



# MINUTES

## HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

### JULY 10, 2024

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Historic Preservation commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held in hybrid format in person at City Council Chambers, 31 East 5th Street, Tempe, AZ, and virtually through WebEx.

#### Regular Meeting 6:00 PM

**Present:**

**Staff:**

Kyle Woodson	Jeff Tamulevich, Comm Development Director
Dave Fackler	Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director, Comm Development
Erin Davis	Zachary Lechner, Historic Preservation Officer
Kristie Melcher	Ambika Adhikari, Principal Planner, Comm Dev
Reylynn Williams	Brenda Abney, Tempe Museum Manager, Comm Ser
Kiyomi Kurooka	Jennifer Daniels, Admirative Assistant II, Comm Dev
Kathleen Lamp	
Mariah Justice	

**Native Land Acknowledgement Statement:** We wish to acknowledge that Tempe is the homeland of the Native people who have inhabited this landscape since time immemorial. These ancestral lands of the O’odham (known as the Pima), Piipaash (known as the Maricopa), and their ancestors extend far beyond our city. This land continues to be spiritually connected to the O’odham of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Gila River Indian Community. We accept the responsibility of stewarding those places and solemnly pledge to consider this commitment in every action.

- 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) Voting of the Meeting Minutes for April 10, 2024**

Commissioner Justice stated that on page 3 the first phrase, “Commission Justice,” should be “Commissioner Justice.”

**Motion** by Commissioner Williams to approve Meeting Minutes for April 10, 2024, with correction; second by Commissioner Justice. Motion passed on **8-0** vote.

**Ayes:** Chair Woodson, Vice Chair Fackler, Commissioners Davis, Williams, Kurooka, Melcher, Lamp, and Justice

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Commissioner Robinson

- 3) Approval of Agenda**

Approval of agenda by Chair Woodson.

**5) Review of National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos, located at 119 South Mill Avenue. The presenter is Jennifer Levstik of Westland Engineering and Environmental Services.**

(Item was moved to Agenda #5 because presenter was not online at the time the item was called.)

Ms. Jennifer Levstik of Westland Engineering and Environmental Services gave a presentation on her National Register of Historic Places nomination for the Hayden Flour Mill and Silos. This is an important piece of the pending redevelopment project. To go after the federal historic rehabilitation tax credit, which the developer plans to do, the property must be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Two of the nomination's critical components are period of significance (1918-1966) and criteria (A and C). The original flour mill building burned down in 1917 and does not fall within the period of significance. Criteria A is related to properties that have a significant role in historical events or historical trends. Criteria C is related to architecture. The proposed historic district contains two contributing properties and three noncontributing properties. The federal historic rehabilitation tax credit application is for a 20% tax credit (i.e., 20% of what is spent on the project will come back as a tax credit over a 5-year period). The application is in three parts. Part one is the significance of the building. Part two, which the client and its consultants are currently working on, is the actual rehabilitation plan. That will follow once the National Register nomination is approved.

Dr. Lechner stated that he submitted a letter to the Historic Sites Review Committee (HSRC) (meeting this Friday) expressing support for the nomination.

Commissioner Justice asked why the railroad tracks are considered noncontributing to the proposed district. Although they were installed prior to the current concrete mill building, they were installed to service the adobe mill building and they were recommended by ACS's report in 2008 to be eligible. Ms. Levstik stated that she is not implying that the tracks are not important, but they were constructed prior to the period of significance. We must have things that are built and established in that time frame, she said. She said she can talk to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and see if it has any concerns about it. The railroad tracks will be included in the forthcoming rehabilitation plan; there is no intention of removing them. Commissioner Justice stated that although the tracks predate the 1918 mill, they were utilized while this proposed district became significant. She said she believe it helps the proposed district to communicate its significance under Criterion A. Ms. Levstik stated she understands Commissioner Justice's concerns. It is up to SHPO and the NPS's Keeper of the Register regarding how they want to treat the railroad tracks. The direction she was given is that the tracks are noncontributing due to the time frame. Commissioner Justice stated she wrote some comments and that Dr. Lechner will forward them to SHPO so they can be noted at the HSRC meeting.

Commissioner Justice stated that Ms. Levstik mentioned that this is the tallest standing reinforced concrete building in the Salt River Valley. That statement is inaccurate, Commissioner Justice said. There is the 1912 San Marcos hotel in Chandler. She recommended that the nomination be edited to reflect its significance accurately and perhaps provide some comparable examples in the Salt River Valley. Ms. Levstik stated her information comes from multiple sources. Archaeological Consulting Services (ACS) did a comparative analysis of other equally tall concrete buildings. Commissioner Justice also stated that she believes there is another older building—a Phoenix hotel—that is still extant. If you did acquire that information from multiple sources, Commissioner Justice said, in the future, perhaps you could footnote such statements. With a Criterion C argument, the 1918 mill's importance is derived from it being one of the oldest and tallest reinforced concrete buildings in the Salt River Valley, but Commissioner Justice said she would like it to be noted that this building incorporated multiple industrial concepts with its construction. The interior features that are associated with daylighting, natural ventilation, and fireproofing, she stated, should be thoroughly addressed in Section 7, and these features' integrity should be addressed as well. How those industrial features were associated with the modern era of industry should be discussed in Section 8. I did not see any photographs or discussion of the fireproof doors in the mill, Commissioner Justice said. Also, there are other features, such as the systems that powered the milling machines via the water turbine that she did not see discussed in Section 7. Commissioner Justice said she thinks those are important features for the NPS to

be aware of.

Commissioner Justice stated that her last concern is with the nomination's discussion of integrity for design materials and workmanship. She did not find that there was a discussion about those aspects, particularly for Criterion C. There is a great discussion of integrity at the beginning of Section 7 involving the setting of the proposed district, which is something that will need to be handled delicately. She recommended including a more robust discussion of that physical integrity relative to both the mill building and the silos.

Commissioner Lamp stated so much of the narrative is composed of biographical information about Hayden, and yet the nomination is not going for Criterion B consideration. She was curious why that was the case. Ms. Levstik stated it is impossible to talk about the mill without talking about Hayden. The reason that Criterion B is not included is because it is a difficult one to support for a National Register nomination. It's typically only used when the property in question is associated with the productive years of someone's life. This is not the only property associated with Charles Hayden; he also has his nearby home listed in the National Register, under Criterion B. As a result, Criterion B cannot be used for another Hayden-related property.

Commissioner Lamp stated that she was curious about the mill's plasters and dentils. Are those typical of the period or the architect, she asked? She said she was curious because of the transition from the earlier adobe building to something else. Does it show a local trend? Ms. Levstik stated that these details are probably not typical for a large-scale industrial property. It does seem that there is a decorative feature to it. It's not clear to her if this is a local trend or signature. Commissioner Lamp stated that there was a move away from adobe in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

Commissioner Justice stated that on page 38 of the nomination, there is a mention of the old power station in Kingman, Arizona. She said she thought that the mill and silos are being nominated under a state level of significance. That is the only mention she found, whether of comparable properties or historic contexts that referred to milling or other industrial buildings within the state of Arizona, in the nomination. The information may simply not be available. Commissioner Justice recommended either changing the level of significance to local to reflect what is going on in the Salt River Valley or to provide an expanded discussion of milling and other industrial buildings in Arizona.

Chair Woodson asked, when you are talking about the boundary for the district, is there any need within the nomination to show the boundary of the district in relation to the boundary of the parcel? Ms. Levstik stated that she strategically left that out; the reason is that, in the past when she has worked on similar types of nominations that preface a tax credit project, there is a desire for flexibility on the landscape. The NPS prefers not to know the parcel boundaries. Ms. Levstik consulted with SHPO on this question. If the NPS comes back and says it wants the entire parcel on there, then so be it.

Dr. Lechner said if any Commissioners would like to provide written comments to the Historic Sites Review Committee, please send them to him by first thing Thursday (tomorrow) morning.

Commissioner Williams stated that in the beginning of the nomination's summary section, there is a line that states the significance of Tempe Butte with the Four Southern Tribes of Arizona, but then further down in the document, it references the local Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. She wasn't sure whether there was a desire to be consistent with the use of the Four Southern Tribes of Arizona or to focus on the local Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Commissioner Williams said she appreciated Ms. Levstik's inclusion of a discussion of Charles Hayden's relationship with local O'odham farmers. Ms. Levstik stated she will address the inconsistency.

Commissioner Justice asked Dr. Lechner if the mill and silos is a locally designated property? Dr. Lechner said, yes. Commissioner Justice asked if the local designation covers the entire parcel. Dr. Lechner stated that is correct. Commissioner Justice asked, should this nomination go through with the nomination's smaller proposed boundary, would other alterations that the developer is going to complete that fall outside of that boundary come before the HPC for review? Dr. Lechner stated that is correct.

**4) Presentation on City pilot program installing arm rests in two alcoves of the Old Mill Avenue (Tempe) Bridge, a Tempe Historic Property Register-designated structure. The presenters are Jessica Wright, City of Tempe Human Services Manager—Homeless Solutions and Kip Carroll, City of Tempe Transportation Maintenance Manager.**

(Note: Kip Carroll was not able to attend. Shelly Seyler, Deputy Director of the Transportation & Sustainability Department, attended instead.)

Ms. Jessica Wright, City of Tempe Human Services Manager, gave a presentation on the Old Mill Avenue Bridge alcoves. About two years ago, City Council requested that the Homeless Solutions Task Force come up with some ideas to deter people from using the alcoves on the Old Mill Avenue bridge in ways they were not intended for. The task force ended up moving forward with a removable arm rest idea for the alcoves. Prior to installing the arm rests, information was collected from the Homeless Outreach Prevention Effort (HOPE), the Tempe Police Department, Care 7, and community responders. The heaviest use was seen on the four southernmost alcoves. It was decided to install armrests in those alcoves. Once they were installed, Community Services began to gather information. The number of engagements with unhoused people on staff walks went down after the armrests were installed.

Vice Chair Fackler stated that it appears that the engagements from November 2023-May 2024 on the southern portion of the bridge do not seem to be at the alcoves, but instead elsewhere on the bridge. Is that shown correctly, he asked? Ms. Wright stated that most, if not all, of the engagements are happening at the alcoves. When the Hope Team offers services, if someone declines, staff will step away and give the person some space. Staff then log that engagement into an application. Often, they don't stand right at the alcove to log the engagement. Vice Chair Fackler asked, in reference to the engagements on the south side of the bridge, what have you seen as far as the maintenance requirements during this period? Were they significantly reduced? Or were they about the same as before the armrests went in? Ms. Seyler stated that staff continues to power wash and maintain them on at least a weekly basis. Prior to the installation of the arm rests, sometimes it was needed daily. Vice Chair Fackler stated that the mounting for the armrest seemed to be well designed and stable. He asked, have you discovered anything negative as far as the leverage of the armrest or damage to the armrest? Ms. Seyler said that the first prototype of the armrest was not successful and would not stay attached. The City moved to a different type that is clamped on. She said she has not seen any damage caused by the replacement version, but she would need to check in with staff about what they are seeing. Ms. Wright said she was unable to speak to any damage, but she did drive the bridge last week and observed that everything was intact.

Commissioner Kurooka asked if there were any photos of the installation? Chair Woodson stated there is a photo in the Commissioners' packet.

Chair Woodson asked, to be clear, are the armrests only installed on the four alcoves on the south side? Ms. Wright stated that is correct, two on the eastern side and two on the western side of the bridge. Chair Woodson said that Ms. Wright's information shows a relatively significant decrease in the percentage of engagements. Would you say that it was a steady decrease month to month, he asked? Was there any pattern to that at all? Ms. Wright stated that she looked for a pattern and there was not one that she could identify. Chair Woodson asked if the engagement log included all eight alcoves. Ms. Wright stated that is correct. Chair Woodson asked if the alcoves with the armrests installed had different numbers of engagements. Ms. Wright stated when the team is out doing outreach, they often find people that are sleeping or using areas to sit and rest. The individuals they found in the alcoves with armrests were not lying down. When someone has been in the elements for a long time or has heat exhaustion, the alcoves are an area where they can find a significant amount of rest. Chair Woodson asked if there was a decrease in trash and debris after the installation. Ms. Seyler stated she does not know. She would need to reach out to staff that performs that work on the bridge. Chair Woodson stated he would like to see more information on that. That was one of the Commissioners' major concerns last year during the armrest presentation. Chair Woodson asked if cleaning the alcoves weekly was a sufficient level of maintenance frequency. Ms. Seyler stated, yes, and said that sometimes the City receives and responds to calls to clean them out. Chair

Woodson asked, after having made these observations during the past year, would you say that these installations are working as they were intended? Or do you find the decline in encounters is just as attributable to the fact that staff is doing daily walks? Ms. Wright stated that she does not have evidence to indicate that the armrests are having much of an influence because the reduction was consistent along all eight of the alcoves. Increased presence and increased engagement often leads to increased successes. Chair Woodson asked if Ms. Wright was recommending that the City move forward with these installations in the other alcoves. Ms. Wright stated that as a task force, they are looking for guidance from the Commission. They do not have any conclusive evidence that indicates the overall efficacy of the arm rests.

Vice Chair Fackler stated he would recommend that the program continue with armrests in four of the alcoves and see what next year brings. The results are inconclusive right now and the armrests could be unnecessary.

Chair Woodson stated that it doesn't seem like the arm rests are affecting the historical architecture of the alcoves. He asked, are you seeing any damage to the concrete? Ms. Seyler confirmed that they are not seeing any damage. Chair Woodson stated he does not see an issue with continuing to use the four existing arm rests and to wait for more data. Will you be continuing the walks in that area as we move forward, he asked? Ms. Wright stated that the walks were started as part of the evaluation period. She said she will need to take this information back to her department to ensure that this work can continue with all departments involved.

**6) Request for recommendation of adoption of historic context study titled *Asians and Asian Americans in Tempe, 1880-1980: A Historic Context with Management Recommendations*. The presenter is Zachary J. Lechner, City of Tempe Historic Preservation Officer.**

Dr. Lechner gave a presentation on the historic context study titled *Asians and Asian Americans in Tempe, 1880-1980*. Dr. Lechner stated that in 2022, the HPO applied for and received a \$20,000 Certified Local Government Pass-Through Grant administered by SHPO for completion of an Asian and Asian Americans in Tempe historic context study. Commonwealth Heritage Group (now Chronicle Heritage) was selected as the contractor, which researched and drafted the study in 2022 and 2023. The HPO reviewed multiple drafts and offered comments. The HPO found the report acceptable and sent to SHPO, which did not ask for any revisions. The historic context fulfills two main tasks. One is to provide a narrative history of Asians and Asian Americans in Tempe from 1880-1980. The second is to assess the significance of and provide management recommendations for properties associated with members of the city's Asian and Asian American community throughout the 1880-1980 period. Staff requested that the Commission advance a motion to recommend adoption of this historic context study. If the HPC were to pass such a motion, then the item would move on to the City Council. Council would then vote on whether to adopt the context study.

Chair Woodson stated that this study has been a long time coming and he is very pleased to see it's been completed. He said he found the study very interesting.

Commissioner Justice said she appreciated that the contractor recognized properties that don't exist anymore. Sometimes you can get lost in the buildings that are here, people think if it does not still exist, it's not worth acknowledging.

Commissioner Lamp stated that she was impressed with the level of detail and archival research. She asked Dr. Lechner if he would be the appropriate person to send line-item edits to? Dr. Lechner stated, yes.

Vice Chair Fackler said that as he read through the properties in the study, he noticed that there are so many in the downtown area he and his former colleagues with the City were involved with as part of redevelopment projects. The study talked about the Peterson Shipman building on the east side of Mill Avenue. There were nice artifacts that were found there, Vice Chair Fackler stated.

Chair Woodson asked, how many context studies will this make now for the city? Dr. Lechner stated it is two at this point. Possibly three.

**Motion** by Vice Chair Fackler to approve request for recommendation of adoption of historic context study titled *Asians and Asian Americans in Tempe, 1880-1980: A Historic Context with Management Recommendations*; second by Commissioner Williams. Motion passed on **8-0** vote.

**Ayes:** Chair Woodson, Vice Chair Fackler, Commissioners Davis, Williams, Kurooka, Melcher, Lamp, and Justice

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Commissioner Robinson

**7) Presentation on Request for Proposals (RFP) for redevelopment of City-owned land, consisting of approximately 0.34 acres located at 401-405 South Maple Avenue, directly east of the Tempe Historic Property Register-designated Hackett House and Tempe (Hilge) Bakery building. The presenter is Zachary J. Lechner.**

Dr. Lechner gave a presentation on the request for proposals (RFP) for redevelopment of the City-owned land located at 401-405 South Maple Avenue. This was done upon the request of Tempe Sister Cities, which is the community organization that leases from the City of Tempe the Hackett House and Hilge Bakery building. The project area excludes the two historic buildings. There will be no changes or demolition to the historic buildings. Because the project area partially falls within parcels with historic overlays, as the selected developer's projects goes through the planning process, the HPC will have an opportunity to weigh in on the project. The City encourages the developer to provide some affordable residential units. Dr. Lechner discussed some of the items that the City is looking for in the proposals. These items include residential units (for sale and/or rent), a boutique hotel, and a 3,500 square-foot conference or event hall. Materials on the first-floor exterior are to match the design elements of the adjacent historic buildings. Floors above the first level should be composed of modern materials and include modern design elements. The request for proposals will stay open for a few weeks. After the submission period closes, a committee that includes Principle Planner Ambika Adhikari, Dr. Lechner, and other City staff members will review and select a proposal.

Vice Chair Fackler stated after the rush to demolition with the Watson's Flower building based on an affordable housing strategy, he definitely does not want to see something like that happen again. Dr. Lechner stated that the Hackett House and Hilge Bakery are City-owned buildings, which makes this a very different situation. Also, they are both designated in the Tempe Historic Property Register. Now or at any point in the future, if there was an intent to demolish these buildings, the HPC would have to approve a demolition permit request. Vice Chair Fackler asked if there was anything in the document that limits Tempe Sister Cities from being part of the ownership of the new project? Dr. Lechner stated that Tempe Sister Cities would still be the lessee (tenant), with the City retaining ownership.

Commissioner Kurooka stated that she is disappointed to hear about the project only after the RFP came out. There were opportunities to discuss the concept before the RFP was finalized. When the City has tried to get something out of other developers, the City did not get what it wanted, including, for example, the I.D.E.A. Campus and Farmer Arts. A boutique hotel is included, and with many more hotels being built, are they financially stable, Commissioner Kurooka asked? This property is very tiny for a high-rise. She said she is very concerned what it will look like. Dr. Lechner stated that it concerns him too. That is why HPC and HPO input is going to be so important during the review process. There are City buildings that have been constructed by private developers. Dr. Lechner said the RFP came to him late in the process. It was already finalized by the time he saw it. Community Development staff was present in the executive sessions with City Council and were able to provide a historic preservation perspective.

Chair Woodson asked, once the selected proposal from the RFP submissions is available, will the HPC get a chance to see it? Dr. Lechner stated he will need to see how the developer will handle the process. He said he will request that the selected developer come to the HPC and present their concepts and give the opportunity for the Commission to ask questions. That will probably be later in the year. Chair Woodson said that the HPC did not have a chance to comment on any of this before the RFP was issued. He said he is

finding it hard to understand why the City would be seeking such a high-rise development—not to exceed 250 feet, with 65 dwelling units per acre—on this parcel. Who made the decision to have this developed to that degree, he asked? Dr. Lechner stated he believed that was made by City Council. Most of the conversations about this topic occurred during executive sessions. Chair Woodson asked, how many stories would 250 feet be? Dr. Lechner stated that it would be 20 stories. Chair Woodson said that seems like it will be extremely out of place in that location. I don't see how it couldn't affect the integrity of the historic buildings, he stated. Also, no parking is going to be required. How is that possible? Where will people park? Dr. Lechner stated that it is going to be the same thing for the Hayden Flour Mill redevelopment. The idea is that there is plenty of downtown public parking available. It is going to be a tall building, and the HPO and the HPC must be diligent and provide input where they can.

Mr. Adhikari stated that some processes, like RFPs, go through a particular channel in the City. Typically, there is a pressure to build high-rises in downtown developments. In downtown areas, if you can avoid having to include parking in the building structure, you get a much better design. It was same in downtown Phoenix for a while, too; onsite parking for developments was not required there.

Chair Woodson said this RFP is calling for 20-story-high residential apartment complex, with some affordable housing and no parking required. The proposed project at the Watson's Flowers property is two stories, and the City is requiring much more parking. That was one of the reasons the Tempe Community Action Agency stated that it would have to demolish Watson's Flowers—so they could make room for parking. Why do City managers/people who participate in the planning process have such divergent directives and requirements, Chair Woodson asked? He also said he is pleased the historic buildings are protected in the Hackett House site RFP. Dr. Lechner stated that the Hackett House and Watson's Flowers locations are in different parts of the city with very different public transportation situations. It is East Apache Boulevard versus the center of downtown. Chair Woodson said he did not agree with that at all.

Vice Chair Fackler stated that one thing you do not see in the site photo included in Dr. Lechner's PowerPoint presentation is a 12-inch-high Southwest Gas pressure gas line running north-south through a portion of the site. You also do not see a massive 24-foot-deep telecommunications complex that runs north-south through the alley. The last time the City dealt with the telecommunications line, it was told that it would cost \$250,000 an hour to displace the line. There was a challenging situation in Chandler with that same line where someone attempted to build over it. Those items should be included in the RFP review. Dr. Lechner stated he will make sure staff is aware.

Commissioner Justice stated that she works across the street from the Hackett House site. Twenty stories would absolutely dwarf not only the historic buildings, but literally everything else around it. She said she finds it ironic that we are providing affordable housing and then not providing free parking. If you are going to provide affordable housing, you should provide people a place to park for free.

Chair Woodson stated that the affordable housing sounded like an afterthought in the proposal. It does not sound like it is required. Dr. Lechner stated that the RFP says it is "encouraged."

Commissioner Melcher asked if the two buildings in front are both two stories. If the proposal for the high-rise is 20 stories or fewer, why would the City only call for the use of materials on the first floor that are compatible with the historic buildings? Dr. Lechner stated he does not know what the reasoning was behind that decision. He said it may be because the first floor is at street level, so the desire might be for more visual continuity. It will be important to review the design, not only the size of the building, but the appearance of the building and how well it meshes with the historic buildings. Commissioner Melcher stated that she echoes many of the other Commissioners' concerns.

Commissioner Justice stated that constructing a large modern building directly adjacent to historic buildings is not in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, because it would result in a serious alteration of the setting of those two buildings. Dr. Lechner stated that is a good point, but we will have to see what the design looks like and go from there.

## 8) Chair/Staff Updates and Announcements

Chair Woodson stated he does not have any announcements but would like an update on the City's proposed changes to ADUs. He asked if things were moving forward as discussed in the previous HPC meeting in April.

Mr. Ryan Levesque, Community Development Deputy Director stated, yes, he received direction from City Council to move forward on the ordinance draft. He and other staff are working on the draft now and hopes to make it public by early August. Department representatives are planning to present on the proposed ordinance at a City Council regular meeting in late August, September, or October of this year. The City is obligated by state law to adopt the ordinance by January 1, 2025. The City will be following the state-mandated House Bill 2721, which places limitations on what a municipality can and cannot do in regard to ADUs. Chair Woodson asked Mr. Levesque if he foresees that going forward as expected? Are there any other issues that have come up? Mr. Levesque stated it is pretty much as discussed in the hearings. Regarding some of the concerns about limitations on parking, the State had restricted municipalities from requiring additional parking. Various comments or opinions received about parking are no longer valid because the City can't require parking for ADUs. Mr. Levesque said he hopes to have a public review process in the month of August so that staff can collect comments online or at the public hearing, which may occur at the August DRC Meeting or at the first DRC meeting in September. Chair Woodson stated that he had made some suggestions for City staff to discuss, and there was mention that staff would discuss possibly adding incentives for people that own historic-eligible or historic-designated properties. Mr. Levesque stated that he would like to continue that conversation. At the same time, as staff is drafting the ordinance, they are conducting further research on how to create streamlined processes or having pre-approved plans that might have some sustainability elements to them. Chair Woodson asked, when you say have a meeting, do you mean a meeting with the Commission? Mr. Levesque stated, yes, with everyone here to discuss boundaries or what type of incentives you are looking to establish for ADUs. Chair Woodson stated that he has a little concern with this because Mr. Levesque stated initially that he was not expecting 40-50 applications the first year, but this seems like a program that could really take off. People who were not thinking about redeveloping their property, when they see that opportunity, might jump at it. That should be something to discuss.

Mr. Adhikari gave an update on Character Area 6, Southwest Tempe. The document draft was released on June 14. The survey will close on July 22. He encouraged the Commissioners to review the draft and let staff know if they have any questions. He said that staff plans to present at the DRC meeting on September 13 and to City Council in October.

Chair Woodson asked for an update on the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Dr. Lechner said there is a meeting tomorrow, Thursday, July 11, with Community Development staff and the City Attorney's Office to hopefully finalize the draft. The draft will then go to the HPC to review and comment on via email before moving to City Council. Chair Woodson asked if Dr. Lechner can share what the issue is that is still being discussed after six months. Dr. Lechner stated many of the delays have resulted from the City Attorney's Office's schedule and because all parties want to make sure the language is correct from a legal standpoint. Mr. Levesque stated that once the City Attorney's Office is comfortable with staff's draft language, staff will forward a copy to the HPC for review. Chair Woodson asked that all significant changes from earlier drafts be highlighted. Dr. Lechner agreed to do that.

Dr. Lechner stated that there are not currently any agenda items scheduled for the August HPC Meeting.

Meeting Adjourned by Chair Woodson.

Hearing adjourned at 8:06 PM.

Prepared by: Jennifer Daniels, Administrative Assistant  
Reviewed by: Zachary Lechner, Historic Preservation Officer  
jd:zl