

City of Prescott

Prescott Preservation Commission



July 12, 2024 | 9:00 AM
201 N. Montezuma Street
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301

AGENDA

The following Agenda will be considered by the **Prescott Preservation Commission** at their meeting to be held **July 12, 2024**. Notice of this meeting is given pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 38-431.02.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

- A. Approval of June 14, 2024 Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes.
Recommended Action: MOVE to approve minutes as presented
- B. **HP24-007** - A Request for Approval of Demolition of Existing Building & Construction of a Four-Story Mixed-Use Hotel, Restaurant and Retail Building at 201 N. Cortez Street (Old City Hall).
Recommended Action: This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.
- C. Presentation & Discussion Regarding the 2024 AZ Preservation Conference Debrief.
Recommended Action: This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.

4. UPDATES

- A. Staff Announcements

5. ADJOURNMENT

Upon a public majority vote of a quorum of the Board, the Board may hold an executive session, which will not be open to the public, regarding any item listed on the agenda but only for the following purposes:

- (1) Discussion or consideration of personnel matters (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(1));
- (2) Discussion or consideration of records exempt by law (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(2));
- (3) Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the city's attorneys (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3));
- (4) Discussion or consultation with the city's attorneys regarding the city's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation, or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid litigation (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4));

- (5) Discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations with employee organizations (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(5));
- (6) Discussion, consultation or consideration for negotiations by the city or its designated representatives with members of a tribal council, or its designated representatives, of an Indian reservation located within or adjacent to the city (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(6));
- (7) Discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(7)).

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Prescott City Hall on 7/3/24 at 3:00 p.m. in accordance with the statement filed by the Prescott City Council with the City Clerk.



Sarah M. Siep, City Clerk



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA: July 12 Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting
DATE: July 12, 2024
DEPT: Community Development
ITEM #: 3.A
SUBJECT: Approval of June 14, 2024 Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes.

ITEM SUMMARY

This item is for the approval of the June 14, 2024 Prescott Preservation Commission minutes. Staff recommends approving the minutes as presented.

BACKGROUND

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

MOVE to approve minutes as presented

ATTACHMENTS

1. 06.14.24 PPC Minutes



City of Prescott

Prescott Preservation Commission

June 14, 2024 | 9:00 AM
201 N Montezuma Street
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mirco called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Michael Mirco - Chair
Mike King - Vice Chair
Diane Travis – Member
James McCarver - Member
Rob Johnson – Member, Excused
Richard Sprain – Member
Mary Ann Suttles – Member

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

- A. Approval of April 12, 2024 & May 10, 2024, Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SUTTLES TO APPROVE THE APRIL 12, 2024, AND MAY 10, 2024, MINUTES AS PRESENTED; MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TRAVIS: PASSED (6 - 0)

- B. HP24-007 - Request for Approval of Demolition of an Existing Building & Construction of a Four-story Mixed Use Hotel, Restaurant and Retail Building at 201 S Cortez St.

Item 3.B was discussed following item 3.D.

Community Development Planner, Kaylee Nunez, presented the item and provided a brief summary of the discussion that took place during the May 10, 2024, Commission meeting. The request is for the demolition of the existing old City Hall building, and construction of a four-story mixed use hotel, restaurant, and retail building.

Since the May meeting, there have been improvements made to the proposed project design, as well as complying with standards 3, 9, and 10 of the Secretary of Interiors Standards (SOIS) for rehabilitation selected by the State Historic Preservation Office (SPHO).

The Courthouse Plaza district guidelines build upon SOIS standards to address the protection of existing historic buildings and assets within the district. The guidelines for the district are not intended to require new buildings to exactly match the wide variation of building designs, styles, and eras of the existing buildings in the district but to have their design be compatible.

Ms. Nunez explained that the southern end of the site is located in the South Prescott National District. Once the parcels are combined, there will be amendments to include the entirety of the site within the Historic Preservation District.

Additional renderings were provided by the applicant and shared by Ms. Nunez. The Palace was referenced as an example, referring to the setbacks in the design. Ms. Nunez discussed the setbacks in the design renderings, as well as other design details that provide a better fit within the Historic District.

Community Development Planning Manager, George Worley, acknowledged the weight of the proposed project on the Commissioners, and thanked them for considering all aspects. It is a very large project, and staff have reviewed all concerns to help provide boundaries and insight. Mr. Worley explained the importance of the Commissioners expressing to the developer what differences they may wish to see, as well as the reasons they may be unable to approve the project. The more specific the better, as the developer may then provide more design compatibility within the Historic District.

Developer and applicant, Shane Shumway with Territory Holdings, provided a presentation to the Commission. He emphasized the point that wherever they go, there is a desire to be good contributing partners to and within the community. There are various options to consider, including approval, approval with conditions, or deferment to a future meeting with clear direction as to what would result in an approval.

Mr. Shumway's presentation included a history of Howey Hall. Mr. Howey's original vision included a hotel at the location (of the proposed project), and Mr. Shumway shared how he was intrigued by that piece of history as this project in many ways is pulling back to original history. He pointed out a detail in the rendering of the balcony, consistent with the history of the site. The Howey Hall railing on the second floor in the historical photo was actually used on the first floor in the rendering.

Mr. Shumway discussed the comments received during the prior Committee meeting, and how that feedback has been addressed. An original versus revised rendering image was displayed, and updates were outlined. Concluding his presentation, he welcomed questions and comments from the Committee.

Commissioner King referred to the left corner of the building on the fourth floor, and asked if glass was still present in the design.

Mr. Shumway responded that the paneling between guest rooms did not change, however, a change was made to the balconies as to what was requested during the prior meeting.

Commissioner King commented that he understood the goal for privacy and likes the setbacks on this building's design as it softens the massing and scale. Although setbacks may not be in the guidelines, there is flexibility.

Mr. Shumway discussed the structured parking included in the project and shared a building height image. Also shared were renderings with views from the Courthouse, an alleyway parallel with Cortez Street, and from Hotel Vendome on Cortez Street.

Addressing concerns on massing, Mr. Shumway commented that the design team is aiming to fulfill their agreement and address historic guidelines.

One option is to divide and create offsets, which has been done along Goodwin Street and along Cortez Street. This gives the building a more inviting appearance, similar to the way Whiskey Row is divided up into various colors and heights.

Commissioner King commented on the rendering with the view from Hotel Vendome. He compared the view appearing as a large rectangular building; however, it does not appear so from the Courthouse view as it shows the contrast. It seems that the Hotel Vendome view may be what is troubling the Commissioners because it doesn't have other buildings to provide scale, in Mr. King's opinion. He suggested more rendering from various views, as it may soften some concern about massing.

Commissioner Travis thanked Mr. Shumway for discussing changes made thus far. She referred to the rendering with the Hotel Vendome view on the Cortez Street side and stated that the mass and appearance remind her of a downtown Phoenix building rather than what would align with downtown Prescott. Commissioner Travis suggested finding a way to square up the buildings or create a separate entrance into the parking area.

Mr. Shumway requested clarification on the 48 foot concern of the Commission, prior to addressing the massing comment.

Commissioner Travis responded that guidelines state "shall" for the 48 foot height concern, so there is some flexibility.

Ms. Nunez commented that measured north to south, the excluding patio, the proposed project building would be 320 feet long.

Mr. Shumway referenced the Courthouse length of 170 feet, and that an option could include splitting the project building into two at 150 feet long each.

Chair Mirco stated that a consensus may not be reached at today's meeting, however, would like to invite additional staff and public input.

Ms. Nunez referred back to her presentation and commented on the option of two buildings. The Commission has never had a project this large before. If the Commission could provide input, it would greatly assist the developer. Considering the option of two buildings is not specifically addressed within the guidelines, this is where the discretion of the Commission applies.

Chair Mirco suggested each Commissioner provide clear and concise comments and requests, one by one, to Mr. Shumway.

Commissioner Suttles referenced the April Commission meeting and two statements discussed. One being that this would take more than one month of study, which has been proven today. The other being that the Commission has not had something this large to review and provide recommendation on. She acknowledged that while Mr. Shumway has been willing to receive feedback and negotiate, it appears it will take another meeting or two to reach consensus. The first issue for her is height, and next is massing, although she understands the correlation. It will take work, but she does believe a consensus can be reached.

Commissioner Travis expressed her concerns about demolishing the current building, and that a larger and taller building may cause an issue or threaten the Historical District. She stated that she is not against the proposed project and does feel a consensus can be reached.

Chair Mirco stated that he shares the same issues as the majority of Commissioners with massing and height. Additionally, for him, balconies are of concern.

Ms. Nunez asked if the concern was related to the absence of balconies within the Historic District currently.

Chair Mirco confirmed yes.

Commissioner King stated that great moments are born from great opportunities. He referenced the Request for Proposals (RFP) from the City, for a three acre development, and the sales agreement with Territory Holdings. There wasn't a strong message in the first place for the developer, according to Commissioner King. He commented on the open house and the positivity he observed. The guidelines are not a law or mandate, and there is flexibility to deviate. Considering items that are requested is encouraged, to maintain the historical character for a project the City asked for. He added that he is in favor of the setbacks in the design, as it helps with massing and perspective. With regard to the old City Hall building, it served its purpose, and was constructed prior to the current guidelines. The proposed project contributes to the surrounding district and provides a busy yet neighborly center. He complimented Mr. Shumway on the revisions, as it demonstrates Mr. Shumway is listening to the concerns of the Commission.

Commissioner Sprain thanked Mr. Shumway for all the hard work. His reservations related to the Historic District were discussed, and he stated that if this is not done right, the District could be altered forever. He feels the old City Hall building should be replaced with a building of similar mass and scale. Considering the proposed project, Commissioner Sprain suggested the option of splitting the building into two to appear as a continuation of the downtown area.

Commissioner McCarver thanked Mr. Shumway as well. He referenced buildings in Florence, Italy, existing since the 1400s. As the area expanded, considerations had to be decided for growth. It was decided that no building would be higher than a prominent current existing building. In comparison to Prescott, the city also has an iconic historic downtown area, and he feels similar considerations should be made with the proposed project and the impacts to the Historic District.

Chair Mirco invited members of the public to comment. Public comments included references to the setbacks in the design, and how it may encourage encroachments within the guidelines. Concerns were also expressed about the proposed project's hotel element later becoming long term rentals.

Architect Doug Stroh, of Stroh Architecture, stated that there is one opportunity to get this right. He expressed concern about the proposed project not enhancing or contributing to the downtown history, structure, or entertainment aspects. The design appears to replicate the courthouse instead of other surrounding buildings, according to Mr. Stroh. Rainwater should be harvested and stored. He recommended the building not be four stories, as two levels of parking would yield 200 spaces and would not be visible behind a two story building.

Mr. Shumway addressed the public comments, as well as items Mr. Stroh referenced. He asked Mr. Stroh; how many stories was Mr. Stroh's proposed project originally, to which Mr. Stroh responded four.

Mr. Shumway stated that the comments referencing their (Territory Holdings) involvement in the community and the types of citizens they are, need to be addressed. Many contributions to parks and other items within the community have been made by Territory Holdings. Today, he is requesting three things he can take to the design team that encompass community and Commission concerns alike.

After further discussion, the main concerns for Chair Mirco and Commissioners King and Sprain were the height and mass. For Commissioner Suttles, the building height, and the view from Hotel Vendome were the main concerns. Commissioner Travis was willing to waiver on the height if the mass issue could be solved. There was a suggestion among the Commissioners about having the total height be - three stories, and landscaping in between the two buildings should the project building be split into two.

Mr. Shumway responded to the concerns and confirmed that what is requested for review by the design team is the height and massing of the building, with a possible building split. As far as landscaping is concerned, how that would be incorporated would need to be determined.

Ms. Nunez commented that the landscaping would not need to be reviewed, as guidelines do not favor it be between the two buildings.

Mr. Shumway addressed the four story to three story issue, and explained that when building down, there is a need to build up to recuperate the cost. In this case, it would apply to the parking area.

Commissioner Travis agreed, from a construction cost standpoint, that the underground cost would need more height for rooms to offset the parking cost. However, the three story height restriction may still apply.

Mr. Shumway commented that this is the first time hearing about guidelines requiring no more than three stories. Only height has been a concern.

Ms. Nunez provided clarification that while there is no restriction on greater than three stories, there are guidelines that the wider the building the higher it should be.

With respect to providing time for the developer to make any revisions, taking in feedback from the Commission, the general consensus was to defer the item.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SUTTLES TO DEFER HP24-007 WITH A FUTURE MEETING DATE TO BE DETERMINED; MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TRAVIS: PASSED (6 - 0)

- C. HP24-008- Request for Installation of two (2) new wall signs, and one (1) awning sign & refurbish blade sign for National Bank of Arizona at 210 W Goodwin St.

Item 3.C was discussed following item 3.A.

Ms. Nunez presented the item, a request to install two new wall signs, one awning sign, and refurbish a blade sign, deferred from the prior month's meeting. This provided the applicant with time to propose a slight design change.

The proposal largely remains the same, which includes the install of two new wall mounted signs on the eastern and southern elevations, a new awning over the ATM on the eastern elevation, a re-skin of the blade sign on the southern elevation with a company logo, a small blade sign on the southeastern corner, and wall mounted signs with illuminated vinyl lettering with acrylic facing.

Concluding her presentation, Ms. Nunez explained that the staff analysis and recommendation were being based on a review of the request's consistency with Chapter 8 of Prescott's Historic Preservation Master Plan. She invited the applicant to address the commission.

Applicant representative, Taylor Lam, stated that the existing blade sign has been there over 16 years, and the request is that it be retained.

Chair Mirco asked about the size of the sign and how far above the sidewalk it sits.

Mr. Lam responded that it was 11 feet above the sidewalk and 2 by 3 feet in size.

Commissioner McCarver requested confirmation that removal was suggested, to which Ms. Nunez responded yes.

Chair Mirco asked if there was a certain square footage for combined signage.

Ms. Nunez responded that it has been reviewed and is under the requirement of the zoning code. The blade sign addition would push it over code slightly.

Commissioner McCarver asked if the sign was able to be grandfathered in.

For a while, the sign was not present, according to Ms. Nunez. Guidelines allow for one perpendicular sign. There is the option to omit one or the other.

Applicant representative, Jason King, addressed the Commission regarding signage. He summarized that everything ties together; however, the southeast corner sign is what is coming into question.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SPRAIN TO RECOMMEND HP24-008 WITH CONDITION TO REMOVE THE SOUTHEAST BLADE SIGN TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION; MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MCCARVER: FAILED (3 - 3) CHAIR MIRCO AND COMMISSIONERS SUTTLES AND KING DISSENTING

Commissioner McCarver commented that the standards and regulations are in place, and deviation may allow someone else to push it further in the future.

Commissioner King commented that he would like to clear up term regulation, as flexibility is there, the Commission is not bound by regulation, and has the option to adjust where necessary.

Ms. Nunez provided clarification on the two options; to approve or approve with conditions.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER KING TO RECOMMEND FORWARDING HP24-008 TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION; MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SUTTLES: PASSED (4 - 2) COMMISSIONERS MCCARVER AND SPRAIN DISSENTING

- D. HP24-010: Request for Installation of 28 Lineal Feet (LF) of 4' High Wooden Fencing in Front of Property & 19 LF of 4' Chain-link Fencing on Front, South Side of Property at 143 S Alarcon St.

Ms. Nunez presented the item, a request to install 28 feet of four foot high wooden fencing in the front of the property, and 19 feet of four foot high chain link fencing along the south side of the property. The wooden fencing will match in style and color to existing railings on the front of home. The property is not currently listed within the National Register of Historic Places, as the window configuration was changed at some point.

The property, a Queen Anne Cottage, is being reviewed as it is located within the boundaries of the Southeast Prescott Local & East Prescott National Historic Preservation Districts.

Applicant, Daniel Zorich, was invited to receive questions and comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Travis asked Mr. Zorich about the decision for chain link fencing.

According to Mr. Zorich, there are trees along the property line encroaching onto his property, and over time, a chain link fence would not prohibit growth and would allow the trees to grow through. In contrast, a wood fence may be shifted out of place by the growth and damaged. He explained that the trees are not an issue for him, and that the fence is to provide a solution to keeping his dog within his property.

Commissioner McCarver asked if chain link would be visible from the road.

Mr. Nunez confirmed yes, and that wood fencing material would be more compatible. According to the guidelines, an alternative acceptable material would be wrought iron.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TRAVIS TO RECOMMEND FORWARDING HP24-010 WITH CONDITION THE SOUTH FENCE BE WROUGHT IRON OR WOOD TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION; MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KING: PASSED (6 - 0)

4. STAFF UPDATES

Ms. Nunez reminded the Commission of the upcoming State Preservation Conference; all Commissioners have been registered.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairman Mirco adjourned the meeting at 11:11 a.m.

MICHAEL MIRCO, Chairman

ATTEST:

MARIKAY WHISENAND, Senior City Clerk Specialist

Date



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA: July 12 Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting
DATE: July 12, 2024
DEPT: Community Development
ITEM #: 3.B
SUBJECT: **HP24-007** - A Request for Approval of Demolition of Existing Building & Construction of a Four-Story Mixed-Use Hotel, Restaurant and Retail Building at 201 N. Cortez Street (Old City Hall).

ITEM SUMMARY

The project applicant is requesting an opportunity to provide an update on their progress, and will give a presentation to the Commission regarding revisions since the last meeting.

BACKGROUND

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no financial impact associated with this item.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.

ATTACHMENTS

None



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA: July 12 Prescott Preservation Commission Meeting
DATE: July 12, 2024
DEPT: Community Development
ITEM #: 3.C
SUBJECT: Presentation & Discussion Regarding the 2024 AZ Preservation Conference Debrief.

ITEM SUMMARY

This item is an opportunity for staff & Commission to discuss 2024 AZ Preservation Conference outcomes and takeaways.

BACKGROUND

The annual conference was held in Prescott at the Hassayampa Inn from June 25-28, 2024.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no financial impact associated with this item.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.

ATTACHMENTS

None