175452

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PHOENIX HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Meeting
Final Minutes

Date: March 20, 2023
Time: 4:30 p.m.
Location: Virtual meeting via Webex

Commission Members Present	Staff Present
Dan Klocke, Chair	Kevin Weight
Dan Garcia, Vice Chair	Jodey Elsner
Tricia Amato	Bridget Collins
Richard DeUriarte	Helana Ruter
Taz Khatri	Crystal Carrancho
Greta Rayle	Cletus Montoya
Brenda Thomson	Emma Collins
	Danny Inglese (Law Department)
Commission Members Absent	**Staff Absent**
Christina Noble	
Keely Varvel Hartsell	

1.	**Call meeting to order** Chair Klocke verified that a quorum was established and called the meeting to order at 4:31p.m.	**Dan Klocke, HP Commission Chair**
2.	**Introduction of Commission Members and Staff** The Commission members and HP staff made their introductions. Danny Inglese, Phoenix Law Department, introduced himself and said that he was attending today's meeting in place of Paul Li.	**HP Commission & Staff**
3.	**Review of minutes from the February 13, 2023, monthly meeting** **Action Requested:** Approval of Minutes Chair Klocke asked the Commission for a motion on the February 13th minutes. Commissioner DeUriarte made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted for the February 13, 2023, meeting. Commissioner Amato seconded the motion.	**HP Commission**

	The Commission votes, as follows: Chair Klocke – Yes Vice Chair Garcia – Yes Commissioner Amato – Yes Commissioner DeUriarte – Yes Commissioner Khatri – Abstained Commissioner Rayle – Yes Commissioner Thomson – Abstained Approved 5-0 with 2 abstentions.	
4.	**Initiation of Historic Preservation (HP) overlay zoning for the Walter Hubbard Sterling Residence, 7519 North 9th Place** **Action Requested:** Initiation of HP overlay zoning Chair Klocke invited Kevin Weight to present this item. Mr. Weight said that HP staff was excited to bring this item before the HP Commission and to request initiation of HP overlay zoning for the Walter Hubbard Sterling Residence, located at 7519 North 9th Place. The request for the HP overlay had come from the property owners. The HP Office was not familiar with the property and then contracted with North Wind Resource Consulting to prepare an inventory form for the subject property. North Wind had determined that the property was eligible and HP staff concurred. He displayed the photo that was included in the prepared inventory form. He said that the house was a midcentury design by Sam Bell in 1948. He said that the intent was not to go deeply into the merits of the property at this meeting, but to request that the HP Commission start the initiation process. HP staff would then schedule a public hearing and prepare a full staff report on the eligibility of the property to present at the hearing. Mr. Weight said that questions about the process and next steps could be addressed now. Chair Klocke asked the Commission for questions or comments on this item. Commissioner DeUriarte mentioned he was somewhat familiar with the subject property since friends of his had lived near the subject property for over a decade. He said that it is a very nice property, and he would support initiating the hp overlay. Chair Klocke asked the Commission for any further questions or comments. Commissioner Khatri asked for clarification on a recommendation of eligibility under Criterion B.	**Kevin Weight, HP Staff**

	Mr. Weight responded that the HP staff could take a closer look at possible recommendation of eligibility under Criterion B and include the findings in the staff report for the hearing. Chair Klocke asked if there were any public requests submitted to comment on this item. Mr. Weight said that the property owners were not in attendance. However, the owners did provide staff with a signed waiver to proceed with the initiation of the HP overlay zoning. Chair Klocke asked the Commission for a motion on this item. Commissioner DeUriarte made a motion to initiate HP overlay zoning on the Walter Hubbard Sterling Residence, located at 7519 North 9th Place. Commissioner Thomson seconded the motion. The Commission votes, as follows: Chair Klocke – Yes Vice Chair Garcia – Yes Commissioner Amato – Yes Commissioner DeUriarte – Yes Commissioner Khatri – Yes Commissioner Rayle – Abstained Commissioner Thomson – Yes Approved 6-0 with 1 abstention.	
5.	**Continuing Education Series: Evaluating historic-age properties for historic register eligibility** Chair Klocke invited William Collins to share SHPO's presentation. Mr. Collins, Historic Properties Program Manager at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) said that he was invited to present a brief training on how to evaluate historic-age properties to determine eligibility to be listed on the historic register. He displayed the National Register Bulletin #15 – *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, and reviewed the bulletin, as follows: • Preface: The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to expand this recognition to properties of local and state significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, culture worthy of preservation. The National Register is the official list of these recognized properties • Evaluation Process o Categorize the property type ▪ Building ▪ Structure ▪ Object ▪ Site	**William Collins, State Historic Preservation Office**

- District
- Determine the appropriate historic context
  - Historic contexts are those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, site is understood and its meaning (and ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear
  - Identify the context, what the property represents: theme(s), geographical limits, and chronological period that provide a perspective from which to evaluate the property's significance
  - Determine how the theme of the context is significant in the history of the local area, the State, or the nation
  - Determine what the property type is and whether it is important in illustrating the historic context
  - Determine how the property represents the context through specific historic associations, architectural or engineering values, or information potential (the Criteria for Evaluation)
  - Determine what physical features the property must possess in order for it to reflect the significance of the historic context.
- Determine if the property is significant under the criteria
  - Criterion A: Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
  - Criterion B: Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
  - Criterion C: Design/Construction that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
  - Criterion D: Information potential that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history
- Excluded property types
  - Religious
  - Moved
  - Birthplaces or Graves
  - Cemeteries
  - Reconstructed
  - Commemorative
  - Less than 50 years old
  - Excluded properties are not usually eligible for the National Register
  - Exceptions to these exclusions are called the Criteria Considerations
- Evaluate integrity
  - Seven aspects of Integrity: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association
  - Ability of the property to convey its significance

        - Evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance
        - Physical features must not only be retained but must be visible enough to convey their significance
    - National historic landmarks criteria (Evaluation & Exclusions)

Next, Arianna Urban, who works at SHPO as the Certified Local Government Coordinator, displayed several photos of properties from around the State of Arizona. She shared the associated information for each property. Then she invited the Commission members to share feedback on any of the properties. The following properties were displayed as examples for evaluating eligibility:

- Big Surf (1970)
    - First artificial wave-making machine, developed in Phoenix, AZ
    - Designated as a historic mechanical engineering landmark by ASME
- Bear Cave (1890s)
    - Associated with Murphy Park – 350-acre community amenity in early Prescott, AZ
    - Zoo included many native Arizona species – later donated to Griffith Park Zoo
    - Granite cave from bear exhibit sole remaining feature from Murphy Park
        - Bear cave currently located on a private residential property
- Jefferson Park (1926)
    - Surveyors determined property eligible and contributing to the Jefferson Park Historic District
    - New owners 'rebuilt porch'
- Burton Barr Library (1995)
    - Designed by architect Will Bruder
    - Highly visible modern example of architecture responding to regional materials, design & climate
- Temple Historic District (1925-1949)
    - LDS temple historic context
    - NRHP listed (2000)
    - Slow loss of contributors over time
    - 15 contributing properties demolished (2021)
    - New 4-story multifamily constructed adjacent to 1-story homes

Chair Klocke asked the Commission for any questions or comments.

Commissioner Thomson asked if the inventor of Big Surf was well-known for this invention.

Ms. Urban said that the inventor had not become well-known for this invention.

Commissioner Thomson said that the Bear Cave had lost its setting and that too little of it remained to be of significance. However, it is possible to consider its craftsmanship.

Commission Amato agreed that its craftsmanship could be considered. However, the context is lost on its own.

Mr. Collins said that SHPO had missed an opportunity to preserve Murphy Park and then build around the park.

Commissioner Thomson shared that she likes the distinctive features and feeling of the Burton Barr Library. Her office sits across the street to the west of the library, and she gets to enjoy looking at the library every day. She especially appreciates how the design aligns with the sunlight during the summer solstice.

Vice Chair Garcia said that Burton Barr Library is a good example for Criterion G, which evaluates properties that are less than 50 years old. He mentioned that the library is cantilevered over Central Avenue, and he believes it is significant.

Chair Klocke mentioned that the current library building was originally designed as Phase1 of a two-phase project. He wondered whether the second phase would be allowed to be built were the library to be designated historic.

Ms. Urban said that since the second phase was included in the original design, that it could be constructed and generally not be considered as a detriment.

Commissioner Khatri asked for clarification on why the Burton Barr Library would even be considered for designation now since it is not yet 50 years old.

Commissioner Amato asked whether events or trends in the Phoenix area would be viewed as significant in the broader context of the State and elsewhere. She gave an example of how libraries in the western states have trended more toward more interesting designs to perhaps encourage more visits to libraries.

Ms. Urban agreed that events and trends could be viewed as significant.

Mr. Collins said that Jim Garrison, the former State Historic Preservation Officer, considered architecturally significant buildings eligible as soon as construction was completed. The significance was already there and would remain.

Commissioner Thomson referenced the seven aspects of integrity. Then she mentioned the previous storm damage and roof collapse of the Burton Barr Library. She wondered how the repairs to the roof impacted the integrity of the structure.

	Mr. Collins referenced the evaluation process in Bulletin 15 and stressed that it is important to determine which features are essential or not to the significance of the structure. Ms. Urban said that the storm event and subsequent repairs would become additional components of the story of the library. Chair Klocke thanked Mr. Collins and Ms. Urban for the SHPO presentation.	
6.	**First Church of God – Mercy Hill (745 W Fillmore Street) inventory form and eligibility assessment** **Action Requested:** Information and possible discussion Chair Klocke invited Helana Ruter to give an update on this item. Ms. Ruter displayed some photos of the subject property and gave a brief update. She said that the first demolition application had gone before the HP Commission in September 2020 where staff had recommended the property as not eligible. The second demolition application had then gone before the HP Commission in November 2022, where staff had once again recommended the property as not eligible. Although Lescher and Mahoney had designed the various subsequent alterations, those were not considered significant, nor was property the best representation of Lescher and Mahoney designs. The property did go through a second 30-day hold period in November 2022, which has since been completed. Currently, the subject property is going through a separate rezoning process regarding redevelopment of the site. The rezoning case has been reviewed by the City of Phoenix Planning Commission. Next, the zoning case will be heard by City Council on April 5, 2023. The Grand Avenue Members Association (GAMA) has just submitted a request for staff to reconsider the eligibility of the subject property based on research/recommendation performed by an outside consultant. The consultant has recommended the property individually eligible under Criterion A for Community Planning & Development as well as under Criterion C as a planned campus designed by Lescher & Mahoney. Ms. Ruter said that the HP Office just received GAMA's request last Wednesday. Staff has not yet had adequate time to review the research findings to prepare a formal recommendation. Also, SHPO has not had sufficient time to review the information, discuss with its staff, or confer with Phoenix HP Office. She then asked Mr. Weight to share his comments as well. Mr. Weight said that the HP Office had previously recommended the subject property as not eligible. Now, the HP Office is presented with new recommendations from a professional consultant. He is familiar with	**Helana Ruter, HP Staff**

	the consultant and believes he generally does good work. However, Mr. Weight has several questions concerning the information included on the property inventory form that was submitted by the consultant. He reiterated that HP staff has not yet come to a formal conclusion on this new recommendation. He referenced the earlier presentation by Bill Collins regarding evaluating properties for eligibility against an existing historic context. However, Mr. Weight stated that currently there is no existing historic context or any registration requirements for this property. He said that there is a high number of post-war properties and that the bar should be placed high for evaluating eligibility of these properties. He did a preliminary review of the report, and it seems that the consultant was recommending lowering the existing standards for consideration of this particular property. He said that this new recommendation was to consider the property under Criterion A for community development and Criterion C for architecture. It would be helpful for HP staff to have access to the master plan and an opportunity to review its campus plan. He also wondered whether the entire campus would need to remain intact for it to be considered eligible. Mr. Weight referenced the 1991 Public & Institutional Architect Survey, which looked at religious architecture through 1942. The survey identified 42 properties and determined that only 25 properties were recommended eligible. He said that the HP Office was currently working on a survey of religious properties constructed between 1943-1980. So far, 500 religious properties had been identified that fit that time period. Due to the high number of properties that need to be reviewed, it is important to raise the bar when determining significance of these religious properties. The HP Office is currently working on identifying proposed boundaries for possible expansion of the Grand Avenue area for consideration of a potential historic district. However, the subject property was not included in that proposed boundary expansion. HP staff also has questions about the recommendation for Criterion A. HP staff has asked SHPO to weigh in on the new recommendations. However, the two offices have not yet had time to confer. The HP Office will ultimately defer to the SHPO and the Keeper of the National Register on eligibility. Mr. Weight stressed that eligibility is not essential for the rezoning case to move forward, as the property could still be preserved whether it was eligible or not. Chair Klocke asked whether the property owner was in attendance. Shane Essert said that he was representing the property owner. Since he was just made aware of this meeting, he did not have anything prepared to present, but he would be available to respond to questions. Chair Klocke asked Mr. Essert whether there was a plan to preserve any of the buildings on the property.	

Mr. Essert said that it would be challenging to preserve a large portion of the buildings. However, he mentioned the possibility of saving the bell tower, some exterior features, and part of the façade. However, cost was a major factor in determining what could feasibly be preserved and included in the redevelopment of the site.

Chair Klocke asked the Commission for questions or comments on this item.

Commissioner Rayle wondered why this property was being recommended for community planning, when it is an individual property. She also wondered why it was not reviewed for its social or religious history under Criteria Consideration A.

Mr. Weight said that HP staff had similar questions regarding Criteria Consideration A.

Vice Chair Garcia asked for clarification on how a property could be considered a contributor to a historic district that has not yet been recognized and does not yet exist.

Mr. Weight mentioned that the HP Office is under contract with Bob Graham of Motley Design Group to review the area for possibility of designating a new historic district and that a preliminary boundary had been identified but this property was not in it.

Chair Klocke asked Ms. Ruter if any requests for public comment were submitted for this item.

Ms. Ruter said that there were a few requests to speak from Bob Graham, Beatrice Moore, Ashley Harder, and Roger Brevoort.

Chair Klocke invited Bob Graham to comment.

Mr. Graham agreed with Mr. Weight's description of the current situation. He referenced the HP Commission's previous decision to not initiate HP overlay at the time of the demolition application. He said that the case moved forward to the Central City Village Planning Committee and then the Planning Commission where it was determined that there was not anything eligible to be saved on the property. That was the reason GAMA hired a consultant to make a recommendation on its eligibility.

Chair Klocke said that the HP Commission takes very seriously the professional recommendations of staff. He reiterated that staff had twice recommended this property as not eligible. He said it is important for this Commission to listen to the professionals when considering its action.

Chair Klocke invited Beatrice Moore to comment.

Beatrice Moore said she had spoken with Helana Ruter in January 2023 to inquire about appealing the zoning case. There was no appeal

process in place; however, additional research could be conducted on the property. With regard to this property not being a significant example of Lescher and Mahoney designs, she mentioned that Grand Avenue is a working-class area that does not have a lot of resources. It was important to GAMA to hire a consultant to conduct further research on the property to determine its eligibility. She said that Bob Graham has even designed a plan to keep the church at the northwest corner of the lot to be included in the redevelopment plan.

Chair Klocke then acknowledged Commissioner Rayle's request to comment.

Commissioner Rayle said that her view might not be popular, but it needed to be shared. She stated that there had not been any previous drive by the community to get this property recognized as historic and significant to the community. Its significance was only mentioned when a four-story development was proposed near the Grand Avenue area. She mentioned that the HP Commission is in place to preserve historic properties not to stop development. She said that the consultant was paid for his research and recommendation. She said that he was also provided with the city's findings and recommendation that the property was not eligible. He probably used that information to then set an unusual course to determine eligibility under Criterion (A) instead of the usual course under Criterion (C).

Chair Klocke thanked Commissioner Rayle for her comments. He also stressed that the HP Commission is not a Zoning Board. The zoning process goes through the City Council.

Mr. Graham said that GAMA is not trying to stop development. They are looking for a win-win scenario for the development of this site. He referenced the guidelines for Criterion A and Criteria Consideration A noted in National Register Bulletin 15.

Commissioner Rayle stated that Criteria Consideration A was not noted anywhere on the form submitted.

Chair Klocke invited Ashley Harder to comment.

Ms. Harder thanked the HP Commission and staff for hearing this case. She appreciated Mr. Weight's comments that it is possible for the building to be preserved whether or not it is determined as eligible. She suggested continuing offline discussions with the parties involved to look for more creative solutions for preservation. She suggested that the HP Commission and HP Office prioritize more education opportunities.

Chair Klocke agreed with Ms. Harder that there will be more scenarios similar to this.

Commissioner Khatri said that it may be unfair to say that the community just wants to stop this development. She also stated that the HP Commission does not currently have enough or appropriate tools at its

	disposal to preserve this building. She appreciated that the community had come forward. Chair Klocke invited Roger Brevoort to comment. Mr. Brevoort suggested looking at including the footprint of the church building in the redevelopment plan for the opportunity to utilize tax credits for a win-win scenario. He also mentioned that the other committees based their decisions on the HP Commission's decision to not initiate HP overlay zoning. Chair Klocke said that this was the third time this property had been presented to the HP Commission. He stated that the HP Commission had made its decision based on the professional recommendation of staff. Whether that decision was popular or not, he said that it is unfair to the property owner and developer to hold up the process by repeatedly circling back to review this property. Chair Klocke verified that there were no further comments. He then moved on to the next agenda item.	
7.	**Update on requests for demolition** • 30-day demolition holds • Properties on the Phoenix Register **Action Requested:** Information and possible discussion Chair Klocke invited HP Staff to present the updates. Mr. Montoya referenced the 30-day hold report that was provided to the HP Commission and briefly reviewed the DAPPs that were submitted since last meeting, as follows: DAPPs (11 Total) • (3) Closed o (2) Recommended not eligible o (1) 30-day hold waived by Building Official due to imminent hazard ▪ 10048 South 59th Avenue – Recommended as eligible • (8) Open o (1) Recommended as eligible o (3) Recommended not eligible o (4) To be determined HPDEs (3 Total) • (2) Approved o Demolition of detached garage – 751 East Southern Avenue (Roosevelt Park) o Demolition of accessory building – 3106 North 15th Avenue (North Encanto)	**Cletus Montoya, HP Staff**

	• (1) Denied o 1-year moratorium in effect for 1114 East Portland Street (Garfield) Chair Klocke asked the Commission for questions or comments on this item. The Commissioners did not have any further questions. Chair Klocke expressed his concern for properties located in the middle of historic districts that have had a demolition application denied and are currently in the 1-year moratorium period. He expressed his concern especially for the Garfield Historic District, which has had several demolition applications denied and developers just need to wait for the 1-year hold to expire to begin demolition. He asked staff for clarification on whether any contact has been made to those developers to discuss alternate options to preserve those properties in Garfield that are awaiting the 1-year hold. Mr. Weight responded that staff has had discussions on several of those properties. He said that staff had reached out to the applicant for the property located at 1514 West Encanto Boulevard. However, staff had not heard from that applicant and now the 2-year window for demolition has passed. Therefore, a new application would need to be submitted to begin the process all over again. He said that he had a follow up meeting with the property owner for the two properties located at 916 & 918 North 8th Street in Garfield – they are no longer looking to demolish structures. Instead, they are looking to preserve the historic buildings and intend to add infill project behind the historic structures. He also had discussions with a potential tenant for the property located at 717 North 7th Street. Their intention would be to convert the structure to a restaurant and add a couple of open-dining structures on the lot. He said that HP staff is continuing to make progress with saving some of those properties for more positive outcomes. Chair Klocke thanked Mr. Weight and staff for continuing to work on more positive solutions.	
8.	**Advocacy and outreach update** Chair Klocke asked the Commission and Staff for any advocacy and outreach updates. Commissioner Amato shared that there were over 3000 attendees at this year's Willo Home Tour, which was held on February 18 & 19. She mentioned that the Coronado Home Tour was held on February 26, and the Encanto-Palmcroft Home Tour was held on March 19.	**HP Commission**
9.	**Staff updates and requests for information from staff** Ms. Ruter referenced a report included in the Commission's packet. The report was completed by A-Arid State House Movers regarding potentially moving the Seargeant-Oldaker House (649 N 3rd Avenue)	**HP Commission and Staff**

and included two site evaluations for a potential relocation site. One possible site was a city-owned property on 5th Avenue, which would require extensive deconstruction of the historic structure prior to relocation. The other possible site, owned by the Salvation Army, was directly across from the historic site. However, since the Salvation Army had previously demolished the historic structure from this site for its current building, it may not be open to accepting the historic Seargeant-Oldaker house. A-Arid States was proposing to move the historic house to the Salvation Army lot for $200-300K, which did not include other required services. She and Mr. Weight are in discussions with the property owner and Salvation Army Board members regarding another possible moving company from Pennsylvania that had relocated the guest house from the David and Gladys Wright House property. It was possible to utilize some funds from the Warehouse & Threatened Buildings grant to help preserve this building. She said that she remains optimistic for a positive outcome.

Chair Klocke said that the Seargeant-Oldaker House is a beautiful building, and it would be wonderful to have a positive outcome.

Chair Klocke verified that Kim Kasper had requested to comment on this property, and he invited Ms. Kasper to share her comments.

Ms. Kasper said she was pleased to hear the good news about the Seargeant-Oldaker House. She also appreciated the presentation by SHPO on the topic of evaluating property eligibility for historic designations. Regarding the Mercy Hill Church property, she urged the developer to either relocate the historic structure or incorporate it into the redevelopment of the site for a win-win outcome.

Chair Klocke verified that there were no further requests for comment regarding the Seargeant-Oldaker House. He then asked for staff update on consultant contracts.

Mr. Weight reviewed the following current contracts:

- Motley Design Group
    - Post-war Religious Property survey – Conduct study on architecture and to prepare 100 property survey inventory forms; Scope may need to be expanded since there are 500 properties for consideration;
    - Grand Avenue – Conduct a survey of Grand Avenue, between Van Buren Street and McDowell Road, to prepare a nomination for a potential historic district;
    - South Phoenix Market – Conduct a building assessment to determine whether structure could be rehabilitated and listed on historic register.
- Ryden Architects
    - 1110 Grand Avenue (Former Safeway) – Conduct a building assessment structure that had suffered significant fire damage and determine whether the structure could be repaired, and the façade alterations be reversed and listed on historic register.

	• North Wind Resource Consulting Group
	  ○ Determine registration requirements for the Post-war multi-family properties to begin listing eligible properties identified in the associated study.
	• Swan Architects
	  ○ Duppa-Montgomery Adobe – Conduct an updated cost estimate for some stabilization of the structure, placing a protective cover over the structure, and site interpretation; HP Office would potentially partner with the city's Parks & Recreation Department.
	
	Chair Klocke asked for status on the report by PlaceEconomics.
	
	Ms. Ruter responded that PlaceEconomics was planning to provide a draft report to HP Office by the end of April 2023.
	
	Chair Klocke asked for status on HP zoning cases.
	
	Mr. Weight gave a brief update on the following HP Zoning Cases:
	• Bertram Snyder House – HP overlay zoning was approved by City Council (March 2023)
	• 11th Street & McDowell PUD – HP overlay modification will go before City Council on April 5, 2023
	• 7519 North 9th Place – HP overlay zoning process was initiated by HP Commission on March 20, 2023
	
	Chair Klocke asked for an update on Grant Projects.
	
	Mr. Weight said that the Exterior Rehabilitation Grant recipients were recently approved by City Council. He and Ms. Carrancho are working with the property owners to sign the grant contracts and enter each contract in the system for processing.
	
	The Center City Motel grant application will be reviewed by the City Council EDE Subcommittee on March 22nd and then go to the formal City Council meeting on April 5, 2023.
	
	Chair Klocke asked for an update on HP trivia night.
	
	Ms. Ruter said that the HP Trivia Night is scheduled for Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 6:00 – 8:00pm. The event will be held at the Masonic Temple located at 345 West Monroe Street.
	
	Ms. Ruter mentioned that the Commissioners would be receiving an email regarding verifying information on current parking passes and coordinating pick up of parking passes for the newest Commission members prior to next month's meeting.	

10.	**Future agenda items** Next scheduled meeting: April 17, 2023	**HP Commission and Staff**

	Chair Klocke asked the Commission members for any new agenda items they would like to discuss at future HP Commission meetings. No requests were made for additional agenda items. Mr. Weight said that an HP hearing was held a few weeks ago that was appealed by the applicant. The appeal case will be brought before the HP Commission at the April 17th meeting. He reminded the Commission to refrain from any ex-parte communications given that the appeal process is a quasi-judicial hearing.	
11.	**Public Comment and Communication** John Jacquemart said that he was looking forward to attending the next HP Commission meeting in person at City Council Chambers.	**Public**
12.	**Adjournment** Chair Klocke adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.	**HP Commission**

For further information, please call the Historic Preservation Office at 602-261-8699.

For reasonable accommodations, call Elaine Noble at Voice 602-495-0256 or the City TTY Relay (602) 534-5500 as early as possible to coordinate needed arrangements.

Si necesita asistencia o traducción en español, favor de llamar lo más pronto posible a la Oficina de Preservación His de la ciudad de Phoenix al 602-261-8699.