



**NOTICE OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE TOWN
OF CLARKDALE**

Tuesday, May 3, 2022 6:30 PM

In accordance with Resolution #215 of the Town of Clarkdale, and Section 38-431.02, Arizona Revised Statutes, **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Historic Preservation Commission of the Town of Clarkdale will hold a Regular Meeting Tuesday, May 3, 2022 at 6:30 p.m., at the Men's Lounge, Clark Memorial Clubhouse, 19 N. Ninth Street, Clarkdale, AZ. Those wishing to attend via Zoom may do so at the link below:

<https://zoom.us/j/9554994085>

Meeting ID: 955 499 4085

+16699006833,,9554994085# US (San Jose)
+12532158782,,9554994085# US (Tacoma)

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** The public is invited to provide comments at this time. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision on a later agenda, as required by the Arizona Open Meeting Law. Each speaker is asked to limit comments to **FIVE MINUTES**.
4. **MINUTES:**
 - A. Minutes of the April 5, 2022 Regular Meeting
 - B. Minutes of the September 1, 2021 Regular Meeting
 - C. Minutes of the October 7, 2021 Joint Meeting of the Design Review Board and the Historic Preservation Commission
5. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS:**
 - A. Questers Grant – Cindy Emmett
6. **STAFF MEMBER REPORTS:**
 - A. HPC Notebooks
 - B. Bank Teller Walls
 - C. HVAC – Auditorium
7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**
8. **NON-PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS: None**
9. **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**
 - A. Bandstand Improvements
 - B. Interpretive Signage

C. Interpretive Signage Program – Existing Historic Markers

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

11. ADJOURNMENT:

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The Town of Clarkdale endorses civil discourse. If you wish to speak at this meeting, please:

- **Click on the “Chat” icon at the bottom of the screen and type in your question.**
- **Wait to be recognized before you ask your question**
- **Please do not use the Chat feature for sidebar conversations.**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of this notice was duly posted on the Town Hall bulletin board, located at 890 Main Street, Clarkdale, Arizona and on the Town of Clarkdale’s website on April 25, 2022 at 5:00 p.m.



Ruth Mayday
Community Development Director

www.clarkdale.az.gov

DRAFT



MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE

Wednesday, April 5, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.
Men's Lounge, Clarkdale Memorial Clubhouse

1. **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Gibson called the meeting to order at 6:38pm.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Board Member	Present/Absent
Chairperson Gibson	Present
Commissioner Emmet	Present
Commissioner Loesche	Present
Commissioner Lindner	Present
Commissioner Baird	Present

Attending Staff
Community Development Director Ruth Mayday
Senior Planner Tom Blanchard
Community Development Technician Guss Espolt

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Valerie Thompson a resident of Clarkdale, presented an original clay bust of Senator William A. Clark. The original artwork was created by her late husband Dean Thompson, as a monument to W.A. Clark and for the understanding of tourists and locals regarding the historical involvement of Senator Clark in the town's creation. Valerie Thompson proposed that the Town could purchase the clay bust that needs to be cast in bronze for \$1,000 and the original art for \$3000. The size of the bust is 14" tall, 9" from ear to ear and 10" front to back of head.

Commission thanked Valerie Thompson for her unique presentation and will discuss further with the Town Manager.

4. **MINUTES:**

Motion to approve the following minutes: **APPROVED**

Meeting of March 1, 2022, Regular meeting minutes: **Motion** Lindner, Second Loesche

Meeting of March 30, 2022, Special meeting minutes: **Motion** Lindner, Second Emmett

Board Member	Present/Absent
Chairperson Gibson	Aye
Commissioner Emmet	Aye
Commissioner Loesche	Aye
Commissioner Lindner	Aye
Commissioner Baird	Aye

DRAFT

5. COMMISSIONER REPORTS:

- a. Quester’s update by Commissioner Emmett: Commissioner Emmett stated she is in contact with the Questers and gathering more information to present at the next meeting.
- b. Proclamation to honor Nancy Smith; Commissioner Lindner stated he will do the proclamation.

6. STAFF REPORTS:

a. Update of Historic Preservation Ordinance
Director Mayday stated that first priority is to create the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP), which has been started, and then to prioritize tasks to create the Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO), which will be started Q1 of next calendar year. Some elements of the HPP will include elements from other communities that we liked. The elements we liked are to have a more ‘informative’ user friendly format with illustrations and diagrams, rather than a dictatorial, regulatory format. The RFQ and RFP will also go out next year for the HPP and HPO.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS : None

8. NON-PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Review and approval of Bandstand Engineering Report
Director Mayday summarized the engineering report from Frost Structural Engineers for the historic bandstand, with the following areas of concerns and repair recommendations:
- 1) Deterioration of the 6x6 posts: recommend cutting off the bottom 12” of each of the foundation posts and adding a concrete pier.
 - 2) Lateral stability: adequate but recommend adding (2)5/8” diameter lag bolts to each end of each knee brace as well as SIMPSON connectors to the post to beam connections to increase stability and longevity of the structure.

Staff submitted the full engineering report for the Commission’s consideration and approval. Upon approval by the Commission, staff will forward it to the State Historic Preservation Office and request a finding of No Adverse Effect.

Lindner concerned that ADA access to the bandstand may be required.

Motion Lindner, Second Emmett
Motion to approve bandstand engineering report as written, approved.

Board Member	Aye/Nay
Chairperson Gibson	Aye
Commissioner Emmet	Aye
Commissioner Loesche	Aye
Commissioner Lindner	Aye
Commissioner Baird	Aye

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- a. Review of Strategic Plan
Director Mayday presented background at the March 1, 2022, HPC meeting and provided a draft Strategic Plan as a discussion item. Commissioners reviewed and discussed the plan, and staff is now bringing it back for additional review, with the following items added:
- 1) Draft timelines have been added
 - 2) Reference letters now match Town Code (17-8, Historic Preservation)
 - 3) Notes have been added

DRAFT

b. Creation of Advisory Committees

Director Mayday discussed the function of advisory committees to gather details on specific strategic projects related to historic preservation. The need for volunteers from the community was stressed, to get the community involved in historical preservation.

The following committees and members were formed:

- 1) Historic Inventory: Lindner and Emmett
- 2) Signage and Markers: Gibson

Additionally, members were encouraged to get the word out and to advertise the for volunteers in the local town paper “Small Talk” and possibly the Verde Valley Independent.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS :

- a. Questers
- b. Consideration off a proclamation honoring historian Nancy Smith who passed away.
- c. Building signage mounted on posts.

11. ADJOURNMENT: 7:42 p.m. Motion Emmett, Second, Baird

Chairperson Terry Gibson

Community Development Director Ruth Mayday

DRAFT MINUTES

Joint Meeting of the Design Review Board and the Historic Preservation Commission
September 1, 2021 6:30 PM
Men's Lounge, Clarkdale Memorial Clubhouse

1. Call to Order – Design Review Board

Chair Snyder called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 6:30 pm

2. Roll Call

Present

M. Foutz
M. Kaempfe
A. Kelly
R. Roberts
K. Snyder

3. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the July 7, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes. Motion by Kaempfe, second by Kelly to approve as written. 5 Yeas, 0 Nays.

4. Call to Order – Historic Preservation Commission

Chair Gibson called the Historic Preservation Commission to order at 6:40 pm.

5. Roll Call

Present

M. Lindner
E. Loesch
C. Emmett
T. Gibson

Absent

C. Backus

6. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the July 22, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes. Motion by Lindner, second by Loesch to approve minutes as written. 4 Yeas, 0 Nays.

7. Commissioner & Staff Reports:

DRB: None

HPC: Commissioner Loesch has researched the plaque near the smelter overlook and discussed having the group come up to Clarkdale and give a presentation and discuss the possibility of donating additional signage to Clarkdale.

Staff: Director Mayday discussed the upcoming Historic Preservation Conference in Tempe in October. SHPO is offering training for boards and commissions, and granting free admission to the conference for those commissioners that attend. She sent an email with a link to the sign-up for commissioners interested in attending, and a link to the conference packet.

Staff also announced Mike Gray's resignation from the town, and thanked him for his contributions.

Director Mayday also reminded the Commissioners that SHPO staff would be attending the September 23, 2021 meeting.

8. Discussion and Possible Action: Discussion and possible action by the Design Review Board and Historic Preservation Commission regarding historic signage illustrating Clarkdale's history
 - a. Historic Markers
 - b. Kiosks and other interpretive signage
 - c. Other Tourism oriented signage

Chair Snyder introduced the item. Director Mayday gave a brief power point presentation about different types of historic signage, including markers for individual buildings, historic districts and sites, and the markers throughout town created by Drake Meinke.

Board Member Kaempfe asked if the goal was for unified signage throughout town. Director Mayday replied that consistency was one goal, but that there should be some options for residents and building owners to select. She also stated that the HPC can form a subcommittee to research topics such as this; that we should think about consistent signage in the business district, and other interpretive signage may be useful as well.

Board Member Kaempfe stated that we were not really talking about uniformity; people would have some choices; Director Mayday agreed, and stated that we would have an accepted color list and accepted sign list from which people could choose.

Director Mayday encouraged the board members and commissioners to discuss how they wanted the signage to appear.

Chair Gibson asked who pays for the sign; Director Mayday answered that the building owners usually pay for the signs. She also pointed out that the Pomeroy Foundation provides free historic signage to municipalities.

Board Member Kelly asked for clarification regarding what kind of signs we were discussing for the buildings – was it just an historic marker? Director Mayday responded yes; that we were not tackling window signs, wall signs, or pole signs, just historic markers.

Commissioner Lindner asked if grants were available for projects like this. Director Mayday stated that there might be some funding available, but additional research would be necessary. Perhaps partnering with the Museum or Clarkdale Downtown Business Alliance would make the project fundable.

Board Member Foutz asked how much the plaques cost. Director Mayday deferred to Drake Meinke, who stated that they cost about \$200 to \$300 for the small oval plaques; larger ones sized for commercial buildings would be about \$1,000 to \$2,000. He stated that the marker in front of the museum was about \$2,500.

Chair Snyder inquired about the materials and whether or not they were a flat/smooth surface; Director Mayday stated that the letters were indeed raised against a color background.

Board Member Kelly stated that he could understand having a couple of sizes, but felt that the smaller round or square signs would look more consistent if they were the same throughout. He stated that if we were going to standardize the signage, it ought to be consistent.

Board Member Kelly asked if the building owner has the option to not do anything; Director Mayday stated no, participation would be optional.

Chair Gibson agreed with Member Kelly's assessment of different signage being confusing to visitors, and felt that consistency would make it easier for visitors to follow along. Commissioner Emmett agreed and stated that to her, uniformity is what we should be striving for.

Director Mayday agreed and stated that this kind of detail was why we were holding a joint meeting, so that the details could be discussed between both boards; perhaps a subcommittee could be formed to do additional research and bring back more options for the board and commission to consider.

Chair Gibson mentioned the residential areas and the historic signage on individual homes throughout Clarkdale.

Commissioner Lindner stated that he felt Jerome had a good signage program that was consistent in design and that you could walk up and down the street and read about the history of the buildings and sites. He also mentioned that the signs also included an image of what the building looked like.

Commissioner Emmet mentioned that Drake had done quite a bit of research and had some samples; and asked whether a subcommittee was really necessary.

Director Mayday then invited Drake Meinke to the podium to discuss his research on historic signage. He thanked both the board and the commission for their hard work. He then proceeded to discuss the National Trust for Historic Preservation building signage and minimum requirements. He commented that realtors take pictures of the historic markers and include them in their listings when they list homes with them. He also emphasized that Clarkdale has 387 structures on the National Register, which was one of the larger municipal historic districts in the country.

Drake also discussed the need to change up the signage in downtown and create a destination; that the important factor is that the historic signage not look like what other communities are doing. He then described the difference between a listed building like the Clarkdale Clubhouse, and an individual home in Upper Clarkdale, which would be considered "contributing" to the historic district.

Member Kaempfe stated that we should not do papier mache.

Commissioner Lindner asked Drake if there was something he felt ought to be included; a theme or saying like "Company Town" or "Smelter Town". Drake reiterated that anything could be included on the sign.

Member Kelly asked how much more the signs would cost if they were an odd shape or have a picture on them. Drake stated that it would be extra, but that there was a lot of opportunity in grants right now through the Arizona Office of Tourism.

Chair Gibson asked if Drake had had any discussions with the property owners, if they would be interested or not want to pay for the sign. He stated that some might go for it, and some might not care. They discussed the signage and whether or not all businesses would participate.

Member Foutz added that some of the more established businesses would be likely to participate, but that newer businesses may be more reluctant.

Chair Gibson suggested a questionnaire or survey to get a feel for how many would like to do this so we don't end up wasting a lot of time. Member Kelly added that if consistency is the goal, the project would not achieve that goal if the participation was lacking. Director Mayday stated that staff did send letters to the building owners on Main Street about the meeting tonight, but none had chosen to participate.

Commissioner Emmett stated that her experience with questionnaires was that they were a dead end; not enough people respond to make the results meaningful.

Chair Snyder mentioned that it appears that staff is looking for direction regarding signage should someone want to come in and get an historical marker so that there would be uniformity to the signs. She added that it would be easier for staff if there were pre-approved signs that someone could pick from, rather than have meetings to approve a small sign. She continued, stating that it was the HPC's purview to develop signage related to historic buildings and sites, and then provide it to DRB for review and approval. Director Mayday added that this was indeed the purpose of the meeting, and staff was seeking direction regarding a consistent sign program for all historic buildings in the Central Business District.

After further discussion, DRB Member Foutz suggested that the Historic Preservation Commission develop a signage program for the DRB to approve. Staff reiterated that the purpose of the meeting tonight was to develop just that; rather than hold two (2) separate meetings, it was staff's intent that both bodies agree on a single sign that would be used by all businesses in the downtown area to indicate that they were part of the historic district.

Additional conversation amongst DRB and HPC members indicated that they were more interested in developing an interpretive sign project than simple building markers. Director Mayday agreed to seek grant opportunities for such a project and return to the HPC with additional information when funding had been identified. Director Mayday then indicated that a motion to adjourn for both bodies would be appropriate.

Chair Snyder asked for a motion; moved by Foutz, second by Kaempfe to adjourn the Design Review Board meeting. 5 yeas, 0 nays; meeting adjourned.

Chair Gibson asked for a motion; moved by Linder, second by Emmet to adjourn the Historic Preservation Commission meeting. 4 yeas; 0 nays; meeting adjourned.

Meetings adjourned at 8:38.

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CLARKDALE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
OCTOBER 7, 2021 3:00 PM
MEN'S LOUNGE, CLARK MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE
ZOOM**

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m. by Chair Terry Gibson

Roll Call: Present: Michael Lindner, Cindy Emmet, Ed Loesch, Terry Gibson
Absent: Craig Backus

Commissioner Reports: Michael Lindner noted that Phil Tavasci had purchased the two (2) buildings that comprise The Newsstand, located on Main Street in downtown Clarkdale.

Staff Report: Director Mayday reported on the Public Hearing held before the Design Review Board on October 6, 2021 regarding the proposed Plateau at Clarkdale multiple family development adjacent to the Arizona Copper Arts Museum.

Discussion Items: Staff introduced Eric Vondy, Certified Local Government (CLG) Coordinator for the Arizona State Historic Preservation office. Staff and the Commission watched a video produced by Az SHPO that featured former Arizona State Historic Preservation Office Deputy Director Chris Cody, who filmed a video regarding historic preservation and the law: <https://vimeo.com/623799157/2e226f3b30>

Mr. Vondy discussed historic preservation in general and outlined issues other CLG's were facing, especially with respect to residents of communities that differ with their historic preservation commissions. For instance, rules followed by CLG's and HPC's are not the same as those followed by SHPO's, even though they are both based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Further, there is a misconception that once something has been declared historic it cannot be torn down; being identified as historic is an honorary designation and does not impose any protection; the same can be said of state designation as well.

For projects that use federal funds, a Section 106 review becomes necessary. The review is required by the National Historic Preservation Act only for those projects that involve federal funds to try to avoid those funds for being used to negatively impact historic properties. The State of Arizona has passed a similar act applicable to state funded projects that result in tax credits for residential properties; a number of homes in Clarkdale are beneficiaries of that program. The state law establishing the residential tax credits require that the property be non-income producing, on the National Register, and meet minimum maintenance standards to qualify for the credits. However, CLG's that have design guidelines in place can be more specific about standards for approval at the local level than the state; this is also one of the instances where the state regulating agency cannot necessarily overrule guidelines that are adopted by the CLG and HPC.

Chair Gibson then asked for clarification regarding the tax credits and Air B & B's (short term rentals). Mr. Vondy stated that in instances where the home was used 100% of the time for short term rentals, the property could not qualify for tax credits; for part time use, the credit would be prorated. The HPC then watched the video, which highlighted the following:

- 1) Three tiers of historic preservation law: Federal, State, and local
- 2) Section 106 Reviews only apply to federal agencies using federal funds
- 3) SHPO's do not issue permits and have no legal authority to stop or alter federal undertakings
- 4) In Arizona, Section 106 reviews regularly result in the complete avoidance of adverse impacts on historic resources and reasonable mitigation measures
- 5) Historic preservation in Arizona is governed by the Arizona State Historic Preservation Act (modeled after the federal act) and the Arizona Antiquities Act (governs archaeological artifacts)
- 6) ASHPA applies to state agencies in the same manner that the federal act applies to federal agencies
- 7) Local historic preservation regulations are the most effective means of preserving historic structures, sites, and landscaping, and ensure that the districts are added to positively over time
- 8) Jurisdictions have broad ability regulate demolitions and new construction through historic preservation zoning ordinances
- 9) The Arizona Private Property Protection Act (Prop 207) does not likely apply as there was no evidence that the intent of the voters was to limit historic preservation activities; historic preservation tends to augment rather than detract from property values
- 10) Due process rights apply to Historic Preservation Commission proceedings
 - a) Fairly noticed meetings compliant with Arizona Open Meeting Law and local ordinances
 - b) Board/commission members should never discuss pending applications privately amongst themselves, nor should they reference unrelated matters (e.g., previous applications by applicant) in the decision making process.
 - c) Making decisions predicated on inadequate bases or unrelated matters

Chair Gibson opened the item for discussion by the Board. Commissioner Loesch stated that having prompts would be helpful to Commissioners. Director Mayday agreed to develop guidelines

Commissioner Emmet asked about the Prop 207 interpretation; Mr. Vondy stated that there appeared to be nothing in the language of the proposition indicating that Historic Preservation was a target of the proposed act. He also discussed other aspects of Prop 207 and its impacts on jurisdictions across Arizona. She also asked about SHPO approval of an Ordinance; Mr. Vondy stated that ordinances adopted by CLG's need to be reviewed and approved by SHPO and the feds. He also advised the commission to avoid decisions that are arbitrary and capricious, and that design guidelines must be easily understood by an average citizen. Finally, commissioners must avoid imparting their personal opinion into the decision-making process. Mr. Vondy continued, stating that consideration of massing and scale were more important factors in creating development guidelines rather than fine details like doorknobs and colors. He also emphasized the importance of clear communication between boards and commissions

to avoid conflicting decisions. He pointed to the proposed Plateau at Clarkdale project and mentioned how that is preferable to making a project “look” historic, and referenced the Secretary of Interior’s Standard #3 that states “Do not create a false sense of history”; he advised that if you have infill and you construct something that looks like 1920, that would be considered creating a false sense of history. While counterintuitive, he pointed to the rehabilitation of the Notre Dame Cathedral in the 1850’s by Viollet-le-Duc, who added the now famous spire, in spite of criticism at the time that it made the Cathedral look “too gothic” and added that infill development should be easily distinguished from historic structures. He continued, stating that structures that mimic historic architecture actually devalue the historic buildings they seek to duplicate.

Commissioner Lindner asked about contrast in architectural styles and stated: “I’ve heard that statement before about making sure everything looks very different -contrast- I think that a lot of people in Clarkdale disagree with that, a lot. I think it is probably important to clarify that, yeah, Disneyland, Tombstone style construction is not what you are looking for; that a lot of design is really timeless and there is a distinction because there are more modern materials; you can tell a 1920 window from a 2021 window, and so forth. I think that we need to make sure that we are very clear in our communication to this board, to the Design Review Board, and the community, because I think they will get the wrong idea – they’ll think that what was presented last night is ok, and I think a lot of us feel it’s not.

Mr. Vondy then discussed the windows and that substituting modern, energy efficient windows that mimic period windows are fine; that you should notice the contemporary additions to historic structures last and not first, and that differences can be subtle and don’t have to be striking.

I don’t know if there is a way that this can be communicated or framed so that people don’t get that wrong opinion about it because I think the way it came across when you stated it was that Hey, its too bad whatever they want there and it doesn’t have to blend in with the surroundings.

Mr. Vondy shared that this is where your design guidelines can mold that to what is appropriate and what isn’t as long as you’re not saying “create something that you see elsewhere in town and make an exact copy of it”; scale and massing are more important to further the historic. He used Bisbee as an example of blending the new and historic so that you notice the historic more than the contemporary, and discussed “deferring to the historic”, which references emphasizing the historic aspects of a structure when adding onto an historic building.

Commissioner Lindner stated: I’d also like some guidance about when it is appropriate to replicate and when it is not. So for example, we lost the Clark Mansion 12 years ago, and I don’t know if you are familiar with that. Mr. Vondy said that if you have documentation of what it looked like, you can replicate it. He referenced a Japanese internment camp in California that is basically a reconstruction- the original buildings were torn down at some point, but there was enough documentary evidence to rebuild it.

Chair Gibson then thanked Mr. Vondy for his presentation and discussion and asked him for any parting comments, and asked to invite him back, which Mr. Vondy agreed would be possible. Commissioner Lindner then asked if he could stay to hear the agenda items for discussion. Director Mayday provided

an overview of Selna-Mongini Park project and the Gazebo, and asked for specific guidance regarding the Gazebo. Public Works Director Maher Hazine stated that it had been rebuilt in the 1990's; Commissioner Emmet stated that it had originally been built in 1915.

Chair Gibson then recognized Maher Hazine, who walked through the presentation regarding the Gazebo. He discussed the unsafe conditions that currently exist with the structure, and proposed a complete reconstruction of the gazebo.

He then presented photos of the structure in the 1990's, stating that the gazebo had been constructed on railroad ties, which were removed and replaced with a concrete foundation. The posts from the original structure were retained, however, the colors had been changed. Instead of replacing the posts, the dry rot and termite damage was repaired well enough to get them whole again, but not well enough to last. The photos showed extensive rotting in the 90's that was patched up.

Mr. Hazine then turned to the structure's current condition. He showed a cracked beam that had been reinforced with a sister section bolted to the original beam. Commissioner Lindner interjected, stating that it was actually a remnant of a flagpole that used to be there. Director Hazine continued, stating that the post behind it was cracked.

Commissioner Lindner then stated he had a couple of factual clarifications. First, the reconstruction was done in 2004 and not the late 90's; Director Hazine said that the records he had showed the 90's; Lindner continued stating and the pictures (a number of people here fundraised for it) the work that was shown on the picture that Maher just showed was right prior to the lead remediation and that is why the wood was stripped down. Mr. Vondy asked for clarification that it was still about 2004; Commissioner Lindner agreed.

Commissioner Emmett asked who did the reconstruction; Director Hazine stated that it was done by one individual who was a neighbor of one of the employees that recently retired that was hired on a temporary basis; however, he did see some records of companies bidding on the project; discussion ensued regarding bidding the project, however, what he had been told by people that were still around was that this individual was the one that rebuilt it. Commissioner Lindner stated that if Town minutes were reviewed, that they were going to go out to bid, but the Town decided to use their staff and hired this guy.

The next photo illustrated how the structure was beginning to twist, and that the cabling underneath the floor had to be tightened to keep it as true as possible. Dry rot was also visible; while it had been caked over with paint in an attempt to preserve it, several members were too rotted to preserve. Some beams and floor boards had been cracked, as had some of the treads on the stairway. He then pointed out dry rot on the siding; Chair Gibson pointed out that the handrails were pulling away from the frame. Director Hazine also pointed out that not only were the posts twisting, they were also out of plumb. He also mentioned that ADA accessibility would have to be a component of the project.

Commissioner Emmett asked about the bandstand (gazebo), and whether the electrical service was changed in 2004. Director Hazine replied that it was upgraded around 2018 when the UVSP remediation took place, and detailed the improvements to the electrical service.

He continued, showing photos underneath of the structure, showing dry rotting of the beams; painting of the decking underneath had helped to slow the rot but had not prevented it from occurring. He also pointed out supports and bracing that had been added and the absence of Simpson strong ties, stating that things had been toe-nailed together.

The outer wall, while not designed to be load bearing, is now carrying structure load as the building twists and shifts; the siding is also showing dry rot and decay in places. The roof shingles are past their effective life and need to be replaced.

Director Hazine informed the Commission that the plans for the earlier rehabilitation were available and would be used to design the new structure, and an ADA access ramp would be added that would start adjacent to the stairs and wrap around the exterior of the structure, providing access at the back.

He stated that in staff's opinion, the structure needed to be rebuilt from the ground up and replicate the look of the existing structure; to adequately brace the structure and stabilize it and replace rotting structural and decorative features would not be cost effective. Further, the gazebo was not structurally sound enough to brace or repair to a condition that would be safe to occupy. New materials proposed included a synthetic cedar shake shingle with a 50-year life; composite siding to reduce dry rot and other decay; he indicated that the color was very close to the existing green, although the color may have been different in the past. Commissioner Lindner added that he had only known it to be red and white; however, at the time of the reconstruction in 2004, someone remembered the original color as being green, which was why it was painted green as part of the rehabilitation. Director Hazine continued the review of materials, proposing a composite decking that would be a darker wood.

He then reviewed next steps, which included review by SHPO and the Design Review Board, as well as a neighborhood meeting prior to consideration by DRB and ultimately to Town Council. Once Town Council approves the plan, the project could go out to bid for construction. He stated that the request of the Historic Preservation Commission was to approve the reconstruction of the gazebo from the ground up subject to review by DRB and Town Council.

Chair Gibson then opened the floor to questions by the Commissioners; Commissioner Loesch asked whether the decking would be Trex © or trex-like material; Director Hazine responded that it was a Trex-like material called Fibercon that has a better fire rating than trex.

Action Items:

- a. Discussion and possible action to provide a letter of support for a Heritage Grant application for the Miller Building located at 901 Main Street. (*Partner Yavapai College Construction?*)**
- b. Discussion and possible action to approve reconstruction of the Gazebo/Bandstand at the Town Park. (*Tabled*)**
- c. Discussion and possible action to approve removal of backstop at Selna-Mongini Park. (No notes)**

Future Agenda Items: Vice Chair

Adjournment: 5:52



Staff Report

Agenda Item: **9A: Bandstand Improvements**

Staff Contact: **Ruth Mayday, Community Development Director**

Meeting Date: **May 3, 2022**

Summary: This item is a follow-up to the March 11, 2022 Frost Structural Engineering Report regarding the structural condition of the Bandstand/Gazebo.

Background: During the October 7, 2021 meeting, the HPC voted to conduct a structural and architectural review of the Bandstand (Gazebo) in Town Park. Staff engaged Bill Otwell, Otwell Architects, to coordinate the reviews; the engineering review was completed on March 11, 2022. The HPC discussed the report at the April 5, 2022 meeting and voted to accept the report.

In previous communications with the SHPO Architect, Pat Dahlen, she confirmed that the replacement materials needed to be like-for-like as much as possible. While some substitutions would be acceptable (e.g., substituting hardiplank for siding), cumulative effect is the overriding issue.

Emergency stabilization (rotten decking boards) can be undertaken with wood of any species as long as it is painted to match and the dimensions are as close as possible – nominal and dimensional can be used interchangeably.

Recommendation: **This is a discussion item only.**



Staff Report

Agenda Item: **9B: Interpretive Signage**

Staff Contact: **Ruth Mayday, Community Development Director**

Meeting Date: **May 3, 2022**

Summary: Continued discussion by the Historic Preservation Commission to consider the design, materials and strategic placement of interpretive signage depicting Clarkdale's historic events.

Background: Clarkdale's existing interpretive signage is deteriorating and in need of replacement.

Recommendation: **This is a discussion item only.**



Staff Report

Agenda Item: **9C: Interpretive Signage – Historic Markers**

Staff Contact: **Ruth Mayday, Community Development Director**

Meeting Date: **May 3, 2022**

Summary: Continued discussion by the Historic Preservation Commission to considering the design of historic markers for homes and businesses that qualify for national historic designation.

Background: Drake Meinke presented a preliminary design and scale mock-up for the historic signage with draft verbiage, estimated costs, and details. He also provided illustrations for other historic signage throughout Arizona and the United States, including detailed descriptions of the signage in Jerome that includes period photographs of the buildings described in the plaques.

Recommendation: **This is a discussion item only.**