

MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 12, 2020

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Historic Preservation commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held at the Hatton Hall, 34 East Seventh Street, Tempe, Arizona.

Regular Meeting 6:05 PM

Present:	Staff:
Chuck Buss, Chair	Chad Weaver, Community Development Director
Martin Ball, Vice-Chair	Alex Smith, Deputy Director of Special Projects
Matthew Bilsbarrow	Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner
Chris Garraty	Ambika Adhikari, Principal Planner
Jim Garrison	John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
Elizabeth Gilbert	Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant
Gregory Larson	
Laurence Montero	
Joe Nucci	

1) Voting of the Meeting Minutes

Motion by Vice Chair Ball to approve the Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2019; second by Commissioner Gilbert. Motion passed on 9-0 vote.

Ayes: Chuck Buss, Martin Ball, Matthew Bilsbarrow, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Gregory Larson, Laurence Montero, Joe Nucci

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

- 2) Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Detached Carport at the Raymond (Hausman) House, located at 1108 South Maple Avenue

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the board that the house was built in 1936. The applicant has supplied the plans, cut sheet for the materials, in addition to photos of the home. This is for the detached carport there is currently a shade like carport in place. The detached carport will be constructed to place in the existing driveway boundary. There will be a slanted roof. It would extend beyond the front of the house however given the detached nature and the compatibility with the existing patio it will not have any adverse integrity of the home. Staff recommends approval.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball

Vice Chair Ball asked if the applicant was present at the meeting. Vice Chair Ball was wonder where the placement of the carport was to the façade of the house. He is aware that in other instances where there is a sensitive property the Commission prefer for the front of the carport to be recessive from the façade of the house.

The Applicant explained that the purpose was to space it out so that two vehicles can fit underneath. There is a large divider that blends into the area.

Chair Buss stated that he had the same thought process to why the carport is forward so much.

The applicant stated that there is a fence and a gate going across the driveway that cannot be opened all the way to pull a car in forward. In order to get both vehicles underneath the area for shade.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball asked for clarification of where the fence and the gate are on site.

The applicant pointed out to Vice Chair ball on the documents where the obstruction is.

Vice Chair Ball asked Mr. Southard if the commissioners act then the applicant will bring final plans to the city for the permits and then it will be signed off on with the commissioner's recommendations.

Mr. Southard stated that is correct.

Motion by Commissioner Nucci to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for a Detached Carport at the Raymond (Hausman) House, located at 1108 South Maple Avenue; second by Vice Chair Ball. Motion passed on 9-0 vote.

Ayes: Chuck Buss, Martin Ball, Matthew Bilsbarrow, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Gregory Larson, Laurence Montero, Joe Nucci

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

3) Tempe / Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study Presentation 11:20

Presentation by, Omar Peters, Planner III with Valley Metro

Eric Iwerson informed that the commissioners that the streetcar project is expected to be operational next summer 2021. As that is nearing completion the City is looking at extensions to that route. Really a bigger picture of where the East Valley and Tempe high volume rail transits are looking forward for the next 20 – 40 years. With the regional transportation plan and tax that is expiring in the end of 2024/2025. They are presenting the same prestation to the City Council the next day. They are looking to go to the Council in May to gain their support for the project's final corridor for the streetcar extension project. These are unfunded projects right now, so it is a big factor in what happens next with the rail system. Mr. Iwerson then introduced the Commissioners to Mr. Peters from Valley Metro.

Mr. Peters informed the commissioners that the cities of Tempe and Mesa have partnered with Valley Metro to evaluate streetcar as a high capacity transit option. The focus is on the Western boundaries of Tempe which is Priest Drive and in Mesa it is Country Club; also, the North parts are 202 down to Baseline Road; the downtown area of Tempe ASU area and over in East Mesa to help them connect. They are working on the next steps that they will need to take place to make everything work like the regional tax plan to help fund the project. The process started with identifying areas with the High density so where is the existing transit system peak travel areas. The next two steps are the Core of the Elevation which is a two-tier process. The first is looking at what is going on in the area are they feasible for a high transit compacity. Then in tier two looking at the corridors if they were to build

the transit area how will it impact the people and the environment and the transit area, now that is where the study is at. The next step is to take the information to the council of City of Tempe and Mesa in the May/June time frame. On the map that was provided they choose all the areas in green the ones that they did not choose was on Broadway Road because it overlaps the current transit in place. They also choose to do the Gammage curve to Southern because it has an underlining curve for the streetcar system, but it is going down further South. There is more data and new information that is coming and changes from the last year. The data that they gathered helped them form what the impact would be the positive and the negatives. This information fits into six sections mobility improvements, access opportunities, potential impacts, land use/ economic development potential, costs, and efficiencies. Mobility improvements are to see how it will improve with people needing to get around. Looking at how many trips would be on that system. Access is to see how people will get to it with the projection of future people in the area. How people are going to connect into the system are there bike lanes. Is there an existing transit system that is available? Would need to be a bridge which could also impact the cost of the product. Economic development what do the cities plan for the corridors. Are there any enhanced developments that would require more transits giving people the choice of doing other things besides driving to get there? The Cost is very high level where the one would look at a cost per mile. The longer project would be more sense to build. With the added-on cost of structures being built. There are also operation costs. Then the efficiencies would be if they are reliable and easy to get onto the system. Is there a long delay for the system and they need to do a turnaround, will there be a lot of turns in the system?

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball asked that while the group was evaluating the protentional routes is there consideration to the future regional transit system aligned with the freight tracks.

Mr. Peters stated yes, they are looking at a regional transit system from the far east valley to Tucson with the existing freight network.

Mr. Peters then informed the Commissioners that the results from walking through of all the list is that on Rio East the end of the rail line. Going through Tempe Marketplace and Mesa into Mesa Riverview is being built up. There is a lot of transit market there and it is more of an Industrial area. There is already an existing transit center that connects that area as well. There are coming along that may make that area a high lead. In addition to that there is no existing transit bus system that connects the activity centers yet. There was the Local Route 48 that is terminated in Tempe at Tempe Marketplace no routes go through. In that area there is a 14-foot easement for transit. Which allows for a few impacts to have a dedicated transit. In the area of Rural going south to Tempe Library area and then west over to Mill Avenue. This section has been looked at as a potential area for MAG and it is an area for a high need of future transit investment. The existing route opposite Rural Rio Salado East there is a route there that runs through Chandler into Tempe and into Scottsdale that preforms very well. There are some challenges one being it is built out already in the area, there are not a lot of development that will be happening. There is a potential for right of way impacts and there would need to be a bridge built over that area. The next is Mesa Dobson Country Club area that connects to a lot of the activity centers in the East Mesa area. Broadway and Southern on Dobson is coined as the ASU Mesa district plus Mesa Community College and the former Fiesta Mall. Which the city sees as prime for development. The issues there is that it is very long, and it will be very costly to build. Rio West coming from Tempe Beach Park past TCA and over to Priest. It has been identified in previous studies that there is a lot of development opportunities. Especially up the River with City properties that can be developed there. It is not shown as a very strong corridor now, but there is a lot of future potential there. In Mesa they are looking at connecting the existing light rail system that will run Downtown Mesa to Rio area. The Big problem area is mostly in Chandler. Looking at the movability needs there are a lot of potential impact. In the next steps there are some multi-tier analyst. And they will be going to Council to discuss the study as well.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Bilsbarrow.

Commissioner Bilsbarrow stated that on the map there are Historic properties and to keep those in mind.

Mr. Peters stated that was quantified in the analyst.

Mr. Iwerson stated when some of the projects get the funding then they will go through the same process as the streetcar project. Where with the funding it will go through the clearance process and review the impacts. To make sure that they are preserving and not causing any concerns for the commissions.

4) Parks & Recreation Master Plan Presentation

Presentation by Staff, Craig Hayton, Development Community Services Director of Parks and Recreation

Mr. Hayton informed the Commissioners that the last time they did a 2001 Master Plan was in 2001. The department is ten years overdue. The goal is that this will be the first of three touches of the commissioners. There are four key points that will be touched on in the presentation which are what is the Parks and Rec Master Plan, Where Parks and Rec is to date, where they are headed next, and what they are trying to accomplish and anything that they need to keep in mind. They are planning to take the information out to the public and then come back and fill them in on the information hopefully by May. With the understanding that the Parks and Rec Masterplan is the high-level overall system level view. They are not drilling into just one part it is really evaluating all the programs. This a compressive plan that covers parks the physical spaces. The recreation facilities that are available through Tempe and then also the programs. It looks at shared views of the recreation facilities as well with Schools. It is considered what is currently going on in Tempe with elevation contracts. As well as key recommendations for the next ten years. To make sure that Tempe is providing the services that the amenities are providing the services that are serving the customers. The key piece for the Historic Preservation Commission would be what is the relationship between the parks and recreation plan to other plans that the Parks and Recreation team manages. The master plan is really informed by other plans that already have happened. The general plan and the open space piece and review of the Parks and Recreation plan but also the completed plans in the last two years with the regional park. Then also with the 2019 Rio Salado Beach park plan. The team doesn't want to do anything that doesn't take everything into consideration. The team is working to make sure they are consistent with the plans with use and improvements of the programs and activities. The Clark Park, Pool and Aquic amenities and park plans that the team is working on. Then beyond that there is the cemetery that is very historic in nature. Beyond that there is the Peterson house, as well as individual areas in the downtown area that the team is trying to make sure they are being sensitive to. There is a recognition that the cemetery is not a park traditionally, but it is within the Park and Recreation system. Tempe is 40 square miles but there is so much diversity in the area. There ae multiple people that are working on the Masterplan. There is a project team that is working very closely with the consultant and the technical advisory committee. This is made of people from multiple departments. The prime consultant is Planet Community. The final three are the public facing opportunities in early December to provide information to Council. Where they went into great length about the survey results. The team is engaging with the Boards and Commissions, Council, and the Public meetings with the same time period so that they are not jumping steps. There are multiple layers in delivering the information and a lot of cross over with activities. There has been a completed online survey, trends analyst, benchmarking all the services to help compare Tempe with other jurisdictions. Figuring out how much Tempe would like to be with the other jurisdictions. There is also a program assessment and parks identification updates. One factor is knowing how many Parks there are in Tempe. For instance, with Tempe Town Lake there are multiple parks within a parks system how does one gather them. Tempe is trying to be on the same page as others and make sure they area accounting for the parks correctly. The team will be back in the spring to provide more information on what they heard and learned. Then coming back in the Summer Fall with a Draft version. The things that they accomplished today are the Online Survey and focus group which are the first outreach to the public. There were 12 focus groups involved. The team also sent out a survey and received over 1800 results back. Which help the team to see what is keeping people from recreation in Tempe, what do they enjoy doing, and what is the frequency. When the team comes back in the Spring, they want to be able to talk to the program assessment, how they are doing with the programs that they are offering, the parks and rec inventory amenities as well as the overall parks.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball stated that he does have three points that he noted one being that several of the Parks particularly along the river are in sensitive culture areas would be that as there are future amenities considered with in the parks to highlight the history both recent and prehistoric. The question that he has is wether or not there is a plan to engage with the Four Southern Tribes. The second item is that historic preservation is not only the physical things

that are built but rather the creature of the vegetation. The presence or lack of presence from the water canal system which is a huge part of why Tempe is what Tempe is. One of the things that has a value is that the trees are big and lush in areas where the canal and in the area that there is not accessible it has very different character. The last point is that Tempe is land locked and it is growing so the density of use is going to continue to be a challenge. The question then is how the nexus of use for all ages is and getting them to the parks.

Mr. Hayton stated that reaching out to the Tribes is something that they will take into consideration especially at the management level. Regarding connectivity the team is working on that because as they are surveying the residents most of them use trails and pathways rather, they realize that is a park amenity or not. The team is very aware that connectivity is huge. With the density the team is proposing an urban park. Due there being high density and low acreage. This isn't something that doesn't have to be on Public property it can be on private property as well for public use.

Chair Buss acknowledges Robbie Aaron.

Mr. Aaron stated that he is on the technology advisory committee and working with the consult to coordinate their plan with the team's efforts with the UCD. With the spaces that they are trying to work with there are private properties that are combined, and it goes back to the urban park and parks are going in the future.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Bilsbarrow.

Commissioner Bilsbarrow stated that there are two golf courses the one that is next to the Papago park preserve and wanted to make sure they are sensitive of that area and the impact that the team has on the preserve. The golf course to the South that is next the generation station has a large archaeological site and some the plant may extend into some of the golf course area. Then there is A mountain which is getting more use and having the connection to Mill Ave is having one of the drivers.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Nucci.

Commissioner Nucci expressed his appreciation for the team reaching out and including the HPC in the process. There are several properties that overlap Tempe Butte Preserve such as Peterson park. Some of the other resources that are not under the team's operational control but are on the Historic Property register is the Elias-Rodriguez house is underutilized.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball stated that the property for Urban park and open space in a dense area is only going to make the area denser. In working with development teams with the requirements to open space is if one is to decade the open space attached to the public way the responsibility for policing the activities on private property with development of open space is a sticking point. The more that the team deals with how to deal with those types of situations up front will help the process in the long run.

- 5) Urban Core Master Plan / Urban Code District Project Team Development Bonus Program and Transferrable Development Rights Presentation and Possible Commission Action

Presentation by Staff, Ambika Adhikari, Principal Planner

Mr. Adhikari informed the Commissioners that the focus of the presentation is on how the Bonus program affects the Historic Preservation areas. There was a draft Ordinance provided to the Commissioners in reference to the transfer of Historic preservation rights. The Bonus program has four different elements which are affordable housing, public gathering space, sustainability, historic preservation through transfer of development rights also known as TDR. Mr. Adhikari stated he will not be covering all of those today his focus will be on the TDR. He then went over the seven districts on the map with the Commissioners. The most concern at this moment would be the UC-2 along the transit routes. Most of the historic properties are in the downtown area. With the Urban Core District program once you opt in then you get basic heights and density however the historic properties are protected.

Unless you opt in and provide the conservation easement. In order to take part in the Bonus program you need to gather enough points which you can obtain by providing affordable housing on site or through the public gathering space. Staff has investigated some other cities who already have the TDR in place. The City of Surprise has used the open space and Staff has spoken to planners in the area and found out that it is not user friendly. With the City of Scottsdale there were a few takers.

Mr. Adhikari informed the board that the process would be that they opt in and get a Conservation Easement for TDR. A conservation easement is just a way that the city has to show the economic footprint and air rights that are needed by the Historic Preservation Standards. If you have a property that becomes the sending property, then there are steps to get this completed. Then they will need to sever rights via rezoning overlay. Staff will then calculate, sever, and transfer the development right this will mean entering into a development agreement with the City. Followed by recording the severance and enter the development right in a register. Then transfer and use rights in which the City has option to purchase and hold development rights. While the receiving property also register interest. The receiving properties get rezoned via an overlay. The TDR can be on hold and used in the future at that point. Staff has made a lot of outreach to reach the public with 14 public meeting, 5 focus groups, 30 stakeholders' meetings, 6 public hearings and 212,664 postcards mailed out. In summary the Development Bonus program can create certainty and predictability in development environment through a largely administrative process. Development Bonus program helps obtain public benefits in exchange for additional density and height. The Development Bonus program provides a tool for Historic Preservation through TDR process. The Arizona state law established procedures for TDR. Some of the Arizona Jurisdictions utilize TDR for the preservation of open space and cultural resources. The next steps do include staff going to Council.

Chair Buss stated that he thinks staff has come a long way with this however he feels that it still needs more clarification. He would like to see more specific information, what they have so far is a good start.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball stated that he is happy the work that was done in house and with the consulting firm to flesh out a path forward. The value in the efforts of Staff is that which will affect very few properties and may have a narrow pay off but is wonderful to have in place.

Chair Buss acknowledges Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith stated that there is a limited pool, but a lot of the properties are not part of the National Registered eligibility. The City does not have easement for them, so this be a good tool.

Mr. Southard stated that there is a pre-1961 survey in the works. And working to make sure that there is language in the Ordinance.

Mr. Adhikari stated that there is language in the Draft Ordinance.

Chair Buss acknowledges Mr. Aaron.

Mr. Aaron stated that if the program does pass then there is potentially down the road for opportunities to expand beyond just the UC. The way the language is drafted in the Zoning code is that is its own section and could apply to more than just one area.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Bilsbarrow.

Commissioner Bilsbarrow stated speaking to the shallow pool that staff should think about opening it up to properties that are 45 years or older since some development projects take their way to work through the process. Something that he would like to see in the plan regarding the affordable housing is that he would like to see it change rather it be on site or from the extended historic property.

Mr. Adhikari stated that the affordable housing is part of a separate category. However, to clarify that if the developer wants, they can provide 3 percent of that what is affordable to 50 percent of the people or write a check to the affordable house fund.

Mr. Smith stated that the issue that might not have been clear is the overlay. Which is that it is a reverse PAD and there is an Overlay that goes on top of that to restrict what the developer can do. However, it does not change the underline zoning so whatever is or is not allowed in the underline zoning would go.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball asked regarding TDR that the mechanism that allows for several cities does it prohibit City owned properties from developing the transferable right and there by becoming a potential funding for the maintenance of structures that the city might own.

Mr. Aaron stated according to his understanding that the option has to be there for the city to purchase and hold development rights. So, there shouldn't be a problem purchasing and holding while it gains more value.

Vice Chair Ball stated that with the ideal that the goal is to preserve what the City can to help not getting stepped on would be ideal.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Garraty.

Commissioner Garraty asked if this is something that can be transferred through archaeological properties and culturally sensitive places like the tribe.

Mr. Adhikari stated that one of the technical instruments with the consultant they used was what is called a performance in which you can put the bonus point on what is valued. So, the majority of the things in the affordable housing are based on getting extra height, something of value. Where with archaeological is valued as it is.

Mr. Smith stated that when someone preserves something or rehab it is hard to tell what the value is.

Commissioner Bilbarrow stated that with the Draft Ordinance the definition of the Historic sites is muddled throughout. Would like to see clarity in the document.

Mr. Southard stated that there could be an agreement like previous sites an example would be 100 Mill where they initially call out archaeological and craft a solution for it.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball stated that the graphic description of the air rights and setting aside the severed rights. It would be helpful as the Staff is working through Council that he carve out what was done downtown has required 30-foot set back. Does carving that out there by significantly reduce the potential of the properties owners to benefit from the program.

Mr. Adhikari stated that it is clear that what is building has requirements. And even if they have to, they will build it like stated. However, the Department Director wants to give incentives.

Mr. Smith stated that it will be taken into consideration and that there are constant talks in the office.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Larson.

Commissioner Larson asked what the benefit is of preserving and where is the money. Where he is understanding is that the property owner will be selling the development rights to the City. Then would the City be paying the property owner.

Mr. Smith stated that the City does the paperwork to serve the rights and someone must come and buy it. Till someone comes and buy the rights. The City doesn't have to be involved but they can be. If the City does get involved it will be a benefit to all properties.

6) Selection of 2020 Historic Preservation Award Winners

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Title

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that the Historic Preservation Awards is something that they have taken part in the past years all though not last year due to a lack of content. The main purpose is to present awards bases upon their work with project like Gila River Indian Community for funding the Intern Program, Salt River Project for their work on the community ditch. The 2020 awards are based on work done in 2019. The suggestion would be for Commission consideration and recognizing of the 100 Mill and Hayden House project. The projects can be recognized specifically for individual projects. This is a good way to demonstrate value with Historic Preservation project and high profile. With great attention to detail and with great economic development project. That is the construction of the office tower and shortly after a hotel. While preserving the oldest building in the Salt River Valley and while undertaken and update compressive archeological legation.

Chair Buss acknowledges Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith stated that a lot of people always talk about Public and Private partnerships like an abstract thing. However, with the purposed projects there was a lot of hard work. Cousins was a great partner throughout the process. They are always easy to work with. Everyone has done the right thing they have all listened as to why something is being done.

Chair Buss acknowledges Commissioner Bilsbarrow.

Commissioner Bilsbarrow stated that he agrees however the Hayden House is not done. However, the archeology is and so it could be split up.

Mr. Smith stated that while it is not quite done the COO is in close proximity. The process is far enough along that it is a minor technicality.

Mr. Southard agrees with both sides. He also stated that he would like to highlight the partnership.

Chair Buss acknowledges Vice Chair Ball.

Vice Chair Ball stated that he agrees that the narrative and the story does not have quite the same punch if it is split up and he also appreciate the concern for the detail. To highlight another aspect of preservation there might be an opportunity rather there is still work going on top of the Mountain rather this year or next year. And has far more talking points in regard to archeology. Which might be another way to bring to the front the archeology and culture resources.

Mr. Southard stated that there is no limit to the number of awards that are presented.

Chair Buss stated that there is also a chance to mention Hayden House once the restoration is finished.

Commissioner Nucci stated that another milestone was Papago Park preserve.

Motion by Vice Chair Ball to provide the 2020 Historic Preservation Award to the teamwork displayed between all partners displayed at the Hayden House; second by Commissioner Garrison. Motion passed on 9-0 vote.

Ayes: Chuck Buss, Martin Ball, Matthew Bilsbarrow, Chris Garraty, Jim Garrison, Elizabeth Gilbert, Gregory Larson, Laurence Montero, Joe Nucci

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

7) Hayden House Update

Mr. Southard informed the Commissioners that the Windows are in and the North Side is close to being finished. The East side has many layers of coating and some areas that need to be repaired. There is a great deal of effort put into the project more than was expected or required with the door's and all the hardware. The Staff is still waiting for the protection plan in regard to the Adobe from future work.

8) Chair / Staff Updates

Mr. Southard informed the Commission that Craig Hayden had a retreat for his employees and arranged a meeting with the Salt River Project.

Moor park has had some vandalism with the flipping over of tables. There has been some investigation on getting some that can be blotted, in Moor park South of the Hill to the East. The benches are created out of rail but are not listed as concrete benches.

9) Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items

Monday February 24th there is an Open House of the Council Chambers from 4pm-6pm.

February 19, 2020 at 6pm at the Tempe History Museum is the candidate forum.

Future Home of the Historic Preservation Committee will be in Council Chambers starting in April.

Next Month is the Hayden Fair Days Starting Wednesday Night March 4,2020.

Hearing adjourned at 8:28pm

Prepared by: Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant

Reviewed by:

Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner

SA:bn