

City of Mesa

MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE

Date: October 12, 2006 **Time:** 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Ron Peters Barbara Jarrett Steve McCance Jared Smith	Stephanie Brüning	Angelina R. Haro Jason McCormick Sarah Hawkes Virginia Aguero Adrian Barraza Jerry Howard
MEMBERS ABSENT	SUPPORT PRESENT	
Lane Burdick Nathan Ricks Lillian Wilkinson	Anna Camino	

- 1. Call to Order**

The October 12, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) was called to order at 6:05 pm.
Let the Record show that we have Quorum
- 2. Consider Minutes of August 22, 2006 Regular Meeting**

Ms. Brüning has notified the Committee that the minutes of the HPC Meeting on August 22, 2006 are not available. No action will need to be taken. Those minutes will be deferred for review and approval at the next regular meeting, which is scheduled for Thursday, December 14, 2006.
- 3. Discuss and Update: Demolition Clearance for 2222 E. Lehi Road (Crismon Farm Homestead)**

Ms. Brüning – An update was sent to the Committee members via e-mail. Mr. and Mrs. Fenn attended a previous meeting on the Crismon Farm Homestead and they are interested in purchasing the bunkhouse for relocation to their family's historic homestead. There is information for the sale of the property from the owners to see if anyone is interested in purchasing the property for the historic preservation; no interest has been shown. The owners will move forward with the demolition; the 180 days period is up at end of October. The City of Chandler is interested in the materials of the property to reuse in their Tumbleweed Park. No asking price has been disclosed in the documentation. Mr. and Mrs. Fenn would like to relocate the bunkhouse and put it back in place on their farmstead, and the City of Chandler is interested in using materials from the site in recreation of some buildings that fit with their Tumbleweed Park theme.

In the last several Committee Meetings, there has been no interest from anyone to restore the property at its current location. In all likelihood, City of Mesa will lose it.

Staff Recommendation: To see the bunkhouse reused rather than dismantled into pieces and that the City of Chandler reuse materials for buildings they have relocated to their Tumbleweed Park.

It was confirmed that the property was fully documented when it was evaluated by the federal government and ADOT when designing Rt. 202. At that time, the property was considered eligible for the National Register and the original alignment was moved to preserve the farm. Mr. Peters explained to the committee and audience how documentation is a form of historic preservation, even if it cannot be saved.

Mr. and Mrs. Fenn were not present at this Committee Meeting. Ms. Brüning informed Mrs. Fenn that she would bring their letter of interest for the bunkhouse. The Committee discussed it is a reasonable alternative to move the structure even if it will not be relocated in Mesa, and it is better than losing the structure completely.

Motion: (Mr. Smith) That the owners make reasonable efforts to relocate the bunkhouse and any other structures and if unable to relocate the structures, that they try to find someone that is interested in the materials.

(Mr. McCance) It was asked if the Committee needed to state in the motion where the bunkhouse is being relocated. Ms. Brüning responded that it is up to the Committee if they wanted the relocation information stated in the motion.

Discussion:

Mrs. Jarrett – Sounds like the best plan so far.

Mr. Peters – Glad to see it is going to be saved even if moving to another location. The Committee would like to see documentation placed on the bunkhouse after it has been relocated sharing the history of it and where it came from (originally from the Crismon Farm in Mesa).

(Mr. Smith) Requested that photo documentation be sent to HP Committee for the record; to show where the bunkhouse has been relocated.

Amendment (this was added to the first motion):

The HPC recommends that the buildings on the site of the Crismon Farm Homestead be relocated and/or reused in some fashion. Recommendation that the Fenn's request be considered by the current owners and that documentation be placed on the bunkhouse once it has been relocated. Photo documentation of the rebuilt structures is to be sent to the HPC for update.

Seconded: Mr. McCance

Vote: Unanimous (4-0)

4. Discuss and Consider: Historic Clearance – Work conducted without a Permit at 105 North Pasadena (Glenwood Wilbur Historic District)

Ms. Brüning requested that this item be tabled and discussed later in the meeting due to the owners not being present at this time.

Homeowners are still not present when item was revisited. Ms. Brüning read the Staff Recommendation to the Board

The homeowner began work prior to obtaining permits and a Historical Clearance. The owner is now seeking clearance. The owner has ceased work while waiting for the Committee's ruling.

Ms. Brüning sent out a packet to the Committee members and homeowners last week. The Committee commented that the report by Ms. Brüning was very detailed and they appreciated that.

Staff Recommendations:

A. Window replacement (front façade -west elevation)

The front façade window in the southern most location (previously replaced) does not meet the SoIS # 6 or #9. If the front window required replacement it must match the old in design, texture, material, and other visual qualities. According to the SoIS, the removal of historic materials is to be avoided; deteriorated historic features are to be repaired and not replaced and where replacement is needed is should match the original.

The window opening was altered from the original dimensions of the original frame (enlarged); the original window was one-over-one and the new has a divided 8-over-8 glazed-look. The decorative detailing along the bottom of the upper sash has been eliminated from the design of the replacement window. This decorative 'ogee' detail along the sash is characteristic of period homes in the neighborhood and is a distinctive decorative character defining feature from the historic period of the home that should be maintained.

Recommendation: The windows on the front façade should be maintained in their original form, design, texture, material and other decorative detail. The request to keep the new replacement window and replace the front porch window with the same style/type window should be denied because it does not meet the SoIS. The front porch window should be maintained and restored and the replaced window be removed; the original window should be put back in place. If the original window has already been disposed of, the window should be replaced with one that matches the original 1922 that was removed.

B. Window replacement (south façade)

The applicant has requested to keep the replaced window at the front of the house (C); to remove and reduce the size of the two double hung windows (D and E) and make it one large window; to remove and reduce (width)/enlarge(height) the size of the two center opening 4 by 4 glazed windows and create one large window (F and G); replace and change the size of the window (H), and keep the window (I).

According to the SoIS, the removal of historic materials is to be avoided; deteriorated historic features are to be repaired and not replaced and where replacement is needed is should match the original.

Recommendation: Window C: This window has been replaced without historic clearance and should be restored to the original.

Windows D and E: These are original one-over-one c.1922 windows and should be restored and maintained.

Windows F and G: These are possible original windows or early replacement (not having seen the interior) and should be maintained.

Windows H and I: These are part of a newer addition and can be replaced with new windows. The new windows should resemble the others along the façade and it is recommended to use a one-over-one window for H.

C. Window replacement (north façade)

The applicant has requested to replace and restore some of the windows on this façade. The request states: windows (Q and R) will be repaired and restored; to removed windows (O and P) and replace them with one large window that reduces the size of the opening (width) and enlarges the height of the opening; to removed the window (N) *but, no other information was given as to replacement or elimination*; to remove and replace windows (L and M) and replaced with larger windows; remove the window (K) *but, no other information given as to replacement or elimination*.

According to the SoIS, the removal of historic materials is to be avoided; deteriorated historic features are to be repaired and not replaced and where replacement is needed is should match the original.

Recommendation: Windows R and Q: The windows should be restored and maintained as requested in the application.

Windows O and P: These are original one-over-one c.1922 windows and should be restored and maintained.

Window N: This is an original one-over-one c.1922 windows and should be restored and maintained.

Windows M and L: These are part of a newer addition and can be enlarged and replaced with new windows. The new windows should resemble the others along the façade and it is recommended to use a one-over-one window in these locations.

Window K: The request is to remove the window but no other information given as to replacement or elimination; because this is apart of a new addition the window can be eliminated or replaced by the applicant.

D. Window replacement (east façade)

This façade is on the newest addition to the house and is not historically significant.

Recommendation: The window (J) may be replaced per the applicants request.

E. Siding replacement

The removal of the original siding to the house (described in the survey as shiplap siding) was begun without a historic clearance. Three sections of the structure's siding have been removed. Windows were replaced on these sides and corner/end trim has been removed and replaced in areas around the building.

According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation: the historic character of the property is to be retained and preserved and the removal of materials and alteration of features is to be avoided (#2); the property is recognized as a physical record of its time (#3); distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property are to be preserved (#5); deteriorated historic features are to be repaired rather than replace and where the severity of deterioration

requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new features shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other qualities, where possible, materials (#6); new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property (#9).

The house currently has four distinctive types of siding (as noted by the applicant) with the evidence of previous alterations to the house apparent through the siding changes. The request is to continue the removal of the wood siding on the entire house and replace it with a composite wood substitute known as Hardie Board (6 ¼ wide" with a pressed raised grain look) as was begun on the front and north facades.

Recommendation: The original 1922 bungalow was built with wood shiplap beveled (angle ended) siding. The raised grain hardie board (an engineered composite product) the applicant has requested to use on the house does not match the original beveled shiplap siding in style, finish, or craftsmanship. The hardie board construction has a fake wood grained effect that is not characteristic of the original siding, which was planed flat. The width of the proposed siding (6 ¼ " with exposed 5" plane) is wider than the original siding (approx. 4" flat plane with ½" 'V' notch). The original has a beveled edge that when the ship lap is placed together a 'V' notch is formed and the flat sections line up horizontally in the same plane; the end trimming is positioned over the siding which details the width of the siding and was a characteristic method of construction for the historic period of the house (it was also applied for the protection of the cut end of the wood boards from weathering). The proposed hardie board is lapped at angles with only the bottom straight edge of each board exposed. The trim has also been changed and is now flat with the plane of the building altering the original details and craftsmanship. The standards are specific, as outlined above in this report, that features are to be repaired, and if replacement is needed due to severe deterioration, only then may those specific deteriorated features be replaced in accordance with the SoIS. Replacement of these features must match the old in design, texture and materials where possible; the proposed new hardie board does not meet these standards. The proposed hardie board replacement of the original siding should be denied due to the fact it does not meet the SoIS as outlined for rehabilitation. New replacement boards for deteriorated siding should match the original and only be used in areas where the material has severe deterioration; this can be addressed in a future historic clearance application.

It is being recommended that the proposed hardie board may be used on the additions to the original house as per the diagram attached.

F. Roof replacement

The roof material is currently asphalt shingle and in poor condition. The request is to replace the roofing material with new asphalt shingles.

Recommendation: The replacement of the existing asphalt shingles with new asphalt shingles is not a change in the existing material and should be approved.

G. Evaporative Cooler replacement and relocation

The evaporative cooler is currently located on the southern gable end of the house. It is to be moved to the northern side of the home behind the ridgeline.

Recommendation: That the unit be placed on the ground in the rear or side yard (preferably north side) of the home to eliminate the visual impact/detraction from the contributing structure. If it is determined that the unit can not be moved to ground level it

should be placed in an area that lessens its visual impact on the house. The unit should be replaced behind the ridgeline, as requested and should be placed as low as possible to lessen visual impacts seen from the street; a low profile unit is also recommended.

H. Driveway repair and replacement

There were no plans submitted at the time of the application for the driveway.

Recommendation: The driveway may be repaired or replaced in the existing layout however, if a new driveway is proposed, the new design requires a new application for historic clearance.

I. Door removal /elimination on north façade

Recommendation: The door is part of a later addition and not original to the house; it is recommended that the request to remove the door be approved.

J. Other items not specifically requested but part of the notes of the drawing

Front Door Recommendation: The front door is a character-defining feature of this bungalow home, original to the house and should be restored and maintained.

K. National Register Eligibility:

If the window replacement request is granted and/or the siding replacement is granted; it will alter the National Register eligibility of the house from “contributing” to “non-contributing” and therefore render the owners and future owners of the house ineligible for the Arizona State Tax Incentives (SPT)* and for future local historic funds and grants.

*The SPT program reduces the property taxes between 35-45% for 15 years and is renewable for a second SPT.

Motion: (Unknown) The motion was made to accept all of staff’s recommendations.

Seconded: Unknown

Vote: Unanimous (4-0)

Process: An appeal can be filed within 30 days to the Historic Preservation Office. The appeal would be heard by City Council.

5. Discuss and Consider: Historic Clearance for the planting of orange trees in the medians of the West Second Street Historic District

Ms. Brüning sent a report to the HP Committee members regarding some of the history of the orange trees, as well as a copy of the letter that was sent to the homeowners in both the West Second Street and Robson Historic Districts (MacDonald and Robson are both areas that face onto the affected medians). Approximately 1 - 2 years ago, the City was looking at removing the orange trees in the medians. It was requested that the City replace the orange trees in the median with orange trees. The motion was forwarded to the State level because orange trees are a higher water use tree. The State of Arizona gave permission to move forward with the orange trees. The neighborhood got together and requested that the City plant back the orange trees in the medians. The City came up with a 3-year plan to replace the orange trees: Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III. Phase I has been completed. Ms. Brüning is asking the Committee to review this information for historic clearance and move forward with Phase II and Phase III. Notification of the meeting were sent out to the

neighborhood owners. One letter was received by the office with some homeowners that could not attend the Committee meeting; they are opposed to orange trees being planted in the median. This letter consists of six signatures. They would like to have shade trees planted instead of the ornamental orange trees. There are also some homeowners that are present that would like to speak. These homeowners want the orange trees.

Virginia Aguero who is a homeowner in the historic district spoke to the HP Committee. Ms. Aguero presented the Committee with a petition containing 21 signatures requesting continuation of the planting of the orange trees, Phase II and III. The citizens have worked about two years on this project.

(Mr. Peters) The Committee thanked Ms. Aguero for her time and dedication.

(Ms. Aguero) Requested that when the orange trees are in bloom and the fruit starts to drop, the citizens would like to see the oranges picked up for safety reasons. Ms. Aguero introduced other citizens present at this Committee Meeting. Confirmed that the trees originally planted in the medians were ornamental orange trees. The orange trees are a part of Mesa's history.

(Ms. Jarrett) Asked Ms. Brüning approximately how many residents are in the affected historic district(s). Ms. Brüning responded with approximately 50 – 54.

(Mr. Peters) The Committee needs to make a motion that will finalize this issue that it does not keep reoccurring in the Committee Meetings.

Recommendation: Approve the historic clearance for Phase II and Phase III of the replacement of the orange trees in the medians of the Historic District of West Second Street, which is part of the historic landscape of the neighborhood.

Motion: (Mr. McCance) HPC support the Staff Recommendation.

Seconded: Mr. Smith

Vote: Unanimous (4-0)

6. Discuss and Consider: Historic Clearance – Work conducted without a Permit at 226 North Robson (Robson Historic District)

This is a driveway issue. Ms. Brüning sent an update on this topic to all the Committee members and there is staff recommendation in the report. The drive ribbons were demolished without clearance. The homeowner is present. Pictures were posted showing the original ribbons and what the current site looks like now.

Mr. Adrian Barraza, the homeowner, is present. He apologized; he was not aware that a permit was needed.

(Mr. Barraza) The two strips were in very poor condition and there were roots popping out. It was safe. Mr. Barraza has stopped construction, pending the Committee's instructions/direction. He prefers to pour a full driveway but will put the strips back if that is what the Committee prefers.

(Mr. Peters) Prefers to stay with the ribbon drive, but does understand Mr. Barraza's reasons for solid concrete. The ribbon driveways are a part of the historic district and are unique to the downtown area. They are not being used anymore and are starting to disappear. Concrete attracts heat, creating a heat sink affect.

Ribbon driveways can be altered. They can be widened and would still be in the spirit of the history. Also, a more durable material can be used in between the strips.

The HPC will not support a wider driveway. The new driveway, regardless of what it is built with, shall be a single-width slab. The HPC will not support a double-width slab.

Recommendation: The HPC determine that the request for a new driveway meets the Secretary of Interior Standards and a historic clearance would have been granted if it had been requested prior to demolition and that the construction does not adversely affect the resource, therefore, the HPC approves the Historic Clearance application for the removal of the previous driveway and it be replaced with a full-surfaced drive. This is for a single driveway, not a double driveway.

Motion: (Mr. Smith) Encourage the owner to replace the ribbon driveway (double-ribbon sided) if at all possible and stay within the dimensions of the original driveway. The HPC requests a photographic record of the completed project. The HPC will support a concrete driveway as long as it is not wider than the current driveway.

The owner has agreed to submit a photographic record.

Seconded: Mr. McCance

Comments: Downtown area still has the historic texture to it. Houses are being built with big driveways, including 3-car garages. It can be an inconvenience at times to stay with the current dimensions but it is important to the history of the area.

Vote: Unanimous (4-0)

7. **Update: Mesa Southwest Museum and Mesa Historical Museum**

Mesa Historical Museum - Ms. Brüning received an e-mail from Lisa Anderson. The Home Tour is going to be on January 20, 2007, and it will feature 20 homes in the Evergreen Historic District. Rigatony's will be supplying the food. The tickets are \$20.00/each, and includes lunch and free admission to the museum. The new exhibit, "Searching for Mesa," will be officially opened that day. The Arizona Republic, Salt River Project, and Mesa's Office of Historic Preservation will sponsor the event.

There is a free lecture series that will continue on Thursday, October 19th, at 7:00 p.m. The feature speakers are the Artistic Director and the CEO of the Mesa Symphony. They will be discussing the history of Mesa in performing. They ask to join their "Sneaker Tour" on October 14th at 9:00 a.m.

There will be a Benefit Concert on November 4th at Mesa Community College's Theater Outback, which will feature Marshall Trimble and Dollin Ellis. The concert will be two hours long with intermission, and tickets are \$35.00. Tickets can be purchased in advance. All proceeds will go to the Mesa Historical Museum.

The construction is completed in the museum. The restoration project funded by the AZ State Heritage fund was a great success. They are waiting for the lighting to arrive. The exhibit will move from the Southwest Museum beginning November 20th.

Mesa Southwest Museum – Dr. Jerry Howard

For the Mesa Museum, the “Searching for Mesa” exhibit is going to be moved to the Mesa Historical Museum.

Aerial photographs of archeology sites taken around Arizona, New Mexico, and Mexico is just about at its end. The second part has opened at Pueblo Grande. It is a very large show and we were not able to show it at the museum all at one time.

Upcoming exhibits: “Art of the Grand Canyon” and “The Gila With-in”, which is a free traveling show and was going to be given to the museum with no charge but the person redoing the exhibit became ill so Mesa will not be getting that exhibit. The museum staff is working on putting together an exhibit within the next two months that will feature the Gilbert mammoth that was recently excavated. Other Ice Age animals, information on human evolution, and early hunters in Arizona will also be featured in this exhibit.

On October 21, 2006, a tour of Mesa Grande will be given; continental breakfast will be included. Also with Mesa Grande, we have recently opened the Banner Mesa Exhibit on the 8th Floor of the Banner Hospital. This was funded by Salt River Project and Southwest Ambulance. When the formal opening is scheduled, the museum staff will send the announcement to the Committee members.

An application was put in with the tribal groups for gaming money that is donated. The application for \$600,000.00 for Mesa Grande was turned down.

For the past 15 years, Dr. Howard has been doing Cultural Resource Management reports for the City of Mesa. Even a small CRM reports costs \$2,000.00 - \$3,000.00. By doing them through the museum, it has saved the City of Mesa a considerable amount of money. Due to the budget issues, and the museum staff and funding cut in half, the museum has discontinued Dr. Howard’s assistance in these projects.

The Planning and Zoning group, under Gordon Sheffield, is redoing their Planning and Zoning Codes, which includes the Historic Preservation Ordinance. A few people, including Dr. Howard, were asked what they would like to see in the revised ordinances.

The Mesa Grande has recently filmed a movie recently, titled “Zorg and Andy.” There is a trailer for the movie on-line.

8. Discuss and Consider: The Committee’s request to review future plans for the properties at 51, 55, and 59 South Mesa Drive.

The Committee as a whole requested to review future plans for the properties at 51, 55, and 59 South Mesa Drive in the August HP Committee Meeting.

Motion: (Mr. McCance) Moved that the HP Committee continue to review the matters concerning the properties at 51, 55, and 59 South Mesa Drive.

Seconded: Mrs. Jarrett

Vote: Unanimous (4-0)

9. Historic Preservation Office Project Status Report: October 2006

Fraser Field – Draft was sent out and Ms. Brüning sent her comments to the consultants. An edited draft should be received within the next 30 days.

The collective team for the preservation of the 1912 Train in Pioneer Park has been assembled. All alternatives are being investigated. Some of the alternatives are to see if any of the Railroad Companies want to help sponsor with the preservation, as well as seeing if there is public interest in the preservation of the train. Also looking at having a publication in one of the local newspapers to generate interest. The 6-months is expiring in February 2007.

Alston House – Draft plans from Ron Peters have been received. We are moving forward with the recommendations and comments on those draft plans.

Town Center and Engineering are assisting Neighborhood Services with this project. Town Center is moving forward with an ordinance to allow the opportunity for all Level 1 historic structures to be adaptively reused for office use.

Ron Peters stated for the record that he will not need to recuse himself from anything in regards to the Alston House because his work is all pro bono.

10. Committee Member Comments, Questions, and Future Agenda Items

(Ms. Jarrett) Nothing

(Mr. McCance) Asked for a status on The Landmark Restaurant. Ms. Brüning responded that The Landmark Restaurant is on the National Register, and have approached her about putting a gazebo in the front for extra seating. Ms. Brüning should be seeing that application soon.

(Mr. Peters) There is an annual National Trust Conference that Mr. Peters thinks Ms. Brüning should begin attending.

(Mr. Smith) Nothing

The Mesa Room can no longer send a representative due to shortage in staff. The Committee would still like to get updates for the Mesa Room.

11. Items from Citizens Present

Nothing presented

12. Historic Preservation Officer Report

Nothing

13. Adjournment at 7:40 pm