and ten. The Part 2 tax credit application has not yet been submitted, so a National Park Service determination as to adherence with the Standards is not available. As such, some elements of the proposal are recommended for conditional approval contingent upon National Park Service concurrence with their appropriateness. Other elements of the project are not yet finalized, resulting in a staff recommendation of conditional approval contingent upon returning to the Historic Preservation Officer or Historic Preservation Commission for action on said elements prior to initiating construction.

**MILL BUILDING EXTERIOR**

Proposed treatment of the mill building exterior appears to be consistent with the Standards and is in keeping with the recommendations spelled out in volume three of the Report. Upon completion of work, building massing, door and window openings, and historic character will be retained. Proposed additions to the mill building are designed to minimize impact to historic fabric, present a compatible yet distinct appearance, and retain significant spatial relationships. Specific components of the proposal related to the mill building exterior are discussed below.

**ADDITIONS**

**WEST ADDITION**

The phase one proposal calls for construction of a glass and steel addition on the footprint of the ca. 1915-1917 Grain Warehouse. This Grain Warehouse stood for the entire period of significance, eventually suffering a partial collapse in the mid-1980s that destroyed the roof and toppled the south and west walls. The north and east walls were demolished in 2002.

Per the Standards, the practice of rehabilitation “allows expanding a historic building by enlarging it with an addition.” The Standards specify that “additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building, its site, and setting are not negatively impacted. Generally, a new addition should be subordinate to the historic building. A new addition should be compatible, but differentiated enough so that it is not confused as historic or original to the building.” Further, “additions and related new construction that meet the Standards can be any architectural style—traditional, contemporary, or a simplified version of the historic building. However, there must be a balance between differentiation and compatibility to maintain the historic character and the identity of the building being enlarged.” Guidelines for additions may be found on pages 156-162 of the Standards.

Hayden Flour Mill-specific recommendations relating to additions can be found in volume three of the Report. Of note, additions should not be “larger than the missing historic buildings,” should “[respect] the location, massing, size, and scale of the missing features,” should “[leave] the primary façades visible as they were at the height of development during the Historic period of significance,” and be
designed to minimize the “area of surface connection of new to old… to preserve as much of the historic fabric as possible.” The Report also mandates, “… open space at the southwest corner of the Mill Building must be left clear of new additions to respect and preserve the historic entrance to the building and to the site.” The proposed west addition is in conformance with the Standards and the recommendations found in the Report. As such, it is appropriate and warrants unconditional approval.

EAST ADDITION

A four-story addition is proposed for the east side of the mill building, approximating the footprint of the 1945 Wooden Addition. The Wooden Addition was heavily damaged in a 2002 fire and was subsequently demolished in an effort to mitigate safety concerns. Per the Report, the Wooden Addition “was constructed over the Hayden Canal on concrete piers, some of which were original supports for the old Sack Storage Building.” The report identified the east elevation of the mill building as a tertiary façade.

Per the Standards, the practice of rehabilitation “allows expanding a historic building by enlarging it with an addition.” The Standards specify that “additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building, its site, and setting are not negatively impacted. Generally, a new addition should be subordinate to the historic building. A new addition should be compatible, but differentiated enough so that it is not confused as historic or original to the building.” Further, “additions and related new construction that meet the Standards can be any architectural style—traditional, contemporary, or a simplified version of the historic building. However, there must be a balance between differentiation and compatibility to maintain the historic character and the identity of the building being enlarged.” The Standards state locating “an addition on the rear or on another secondary elevation helps to ensure that it will be subordinate to the historic building.”

The Report echoes this in suggesting that the “… most freedom for addition to the mill is found on the tertiary east façade” and specifying that “additions should not be “larger than the missing historic buildings,” and should “[respect] the location, massing, size, and scale of the missing features.”

Guidelines for additions may be found on pages 156-162 of the Standards.

The portion of the proposed east addition located above the concrete piers and below the horizontal plane of the southern mill building roof is in conformance with the Standards and the recommendations found in the Report. As such, it is appropriate and warrants unconditional approval. Further consideration of the portion of the proposed east addition extending below the concrete piers and rising above the horizontal plane of the southern mill building roof follows.

The phase one submittal does not provide detailed information as to the fate of the concrete piers that supported the old Sack Storage Building and, when combined with additional piers constructed in the mid-1940s, later served as the foundation of the 1945 Wooden Addition. While the Report identifies the east elevation of the mill building as a tertiary façade, it does note that “archaeological resources and significant surface features” present in that area “must be integrated into the adaptive reuse design.” Specifically, “the foundations of now-missing additions must be considered in the new rehabilitation plans.” This guidance is consistent with Standards one (minimal change), two (avoiding alteration of features), eight (archaeological resources protected and preserved), nine (new additions will not destroy historic materials), and ten (future removal of new additions should not impair form and integrity of the historic property). Additional information is needed before a prudent decision can be made regarding the future of the concrete piers. A suggested condition of approval addresses this matter.

The portion of the proposed east addition rising above the horizontal plane of the southern mill building roof appears to conform with the Standards and is consistent with recommendations found in the Report, including one safeguarding visibility of the painted signage on the silos. That recommendation reads, “the signage on the face of silos… should be unobstructed by additions… atop the Mill Building.
in the foreground.” The Tempe Historic Preservation Office believes this portion of the proposed east addition to be appropriate based upon the Standards, recommendations included in the Report, and the historic research showing the Wooden Addition included a floor that rose above the horizontal plane of the southern mill building roof. The Wooden Addition floor did not breach the vertical plane of the mill building’s east wall.

Notably, the Report recommends that a two-story rooftop addition to the mill building “must recede at least to the plane of the free-standing interior columns revealing the front one-third of the roof.” Presumably, a one-story addition would merit a less substantial setback in the mind of the Report author. Either way, the proposed rooftop addition extending above the horizontal plane of the southern portion of the mill building roof is acceptable when judged by the recommendation found in the Report and when narrowly evaluated against the one full bay setback metric presented as a “Recommended” strategy in the Standards. Broader examination of the matter raises questions as to the appropriateness of the proposed rooftop addition extending above the horizontal plane of the southern portion of the mill building roof.

The “Recommended” strategy in the Standards speaks to not only the primary elevation of a building, but also “other highly-visible elevations” and the visibility of a rooftop addition “when viewed from surrounding streets.” Preservation Brief 14, titled “New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns” (https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/preservedocs/preservation-briefs/14Preserve-Brief-Additions.pdf), reinforces the idea of evaluating a proposed rooftop addition using multiple views (“Brief 14”). Brief 14 lists several methods for evaluating the impact of proposed rooftop additions, including sight line diagrams, three-dimensional schematics, digital depictions, and “a rough, temporary, full-size or skeletal mock up of a portion of the proposed addition, which can then be photographed and evaluated from critical vantage points on surrounding streets.” Brief 14 depicts a sight-line study as evaluating the visibility of a possible rooftop addition from points across the street from the subject property. This test, acknowledged as one that “can be very restrictive and [not capable of illustrating] the full effect of an addition from other public rights of way,” allows for a greater understanding of potential impact than the test shown in image one of Sheet A 5.2 of the applicant’s submittal. Image one, titled “SIGHT LINE FROM SIDEWALK TO ROOFTOP ADDITION,” shows the sight line from the east side of Mill Avenue, as opposed to the across-the-street study shown in Brief 14. The Report’s evaluation of “the rooftops of the Mill Building and Silos... as facades because of their visibility from atop Hayden Butte (and also from airplanes in low-altitude landing approach to Sky Harbor)” further complicates consideration of the proposed rooftop addition. The numerous points of visibility encountered when evaluating the Hayden Flour Mill property presents challenges less likely to be faced by developers of more traditionally located downtown buildings. Per Brief 14, “a rooftop addition in a densely-built urban area is more likely to be compatible on a building that is adjacent to similarly-sized or taller buildings.” Given recent concerns expressed by the National Park Service relating to relatively minor rooftop changes proposed for the Professional Building in Phoenix, it is possible that the portion of the proposed east addition rising above the horizontal plane of the southern mill building roof will require revision in order to gain Part 2 approval. Accordingly, a suggested condition of approval addressing the rooftop addition is included.

EAST STAIRWELL / INTERPRETIVE AREA

The proposal includes a planned stairwell and interpretive area in the location of the recently-demolished Cribbed Wood Structures. The report identified the circa 1927-1948 Cribbed Wood Structures as “significant and rare (perhaps unique) surviving features of the milling process that should be preserved and integrated into the adaptive-use.” However, safety concerns necessitated the demolition of the Cribbed Wood Structures in early 2017 following consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service. Per the report, “their loss must be mitigated in a significant manner of architectural expression and historic interpretation.” A thorough pre-demolition documentation report prepared by Michael Wilson Kelly will assist the project team in
executing this task. The proposed stair enclosure shown in Sheets A 5.1 and A 5.2 references the verticality and construction method of the Cribbed Wood Structures while remaining distinct enough to not convey a false sense of history. The proposed stair enclosure follows Standards guidance stating, “additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building, its site, and setting are not negatively impacted. Generally, a new addition should be subordinate to the historic building. A new addition should be compatible, but differentiated enough so that it is not confused as historic or original to the building.” It also complies with Report suggestions regarding additions not being “larger than the missing historic buildings,” should “[respect] the location, massing, size, and scale of the missing features,” should “[leave] the primary façades visible as they were at the height of development during the Historic period of significance,” and be designed to minimize the “area of surface connection of new to old… to preserve as much of the historic fabric as possible.”

The proposed stairwell is in conformance with the Standards and the recommendations found in the Report. As such, it is appropriate and warrants unconditional approval. The interpretive area and associated features will be addressed at a later point.

**RETENTION OF HISTORIC ERA CMU ADDITIONS TO MILL BUILDING**

The Report examined the property through the lens of a period of significance ending at 1960, six years prior to the 1966 period of significance end date approved in the Part 1 application. As such, recommendations crafted employing the earlier end date must be reevaluated. One such recommendation is the “removal of post-historic concrete block room additions.” However, as documented in the Report, these features were added within the expanded period of significance. Accordingly, retention of the concrete block room additions atop the mill building is appropriate and prudent from a tax act standpoint. The proposal calls for retention of the CMU additions and is therefore in conformance with the Standards. Staff recommends unconditional approval of this aspect of the project.

**EXTERIOR DOORS AND WINDOWS**

Pages 102-109 of the Standards detail recommended treatments for windows in a rehabilitation project. Per the Report, “the large, operable steel windows of the Mill Building are highly significant for their association with the progressive concept of ‘day-lighting’ and ‘ventilating’ Mill Buildings.” Unfortunately, “very few of the original steel windows and none of the doors have survived.” As such, “the restoration of the 1918 windows is very important. The steel windows of the subsequent remodeling projects may be removed and replaced with new models of steel windows that match the pattern of the 1918 windows as shown in historic photographs or are implied by physical evidence. Original window openings that have been partially or wholly in-filled must be restored to their historic dimensions.”

The Report identifies the absence of historic exterior doors and specifies, “missing doors must be replaced either with new doors of the historic types, or replaced with new doors that are compatible with the character of the historic patterns.”

The proposal includes retention of all historic door and window openings, including reopening infilled openings. The applicant also proposes replacing an awning in place over the main mill building entrance door from at least 1920 through at least 1947. This strategy is generally compliant with the Standards and recommendations included in the Report. However, specific details regarding door, window, and awning products selected for use preclude an unconditional recommendation of approval. Accordingly, a suggested condition of approval addressing exterior doors, windows, and awnings is included.
EXTERIOR COATINGS

Pages 80-87 of the Standards address recommended masonry treatments. The Report provides site-specific recommendations regarding the finish of exterior walls. Per the Report, the exterior walls of the mill building are “symbolic of the sanitary conditions of the milling process,” and their “smooth finish… is an important character-defining feature of the building exterior.” The Report identifies “the post-historic stucco veneer on the Mill Building” as “an improper repair of the deteriorating surfaces of the original skim-coated concrete walls.” The Report suggests removal of the stucco coat, after which, “the skim-coat finish of the concrete walls must be restored.” Further, “the preparation of concrete surfaces and selection of the appropriate paint system must be specified with great care.”

Paint considerations extend beyond color and finish to preservation of the ghost signage present on the mill building. Per the Report, “the identifying and advertising ‘ghost signs’ are “of high significance” and “either must be preserved in their faded condition or restored to their original condition.”

The applicant addresses the exterior finish on Sheet A 3.4, among other pages. Language regarding exterior finish treatment reads as follows: “Existing building to be cleaned/painted while maintaining ghost signage. Final treatment to be coordinated with SHPO, HPC and NPS.” However, specific details regarding finish material(s), paint colors, cleaning and preparation methods, ghost signage preservation strategies, and specific products selected for use preclude an unconditional recommendation of approval. Accordingly, a suggested condition of approval addressing exterior finishes is included.

MILL BUILDING INTERIOR

Proposed treatment of the mill building interior appears to be largely consistent with the Standards and is generally in keeping with the recommendations found in volume three of the Report. Specific components of the proposal related to the mill building interior are discussed below.

FLOOR PLAN

Guidelines for the treatment of interior spaces can be found in pages 124-136 of the Standards. The Standards call out alteration of “a floor plan, or interior spaces (including individual rooms), features, and finishes, which are important in defining the overall historic character” resulting in diminished character as a “Not Recommended” practice. The proposal appears to be largely consistent with both the Standards and the recommendations found in the Report. Proposed removal of the “existing added CMU walls” on the second and third floors, as shown on Sheets A 2.2 and A 2.3, is unlikely to be viewed as an alteration to an interior space deemed “important in defining the overall historic character.” However, the CMU walls were likely erected during the expanded period of significance, which raises concerns as to the advisability of removal. As the Part 2 tax credit application has not yet been submitted, a National Park Service determination as to whether removal of the CMU walls adheres to the Standards is not available. As such, this element of the proposal is recommended for conditional approval contingent upon National Park Service concurrence with its appropriateness.

INTERIOR DOORS

The Report identifies the remaining rolling fire doors as items to be preserved in place. This treatment is consistent with the Standards and is included in the phase one proposal. Staff recommends unconditional approval of this aspect of the project.

The proposal lacks specific details regarding interior door product selection. This omission precludes a recommendation of approval for interior doors other than the fire doors mentioned above. Accordingly, a suggested condition of approval addressing interior doors is included.
FLOORS

Floor treatment guidelines can be found in pages 121-124 of the Standards and page 95 of volume three of the Report. The proposal appears to address floor treatments in a manner consistent with the Standards and recommendations found in the Report. Of note, the plans do not call for removal of the historic wood floors found in the eastern half of the upper floors. Some alteration to floor surfaces in the northernmost rooms of the mill building is proposed. Should this detail present Part 2-related concerns, staff believes it to be a question involving an alteration “obviously minor in nature” that could be resolved administratively. Given the ability to resolve any potential revisions via a Certificate of No Effect, staff recommends unconditional approval of this aspect of the project.

STAIRWELL

Standards two, three, nine, and ten can be applied to the 1918 stairwell located near the center portion of the west side of the mill building. Per the Report, this stairwell is classified as a “Should Preserve” feature, albeit one unlikely to meet modern safety requirements. As such, the Report suggests this feature could be employed as “secondary stairs of convenience.” This recommendation is consistent with encouragement in the Standards to explore “an alternative approach to meeting codes that will be less damaging to the historic building.” Retention of the 1918 stairwell is the outcome preferred by staff. However, life safety issues must be considered. A National Park Service determination as to whether removal of the stairwell adheres to the Standards will serve as valuable guidance when deciding the disposition of the historic stairwell. As such, this element of the proposal is recommended for conditional approval contingent upon the National Park Service Part 2 response concurring with its appropriateness.

Per the Report, upper-floors stairwell located in the northeast corner of the mill building is an “historic modification of the original building” that “has less significance than the concrete stairs” and can “be documented, removed, and replaced with complying stairs for use as part of the required exit system.” The manlift located on the west side of the mill building interior is to be preserved in place.

ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH WATER-POWERED OPERATIONS

The milling operation was powered by water until the facility transitioned to electrically-powered processing in 1924. The Report recommends retention of all elements associated with the water-powered period of operation. The proposal does not include removal of any such elements. As such, staff supports this aspect of the project. Any proposal to alter or remove elements associated with the water-powered period of operations would require Historic Preservation Commission approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

MILLING EQUIPMENT

The Report identifies equipment recommended for preservation and / or interpretation in tables 35.1 and 35.2 of volume three. The submittal does not provide a detailed plan outlining the disposition of equipment currently located in the mill building. A suggested condition requiring administrative review of items in the abovementioned tables is included.

SITE IMPROVEMENTS

LANDSCAPING

Pages 137-142 of the Standards address improvements and alterations to the building site.
The subject property was almost entirely devoid of vegetation during its period of significance. Prior to its utilization as an industrial site, the property is likely to have been host to numerous species of Sonoran Desert flora. The Standards recommend against “adding conjectural landscape features to [a] site (such as period reproduction light fixtures, fences, fountains, or vegetation) that are historically inappropriate, thereby creating an inaccurate appearance of the site.” However, given the flexibility inherent in an adaptive reuse rehabilitation project, municipal landscape requirements are unlikely to raise concerns. Indeed, landscaping requirements provide an opportunity to speak to site’s pre-development environment through use of native Sonoran Desert flora and culturally appropriate plant species. The proposal employs a sensitive plant palette that both reflects the surrounding environment and avoids conveying a false sense of history. On a related note, the proposal calls for rainwater to be retained onsite. This nod to the prehistoric and historic significance of water at and near the project site can be used to underscore the special adaptations Sonoran Desert flora developed in response to their arid native environment. Staff recommends unconditional approval of this aspect of the project.

**INTERPRETIVE FEATURES / TRAILHEAD**

The development agreement requires the applicant to construct public amenities including “Permanent Exhibits and Installations demonstrating the ancient and historic context of the site and remaining structures” and specifies that these “Exhibits and Installations shall either be open to the public for interaction or visibly available by the public.” The Agreement also obligates the developer to provide a “Path and Trailhead at the base of Hayden Butte to be constructed with a Second Street alignment” and a “code compliant pedestrian path and amenities from Mill Avenue to the trailhead.” The developer intends to locate interpretive elements along the path and at the trailhead. The aforementioned public amenity obligations are consistent with the Report’s recommendation of drafting a “formal Hayden Flour Mill interpretive master plan.” The Report provides suggested interpretive themes in chapter 35 of volume three and outlines “key parameters” for the plan in table 36.2 of that volume.

The submittal does indicate numerous areas where interpretive elements will be located, including the northeast corner of mill building, canal, and equipment area. The “INTERPRETIVE APPROACH MILL BUILDING” sheet of the “SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS FOR DPR” portion of the submittal outlines general interpretive strategies relating to the site’s history. The developer also intends to locate numerous interpretive elements along the path and at the trailhead. The developer has held discussions with representatives of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Cultural Preservation Program regarding interpretation of prehistory. In addition, the developer presented an overarching interpretive vision that includes close collaboration with cultural representatives of the Four Southern Tribes at a Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting on July 21, 2017. The applicant is working toward a finalized trailhead design and final plans for interpretive elements. However, details are not yet available. As such, the applicant will need to return to the Commission for action on a detailed plan for interpretive elements and trailhead design.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMEDIATION**

Per the Report, “additional, needed archaeological work was identified” for portions of the project site. However, this work “is comprised of tasks that cannot be undertaken until construction begins on the property.” Areas within phase one of the project area identified for further work are as follows:

- East Side of Mill Building
- Tail Race Feature 7
- Subterranean Rooms – North Side of Mill Building
- Calaboose
The applicant is soliciting bids for this work and will comply with all applicable requirements, including obtaining a site specific permit for work as the project entails excavation within site boundaries on municipal property. Staff believes the remaining archaeological work to be eligible for administrative review and approval via a Certificate of No Effect. As such, staff recommends approval of this aspect of the project contingent upon Historic Preservation Office approval of the monitoring and discovery plan and applicant obtaining site specific permits from the Arizona State Museum.

MISCELLANEOUS

Sheets FA 1.1 and RA 1.1 indicate placement of a “sliding steel gate” at the west end of the pedestrian path to the Tempe (Hayden) Butte trailhead. A gate is required to allow emergency access while preventing unauthorized vehicular access and is likely to be an item eligible for consideration under the “obviously minor in nature” provision of the City preservation ordinance, thereby allowing administrative review and approval via a Certificate of No Effect. As such, staff recommends approval of the sliding steel gate contingent upon Historic Preservation Office issuance of a Certificate of No Effect.

CONCLUSION

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the information provided and the above analysis, staff recommends conditional approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the zoning map amendment, amended planned area development overlay, development plan review requested as part of case PL170218.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

EACH NUMBERED ITEM IS A CONDITION OF APPROVAL. THE CITY COUNCIL MAY ADD TO THESE CONDITIONS.

GENERAL

1. Certificate of Appropriateness applies only to the area within the “PHASE ONE LIMIT LINE” shown on sheet L2.4 (“RENDERED SITE PLAN”) dated July 3, 2017.

2. Revisions proposing work counter to recommendations included in the Report require Tempe Historic Preservation Office review. If eligible for administrative approval, said proposals will be considered for a Certificate of No Effect. Proposed changes not eligible for administrative review shall require Historic Preservation Commission approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to issuance of building permits.

MILL BUILDING EXTERIOR

3. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposed exterior doors, windows, and awnings, a Certificate of Appropriateness for said items shall be required prior to issuance of building permits.

4. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for the portion of the east addition extending beyond the horizontal plane of the 1918 roofline and beyond the vertical plane of the 1918 east mill building wall, a Certificate of Appropriateness for any new construction extending beyond the horizontal and vertical planes referenced above shall require a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to issuance of building permits.
5. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposed treatment of concrete piers in the location of the former Wooden Addition, a Certificate of Appropriateness for treatment of said piers shall be required prior to issuance of building permits.

6. Exterior finish material(s), paint colors, cleaning and preparation methods, and ghost signage preservation strategies shall require a Certificate of Appropriateness prior to issuance of building permits.

**MILL BUILDING INTERIOR**

7. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposed interior doors, a Certificate of Appropriateness for said items shall be required.

8. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposed demolition of “existing added CMU walls” in areas 203 and 303 of sheets A 2.3 and A 2.3, a Certificate of Appropriateness for treatment of said CMU walls shall be required.

9. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposed demolition of “existing non-compliant stair” feature shown sheets A 2.1, A 2.2, A 2.3, and A 2.4, a Certificate of Appropriateness for treatment of said feature shall be required.

10. Should applicant fail to obtain a Part 2 approval for proposal to “infill with new floor as necessary” shown in areas 201, 301, and 401 on sheets A 2.2, A 2.3, and A 2.4, a Certificate of No Effect for treatment of said floors shall be required.

11. Disposition of all equipment identified in tables 35.1 and 35.2 on pages 74-76 of volume three of the Report shall require a Certificate of No Effect.

**INTERPRETIVE FEATURES / TRAILHEAD**

12. Applicant must receive a Certificate of Appropriateness for a detailed interpretive element and trailhead design addressing the prehistory and history of the project site and its contextually-related surroundings.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMEDIATION**

13. Historic Preservation Office approval of the archaeological monitoring and discovery plan addressing the east side of the mill building, tail race feature 7, subterranean rooms on the north side of the mill building, calaboose area, and any additional unanticipated discoveries is required prior to issuance of permits for any ground disturbing activity.

14. Site specific permits from the Arizona State Museum must be obtained prior to excavation within any site boundaries, as required by the Arizona Antiquities Act.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

15. Design of “sliding steel gate” identified on sheets FA 1.1 and RA 1.1 shall require a Certificate of No Effect.
**HISTORY & FACTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 17, 1870</td>
<td>Charles T. Hayden gave notice of the formation of the Hayden Milling and Farming Ditch Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>The Hayden Mill began operations with the original adobe mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 1915</td>
<td>Carl Trumbull Hayden (1877-1972), C. G. Jones, and F. A. Van Ritten incorporated the Tempe Milling Company to continue operation of the Hayden Flour Mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1917</td>
<td>The adobe mill was destroyed in a catastrophic fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10, 1918</td>
<td>The concrete mill (current) was completed and began operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>A concrete grain elevator with multiple silos was added to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Two additions were constructed on the top levels of the mill building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 1981</td>
<td>Bay State Milling took over operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 1984</td>
<td>Hayden Flour Mill eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 1998</td>
<td>Bay State Milling stopped operation of the mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2002</td>
<td>A three-alarm fire burned a portion of Hayden Flour Mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8, 2002</td>
<td>City Council approved the establishment of the Hayden Butte Preserve consisting of approximately 27 acres, which included 6 acres of the Hayden Flour Mill site. (Resolution #2002.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 2005</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission unanimously recommended approval for the historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2005</td>
<td>Redevelopment Review Commission recommended approval for the historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2005</td>
<td>Rio Salado Advisory Commission recommended approval for the historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 2005</td>
<td>City Council introduced and held the first public hearing for the historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, consisting of approximately 10 acres, located at 119 South Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 2005</td>
<td>City Council held the second public hearing and “tabled” the request for historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue. Council tabled the matter due to litigation involving the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 2006</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission recommended a new approval for the historic designation of the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2014</td>
<td>Council approves Resolution 2014.157 permitting City staff to enter into development agreement negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Council approved development agreement between City and Iconic Mill, LLC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Per article 5.12 of the City of Tempe / Iconic Mill, LLC development agreement, the applicant is obligated to process proposed changes as if the property is listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register. As such, for the purposes of this report, its Tempe Historic Property Register status is listed as “Designated.” Hereafter cited as Agreement.

2 Property submitted for National Register consideration as part of the Tempe MRA. The Keeper determined the property to be eligible on October 10, 1984. However, the property was not listed due to owner objection. A January 26, 2017 response to a Part 1 tax credit application for this project affirmed the property likely retains National Register eligibility.
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Attachment B
HISTORIC PRESERVATION CERTIFICATION APPLICATION
PART 2 - DESCRIPTION OF REHABILITATION

1. Property Name: Hayden Flour Mill
   Street: 119 S. Mill Avenue
   City: Tempe
   County: Maricopa
   State: AZ
   Zip: 85281-2804

   Name of Historic District: 
   Listed individually in the National Register of Historic Places; date of listing: 
   Located in a Registered Historic District; name of district: 
   Part 1 - Evaluation of Significance submitted: 
   Date submitted: 12/19/2016
   Date of certification: 01/26/2017

2. Project Data
   Date of building: 1918, 1951
   Estimated rehabilitation costs (ORE): $28.9 Million
   Number of buildings in project: 2
   Floor area before / after rehabilitation: 69,749 / 122,749 sq ft
   Start date (estimated): 03/01/2018
   Use(s) before / after rehabilitation: mill / retail
   Completion date (estimated): 12/31/2019
   Number of housing units before / after rehabilitation: 0 / 0
   Number of phases in project: 2
   Number of low-moderate income housing units before / after rehabilitation: 0 / 0

3. Project Contact (if different from applicant)
   Name: Jennifer Hembree
   Company: MacRostie Historic Advisors LLC
   Street: 991 W Hedding St., Suite 106
   City: San Jose
   State: CA
   Zip: 95126-1213
   Telephone: (408) 490-2069
   Email Address: jhembree@mac-ha.com

4. Applicant
   I hereby attest that the information I have provided is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I further attest that (check one or both boxes, as applicable) (1) I am the owner of the above-described property within the meaning of "owner" as defined in 36 CFR 67.2 (2011), and/or (2) if I am not the fee simple owner of the above-described property, the fee simple owner is aware of the action I am taking relative to this application and has no objection, as noted in a written statement from the owner, a copy of which (1) is attached to this application form and incorporated herein, or has been previously submitted, and (6) meets the requirements of 36 CFR 67.34(1)(2011). For purposes of this attestation, the singular shall include the plural whenever appropriate. I understand that knowing and willful fabrication of factual representations in this application may subject me to fines and imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, which, under certain circumstances, provides for imprisonment of up to 8 years.
   Name: David Baum
   Signature: __________________________
   Date: 11/10/17
   Applicant Entity: Iconic Mill, LLC
   SSN: __________________________
   or TIN: 36-4808973
   Street: 1030 West Chicago Ave., Suite 200
   City: Chicago
   State: IL
   Zip: 60642-5671
   Telephone: (312) 275-3110
   Email Address: david@baumrealty.com

NPS Official Use Only
The National Park Service has reviewed the Historic Preservation Certification Application – Part 2 for the above-named property and has determined that:

☐ the rehabilitation described herein is consistent with the historic character of the property and, where applicable, with the district in which it is located and that the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. This letter is a preliminary determination only, since a formal certification of rehabilitation can be issued only to the owner of a "certified historic structure" after rehabilitation work is complete.

☒ the rehabilitation or proposed rehabilitation will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation if the attached conditions are met.

☐ the rehabilitation described herein is not consistent with the historic character of the property or the district in which it is located and that the project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Date: 8/17/18
National Park Service Authorized Signature

[Signature]
202-354-2032

☐ NPS conditions or comments attached
The rehabilitation of this property as described in the Historic Preservation Certification Application will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation provided that the following condition(s) is/are met:

1) The final design of the new one-story addition along Mill Avenue must be compatible with the historic character of the property.

2) The overall landscape design must be simplified to preserve the historic industrial character of the site and environment of the property.

3) The final design of the new window openings in the silo building must minimize the visual impact of the new openings.

4) The height, location, design, and other aspects of the new mechanical equipment and screening on the new hotel addition must be further studied in order to minimize its visual impact to the greatest extent possible.

Additional information in response to the above conditions must be submitted for review and approval to ensure conformance with the Standards. All submittals must be sent through the State Historic Preservation Office.

This approval is based on preliminary designs and does not extend to final design and construction details, tenant work, future phases of the project, other work including, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, and fire-suppression systems, signage, or any other work which has not been submitted for review and approval to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the NPS. Federal regulations governing this program require evaluation of entire projects. Therefore, review of final construction details by the SHPO and the NPS will also encompass all work proposed or completed as part of the overall rehabilitation project. This approval may be superseded if it is found that the overall rehabilitation does not meet the Secretary's Standards. Please submit the additional information as soon as available for review to ensure conformance of the overall project with the Secretary's Standards.

Date: ____________________________ State Historic Preservation Office Signature: ____________________________ Telephone Number: ____________________________

The National Park Service has determined that this project will meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation if the condition(s) listed in the box above are met.

8/07/2018 ____________________________
Date: National Park Service Signature: ____________________________ Telephone Number: 202-354-2032
1. Property name  Hayden Flour Mill
   Property address  119 S. Mill Avenue Tempe, AZ 85281-2804

2. This form  □ includes additional information requested by NPS for an application currently on hold.
   □ updates applicant or contact information.
   □ amends a previously submitted  □ Part 1  □ Part 2  □ Part 3 application.
   □ requests an advisory determination that phase ___ of ___ phases of this rehabilitation project meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.  Phase completion date __________
   Estimated rehabilitation costs of phase (QRE) __________

   Summarize information here, continue on following page if necessary.

   Based on the meeting with National Park Service (“NPS”) and Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (“AZ SHPO”) on June 29, 2018, Iconic Mill, LLC (“Applicant”) is submitting this amendment to the previously submitted Part Two for Phase One of the Hayden Flour Mill project (NPS Project Number 35366). This amendment summarizes changes agreed upon between NPS, AZ SHPO, and Applicant in order to obtain Part Two approval for Phase One of the project.

3. Project Contact  (if different from applicant)
   Name ____________________________     Company ____________________________
   Street ____________________________     City ____________________________     State _____
   Zip __________     Telephone __________     Email Address __________

4. Applicant
   I hereby attest that the information I have provided is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I further attest that [check one or both boxes, as applicable] (1)  □ I am the owner of the above-described property within the meaning of “owner” set forth in 36 CFR § 67.2 (2011), and/or (2)  □ if I am not the fee simple owner of the above-described property, the fee simple owner is aware of the action I am taking relative to this application and has no objection, as noted in a written statement from the owner, a copy of which (I) either is attached to this application form and incorporated herein, or has been previously submitted, and (ii) meets the requirements of 36 CFR § 67.3(a)(1) (2011). For purposes of this attestation, the singular shall include the plural whenever appropriate. I understand that knowing and willful falsification of factual representations in this application may subject me to fines and imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, which, under certain circumstances, provides for imprisonment of up to 8 years.

   Name David Baum     Signature ____________________________     Date 07/17/2018
   Applicant Entity Iconic Mill, LLC
   SSN 36-4808973 or TIN __________
   Street 1030 West Chicago Avenue #200     City Chicago     State IL
   Zip 60642-5671     Telephone (312) 275-3110     Email Address David@baumrealty.com
   □ Applicant, SSN, or TIN has changed since previously submitted application.

NPS Official Use Only

The National Park Service has reviewed this amendment to the Historic Preservation Certification Application and has determined that the amendment:
   □ meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
   □ will meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard for Rehabilitation if the attached conditions are met.
   □ does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
   □ updates the information on file and does not affect the certification.

Advisory Determinations:
   □ The National Park Service has determined that the work completed in this phase is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. This determination is advisory only. A formal certification of rehabilitation can be issued only after all rehabilitation work and any associated site work or new construction have been completed. This approval could be superseded if it is found that the overall rehabilitation does not meet the Secretary’s Standards. A copy of this form will be provided to the Internal Revenue Service.

   Date 8/7/18
   Antonio Aguilar
   National Park Service Authorized Signature

□ NPS conditions or comments attached
Agenda Item 3
Attachment A
About the Project

Valley Metro, in partnership with the cities of Mesa and Tempe, has initiated a study to evaluate streetcar as a high-capacity transit option in a corridor that would connect the Tempe Streetcar route with regional activity centers, employment destinations and emerging multi-unit residential developments.

The Tempe/Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study will identify options for continued development of the Valley’s multi-modal transportation system. The study will also inform discussions about future regional funding for transit improvements.

PROJECT STATUS

- Collecting data and identifying preliminary corridors for streetcar evaluation.

NEXT STEPS

- Through 2018, the team will evaluate streetcar route alternatives according to a variety of criteria including ridership, connectivity, cost and traffic interface.

STUDY AREA

BUDGET FORECAST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated as of May 2018.

SCHEDULE

MID 2018 - LATE 2019

IDENTIFY AND EVALUATE ALTERNATIVES

LATE 2019 - EARLY 2020

DEVELOP FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To subscribe to email updates, contact Jordan Brackett.
Community Outreach Coordinator
jbrackett@valleymetro.org
602.744.5552 | TTY 602.251.2039
Attachment B
Attachment C
Tempe/Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study

Winter 2018
Agenda

• Study Overview
  • Purpose
  • Study Area
  • Evaluation Criteria
• Process and Timeline
• Related Projects
• Public Information
Overview

• The cities of Tempe and Mesa have partnered with Valley Metro to evaluate streetcar as a high-capacity transit option
• $600,000 budget co-funded by the cities of Tempe and Mesa
Purpose

• Evaluate possible streetcar extension(s) to serve Tempe and Mesa
  • Link Tempe Streetcar with key regional activity centers, employment, residential

• Evaluate feasibility of options

• Identify potential next steps
  • Anticipate/prepare for next phase of regional funding
What is modern streetcar?

- Smaller than light rail vehicle
- Operates individually and not linked together
- Often shares lane with automobiles
- Streetcar stops are more similar in size to bus stops and occur more frequently than light rail stations
Study Area
Key Stakeholders

• Commissions and Boards at cities of Tempe and Mesa
Evaluation Criteria

Tier 1
• Ridership Potential
• Transit-Oriented Land Use and Economic Development Potential

Tier 2
• Physical and Engineering Constraints
• Transportation Network Integrity and Functionality
Process

Identify Corridors
• Identify corridors that meet project’s Purpose and Need and have high potential to improve transit

Tier 1 Evaluation
• Qualitative, high-level analysis.

Tier 2 Evaluation
• Quantitative, in-depth analysis

Recommend Corridors
• Recommendation for future regional transit funding.

2018  2019  2020
Related Projects

- Fiesta District Alternatives Analysis
  - Completion in summer 2019
- Tempe/Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study
  - Completion in spring 2020
- Arizona Avenue Alternatives Analysis
  - Completion in spring 2020
- Tempe Streetcar (under construction)
  - Open for operations in 2021
Public Information

• Feasibility Study
  • Targeted outreach
  • Key stakeholders, property owners
  • Website, information at other public meetings

• Future Phases
  • Expanded outreach to broad range
  • Additional outreach tools, including public meetings
Thank You
Agenda Item 4
MEMORANDUM

TO: Historic Preservation Commission
THROUGH: John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
FROM: Ambika P. Adhikari, Principal Planner
DATE: January 9, 2019
SUBJECT: Urban Core Masterplan and Transportation Overlay District (TOD) Project Update

PURPOSE:
This memo provides an update and progress report on the Urban Core Masterplan project.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
Introduction

The City of Tempe is preparing the Urban Core Master Plan (UCMP) and updating and expanding the existing Transportation Overlay District (TOD) to coordinate regulations, infrastructure investment, and policies related to development to achieve an active and sustainable Downtown and Urban Core area. The plan addresses the potential growth that is expected to occur by 2040. The project will also include the creation of an Affordable Housing Strategy for the City.

The UCMP and of the TOD amendment are intended to maximize economic potential and shape continued growth, and achieve a high-quality place, while respecting and relating to existing neighborhoods and historic properties. The UCMP will identify areas which can benefit from a balanced and holistic planning, and the plan looks beyond individual sites to link development heights to transit and connectivity.

Update on Strengthening Preservation Efforts

To address the comments and input provided by the HPC to staff on November 14, 2018, staff is working with the consultants to include the following proposed provisions in the Transportation Overlay District (TOD) code.

- Preservation Incentives. Providing height and density bonus for new development on the site for the owners of registered historic properties, who will continue to preserve the historic structures within the site. These incentives will also apply to adjacent properties (e.g. via assemblage)

- Disincentives for Demolition of Historic Properties: If a registered historic property is demolished, staff is exploring concepts that can limit the property from receiving the increases in density and heights permitted by the TOD overlay.

Further, staff is meeting with the representatives of Federal Transit Authority and Valley Metro to discuss the concerns raised by the HPC related to the NHPA Section 106 in the TOD code adoption process.

--End--