

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE  
PHOENIX HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Final Minutes

Date: November 16, 2015

Time: 4:30 pm

Location: Phoenix City Hall, 200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona

| <b>Commission Members Present</b> | <b>Staff Present</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Bill Scheel, Chair                | Michelle Dodds       |
| Kathryn Leonard, Vice Chair       | Kevin Weight         |
| Mark Briggs                       | Liz Wilson           |
| Raleigh Dombek                    | Erika Finbraaten     |
| Derek Horn                        | Jodey Elsner         |
| Margy Parisella                   | Bridget Collins      |
| Sherry Rampy                      | John Jacquemart      |
| Tom Jones                         | Patty Boland         |
| Christina Noble                   |                      |
| <b>Commission Members Absent</b>  |                      |
| N / A                             |                      |

|           |  |                                     |
|-----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>1.</b> | <p><b>Call to Order</b></p> <p>Chair Scheel called the meeting to order at 4:32pm.</p>   | Bill Scheel, HP<br>Commission Chair |
| <b>2.</b> | <p><b>Introduction of Commission Members and Staff</b></p> <p>Introductions were made.</p>   | HP Commission & Staff               |
| <b>3.</b> | <p><b>Review of Minutes from the October 19, 2015 Meeting</b></p> <p><b>Action Requested:</b> Approval of Minutes</p> <p>Commissioner Parisella made a motion to accept minutes as submitted.<br/>Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.<br/>Approved 8-0. (Commissioner Noble had not yet arrived.)</p>                                | HP Commission                       |
| <b>4.</b> | <p><b>Appeal of Hearing Officer Decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness Application</b></p> <p><b>Application No. HPCA 1500210, 1607 W. Flower Circle North, North Encanto Historic District.</b></p> <p><b>Action Requested:</b> Action to Uphold, Reverse or Modify the Decision of the Historic Preservation Hearing Officer</p> | Jodey Elsner, HP Staff              |

|           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
|           | <p>Ms. Dodds stated that the applicant had his withdrawn his appeal.</p> <p>Chair Scheel addressed those in attendance, who were there for this item, and reiterated that this appeal had been withdrawn in writing and submitted as of 4:00pm today - he thanked them for their attendance.</p>   |   |
| <p>5.</p> | <p><b>Public Hearing on Application Z-53-15-6, David and Gladys Wright House, approximately 330 feet south of the southeast corner of Rubicon Avenue and Camelback Road</b></p> <p><b>Action Requested:</b> Recommendation on Historic Preservation-Landmark Overlay Zoning</p> <p>Commissioner Horn made a disclosure that he was the Acting Planning &amp; Development Director for the City of Phoenix during the months of October 2012 to June 2013. Subsequently he was involved in the City's Historic Preservation efforts on the David and Gladys Wright House. He also stated that there is no conflict, he just wanted to make that disclosure and have it noted for the record.</p> <p>Chair Scheel began to review the <i>Rules of Procedure</i> for the Historic Preservation Commission. He then said that in order to get through this very important issue efficiently and effectively as possible, the Commission will adhere to the following format:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) 15 minutes for HP Staff presentation</li> <li>2) 15 minutes for Applicant to present the case filed</li> <li>3) Comments from the public: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 45 minutes for Speakers In Favor (<i>2 minute limit per speaker</i>)</li> <li>b) 45 minutes for Speakers Opposed (<i>2 minute limit per speaker</i>)</li> </ol> </li> <li>4) 5 minutes for Applicant rebuttal</li> <li>5) 15 minutes for questions from Commission Members</li> <li>6) 15 minutes for discussion among Commission Members and any possible motion, any further discussion, and then vote on the motion.</li> </ol> <p>Chair Scheel asked the Commission to please hold their questions until everyone has presented and all testimony has been heard. He then asked Mr. Weight to begin his presentation.</p> <p>Mr. Weight stated that he would be presenting a summarized version of the HP Staff Report, and invited all those with a copy of this report to follow along. He then reiterated that this is Case # Z-53-15-6 for the David and Gladys Wright House, address is 5212 E Exeter Boulevard.</p> <p>Mr. Weight continued by giving some background information. The 10-acre property was purchased in two pieces by David and Gladys Wright starting in May 1950 and the second piece was purchased in</p> | <p>Kevin Weight, HP Staff<br/>Vanessa Hickman,<br/>Public Private Land<br/>Strategies</p> |

January 1951. The house itself was built in 1951 and completed in 1952 on the western five-acre lot. The original five-acre lot where the house was located was split into three lots when two new homes were constructed in 1968 and 1972. The builders, David and Gladys Wright, lived in the house for the rest of their lives, until David passed away in 1997 at the age of 102 and Gladys passed away in 2008 at the age of 104.

Mr. Weight then displayed aerial photos of the Wright House. The eastern five acres were covered by citrus groves. The five acres to the west were essentially clear.

An aerial photo from 1959 shows the Wright House and the guest house, which is situated just north of the main house. A photo from 1969 shows the David Lloyd Wright House at the southeast corner of the west lot, built in 1968.

The aerial photo dated 1979 displays two additional homes constructed on the original 10 acres. The eastern five acre-lot was sold to the Sipe Family in 1969, and they built a home on the lot in 1970. The southwest corner of the western five acres was sold to the Stiteler Family, and the Stiteler's built a home on this lot in 1972.

In 2009, in the year after Gladys passed away, three of the Wrights' granddaughters sold the house for \$2.8 million to JT Morning Glory Enterprises LP, who apparently intended to restore and live in the house.

However, in 2012 the property was sold to 8081 Meridian LLC for \$1.8 million. On May 17, 2012, while still in escrow to purchase the property, 8081 Meridian LLC filed an application to split the lot into two parcels, with the new parcel line located where the house currently stands. The lot split was conditionally approved by the Planning & Development Department on June 5, 2012, one day after 8081 Meridian LLC acquired the property.

Around the same time, the Historic Preservation Office was contacted by the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy which expressed concern about the possible demolition of the house. The Mayor's Office contacted 8081 Meridian LLC and persuaded the owners to delay demolition to see if an alternative could be found.

Meanwhile, on June 12, 2012, the Planning Commission initiated an application (Z-24-12-6) to establish HP-L overlay zoning on the property. The initiation triggered a temporary stay of demolition that is still in effect and will remain until the City Council makes a final decision on the rezoning application. HP staff recommended approval of the application, as did the Historic Preservation Commission (voted 7-0), Camelback East Village Planning Committee (voted 9-5), and Planning Commission (voted 7-1). However, on November 7, 2012 the City Council continued the case because 8081 Meridian LLC was in

the process of selling the property to a new owner.

On December 18, 2012, the property was purchased by David Wright House LLC (current owner) for \$2.38 million.

In April 2013, the Planning Commission initiated a text amendment (TA-3-13) to the Zoning Ordinance. This was done due to David Wright House LLC clearly defining their desire to open the property to the public. The text amendment proposed that any property designated with an HP-L zoning overlay be allowed to open to the public, subject to approval of a Special Permit (SP) through the rezoning process. Staff recommended approval of the text amendment, as did the seven Village Planning Committees that chose to review it (Alhambra, Camelback East, Central City, Encanto, Laveen, Maryvale, and North Mountain), the Planning Commission, and the City Council Neighborhoods, Housing & Development Subcommittee. The City Council approved the text amendment on November 6, 2013.

In December 2013, David Wright House LLC began acquiring additional property surrounding the David & Gladys Wright House. On December 20, 2013, the LLC purchased the property at 4517 North Rubicon Avenue, immediately north of the David & Gladys Wright House. On June 23, 2014, the LLC acquired the property at 4529 North Rubicon Avenue. Finally, on October 1, 2014, the LLC purchased the property at 5226 East Exeter Boulevard. On May 19, 2015, the LLC filed an application to combine the four lots under its ownership into a single lot of 5.58 net acres (5.99 gross acres). The lot combination was approved by the City on August 20, 2015.

On September 14, 2015, David Wright House LLC filed the subject rezoning application, which proposes to establish HP-L zoning on the entire 5.99-acre parcel. The application states, "The present application, filed by the property owner, will better protect the existing [5.99-acre] parcel and give public recognition to the intent of Frank Lloyd Wright's design, reflecting the line of sight to Camelback Mountain over a lawn of citrus groves." The accompanying SP application has not been filed yet.

As for the 2012 HP-L zoning case, it has been continued multiple times at the property owner's request. On October 21, 2015 the case was continued again, this time at the request of staff. The case is now scheduled for the March 2, 2016 formal agenda.

At this evening's (November 16, 2015) meeting, the HP Commission is holding the first hearing on the new HP-L zoning application.

Mr. Weight then moved on from the background information, and displayed the most current photos (exterior and interior) of the Wright House and the guest house, provided by the applicant.

Mr. Weight gave a summary on landmark designation, stating that its purpose is to recognize historic properties with exceptional significance. There are five possible categories of significance:

1. A structure or site which contains an outstanding or unique example of an architectural style
2. Contains or is associated with a major historic event or activity
3. Contains important, intact archaeological resources
4. A site or structure of unique visual quality and identification
5. A site of general historic or cultural recognition by the community

In order to qualify as a landmark, the property must also meet all criteria for designation as a standard historic preservation district, which include the criteria of age and integrity.

The review and hearing procedures for landmark designation are the same as for regular HP designation. The only exception being that the HP Commission is required to adopt a set of findings documenting the property's uniqueness and significance.

Mr. Weight explained that there were essentially four effects from landmark designation:

1. A three-year stay of demolition;
2. Exterior alterations requiring a building permit would become subject to HP design standards. There is a hearing process and a general review process for those proposed changes;
3. The property would be eligible to receive financial incentives for preservation, through HP preservation bond funds, if available;
4. The property may be open to the public with the approval of a subsequent special permit through the rezoning process

The significance of the David and Gladys Wright House qualifies as a landmark under three of the five eligibility criteria:

*#1 – A structure or site which contains outstanding or unique examples of an architectural style*

*# 4 – A site or structure of unique visual quality and identification*

*# 5 – A site of general historic or cultural recognition by the community*

Mr. Weight then added that he had stated the following in his previous staff report from three years ago, and he is repeating it again this evening... "It is the most significant work within the City of Phoenix, by Frank Lloyd Wright, who is considered the most significant architect in American history."

Mr. Weight explained that Wright's design for the David and Gladys Wright House was undoubtedly influenced by earlier designs where the homes were adapted to their environment. He cited the "Solar Hemicycle" House for Mr. & Mrs. Herbert Jacobs in Middleton, Wisconsin, built 1946-1948, as an example.

Frank Lloyd Wright designed the house on March 30, 1950. The conceptual plan for the house took no more than an hour for Wright to create. Like the Jacobs House, the David and Gladys Wright House had a circular plan but was adapted to its environment by being raised up off the ground. Wright felt it was important to raise the house in the desert region rather than "berm" it, because of the swirling dust storms and desert vermin, mainly scorpions and spiders. The interior courtyard, which included a pool, would become a shady respite from the desert heat. When it was finished, Wright called the project "How to live in the southwest."

Two months after the creation of the conceptual design, on May 25, 1950, David and Gladys purchased Lot 7, Block H, in Arcadia. After filing the joint tenancy deed with Maricopa County, David wrote his father to let him know that a property was purchased. Attached to the letter was a hand-drawn map of Block H which included an enlarged layout of his lot. The property was covered with over 450 citrus trees which David mapped out by age and type. In his letter, David informed his father of his preference to preserve as many of the trees as possible, especially the oranges.

Mr. Wright used the map to orient the location and direction of the new house. As evident by the changes and notes on the map, the placement of the house was not suitable for the lot. On January 11, 1951, David and Gladys purchased Lot 8. The new lot had significant benefits, as it was adjacent to Lot 7 on the west, was accessible from two roads—Exeter Boulevard on the south and Rubicon Drive on the west—and was not covered with trees.

When finished in 1952, the residence was heralded in magazines such as *House & Home*, which described the dwelling as one that would be "praised, talked about—and argued over—as no other Wright house since Fallingwater."

The house was immensely popular in the first few years after its construction, covered in a number of architectural magazines. *House Beautiful* called it "A Modern Castle in the Air" and stated the following:

"Here in the Arizona desert, where man might easily be the least significant feature, he is king. His home is a castle in the air, curving above the hot, dusty floor of the desert, looking out in all directions above the tree tops of orange groves, 'the lawn of the house,' toward the surrounding mountains among which it stands as securely, as naturally, and fully as nobly as they."

The home's significance is enhanced by the fact that it, along with the Morris Gift Shop in San Francisco, served as a study for the ramps that would be constructed at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York City, one of Mr. Wright's most famous works. Similar ramps appeared in the design of the Grady Gammage Memorial Auditorium.

The David and Gladys Wright House is also one of Frank Lloyd Wright's most personal buildings. Among the hundreds of residential buildings designed by the master architect, the subject property is one of only two designed specifically for one of his children. The subject property is also one of approximately 30 structures that bears Mr. Wright's red signature tile, designating the house as a work that is completely of his design, including cabinetry and other furnishings.

The David and Gladys Wright House is widely recognized by the architectural community as a significant property. It was included in *A Guide to the Architecture of Metro Phoenix*, published in 1983 by the Central Arizona Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. It has been featured in numerous other publications and is considered by many historians and architectural critics to be one of Frank Lloyd Wright's 20 most significant works. In 1998, the National Park Service recommended it as one of 56 Frank Lloyd Wright-designed buildings eligible for listing as a National Historic Landmark.

Mr. Weight explained that in addition to the significance requirement, according to Section 807.D of the Zoning Ordinance, the property must also be at least 50 years old, or have achieved significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance. The property must also possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to convey its significance. In this case, the house was constructed between 1951 and 1952, thus meeting the age requirement. It has good integrity, having remained relatively unchanged since construction. The most notable alterations are to the ramp, which was rebuilt with non-matching block, and to the pool, which has been filled in. The property owner has indicated that both of these features will be restored. A guesthouse, also designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, was constructed in 1954; it contributes to the historic property by virtue of its age.

The integrity of setting has been compromised to some degree by the loss of citrus trees and splitting of the five-acre estate into three smaller lots each with single-family homes. However, most of the changes were done by the Wrights themselves dating back to the 1960s, so they may be deemed appropriate, if not actually historic.

With regard to boundary justification, Mr. Weight explained that Section 807.E further states that, when applying the evaluation criteria in Section 807.D, the boundaries of a historic district should be drawn as carefully as possible to ensure that:

1. The district contains documented historic, architectural, archaeological or natural resources;
2. The district boundaries coincide with documented historic boundaries such as early roadways, canals, subdivision plats or property lines;
3. Other district boundaries coincide with logical physical or manmade features and reflect recognized neighborhood or area boundaries; and
4. Other non-historic resources or vacant land is included where necessary to create appropriate boundaries to assist in meeting the criteria in Section 807.D.

In this case, the applicant has proposed that the entire 5.99-acre parcel owned by David Wright House LLC receive HP-L overlay zoning. This represents a significant increase over the 2.45-acre overlay proposed in the 2012 rezoning application.

The proposed boundary meets the first criterion as it includes two documented historic buildings—the house and the guesthouse. However, it does not meet the second criterion as it fails to coincide with the historic boundary of the Wright property. The proposed boundary includes as much of the original estate as is currently available but inappropriately extends beyond the historic boundary to include approximately two acres to the north.

Mr. Weight explained that the applicant’s justification for including the northern acreage is that it once contained citrus trees that formed part of the “lawn” for the house. However, those trees are now gone, having been removed approximately 50 years ago. What remains today is largely a dirt “lawn,” which does not merit inclusion in the HP-L zoning boundary. While the owner’s intent to reconstruct the historic setting is admirable, the boundary should be drawn based on what actually remains on the site rather than what could possibly be recreated in the future. The fact that this northern acreage has no direct association with the Wrights is also problematic, as they never owned it, lived on it, or planted the trees that once grew there. Including the northern acreage in the HP-L boundary will likely create a false sense of history by suggesting that it was always a part of the Wright property.

As for the third and fourth criteria, Mr. Weight explained that they generally apply to larger historic districts encompassing multiple properties (thus the references to neighborhood or area boundaries). The intent is to include vacant lots or non-contributing properties where necessary in order to create an eligible district. In this case, it is not necessary for the northern acreage to be included for the property to be eligible. The property was already deemed eligible in 2012 with a significantly smaller boundary.

In conclusion, Mr. Weight explained that the rezoning request Z-53-15-6 to establish Historic Preservation-Landmark (HP-L) overlay zoning



for the subject property should be denied as filed and approved with a reduced boundary (3.67 acres) for the following reasons:

1. The property meets the requirements for landmark designation set forth in Section 808 of the Zoning Ordinance;
2. The property also meets the eligibility criteria for age and integrity set forth in Section 807.D; and
3. The reduced boundaries meet the eligibility criteria outlined in Section 807.E.

Mr. Weight displayed the sketch map, which was included in the staff report, showing the reduced boundary (3.67 acres) – it included the main house, what was the David Lloyd Wright House property, but excluded the two lots to the north. He then concluded the staff presentation.

Chair Scheel thanked Mr. Weight for his presentation. He then called for the applicant, who would have 15 minutes to present, and began with Mr. Rawling.

Mr. Rawling introduced himself and stated that his family is the owner of the David and Gladys Wright House. He stated that he is the manager of the David Wright House LLC and the applicant in this case before the Commission tonight. Mr. Rawling thanked the Commission for the opportunity to be heard. He also thanked City staff for their efforts to save the Wright House in 2012, and for working with him and David Wright House LLC for the last three years to create a public process to open the David and Gladys Wright House to the public as a museum and as an educational and cultural center.

That process began in 2013, when the City Council unanimously adopted a text amendment. This created a two-step pathway to open the David and Gladys Wright House as a museum. The first step begins tonight with the HP-L application. The second step would be a Special Permit to define public access and uses with a great deal of specificity. Mr. Rawling noted that he looked forward to the public process framing an intensive and productive dialogue with neighbors, the preservation community, and the Phoenix community at large so that this house would be able to open to the public as a community asset.

Mr. Rawling stated that his family's involvement began in 2012 when the house was threatened with demolition. He also said that he was familiar with this house from childhood since he grew up just down the street. He mentioned that his mother studied architecture and she knew where the Frank Lloyd Wright homes were, and they would ride their bikes by the homes as well as the Arizona Biltmore. His mother had seen that he had fallen in love with architecture, and over the years they traveled the country to view hundreds of Wright buildings together. When they learned that the David Wright House was threatened with demolition and was for sale, they took the opportunity

to visit the house for the first time, after only seeing the house from the street. The house, the orchard, and the view of Camelback Mountain are the defining features of this house, and to Mr. Rawling, it was one of the defining images of the City of Phoenix and his home.

Mr. Rawling referenced the 1955 *House Beautiful* article. As the Commission considers whether the property is representative of the work of a master possessing higher artistic values, and specifically whether the northern two acres, that were once citrus groves that are part of the now existing property, are historic – he said it is worth repeating some of the words from 1995.

He then read an excerpt from the article titled “A Modern Castle in the Air.”

“As a climax, but not an end, to our story of the world’s greatest architect, we have, in this recent house designed for his son David Wright, one of the most exquisite examples of the romance and beauty he has brought—and at eighty-six continues to bring—to American life.

It symbolizes everything we have been saying about the meaning of Frank Lloyd Wright: his concern for the individual, his sense of the importance of interior space, his sensitivity to the character of the site, to the nature of the materials and to the poetry of structure—in short, the perpetual freshness of form and design which springs from the profound principles of his organic architecture. In this one building, we can bring together and study everything he stands for in terms of both his philosophy of building and his even greater philosophy of living.

Here in the Arizona desert, where man might easily be the least significant feature, he is king. His home is a castle in the air, curving above the hot, dusty floor of the desert, looking out in all directions above the tree tops of orange groves, ‘the lawn of the house,’ toward the surrounding mountains among which it stands as securely, as naturally, and fully as nobly as they.”

Mr. Rawling then shared that he thought the “lawn” mentioned in the article was referencing the citrus grove to the north of the property, which is now part of the David Wright House parcel and part of the property that he now has the opportunity to restore as a citrus grove. He also stated that their goal is to preserve the house in perpetuity, and their belief is that the building should survive not only one generation of citrus trees, but should survive for centuries to come. There should always be an expectation that the landscape will be evolving but ultimately we can restore the integrity of Wright’s composition of house, grove and mountain in the way that he saw it when he first visited the site in 1950.

Mr. Rawling said as they prepare to go through this process, the ultimate goal is to transfer ownership of the property to the David and Gladys Wright House Foundation, an approved 501(c)3 non-profit

organization, to preserve the house in perpetuity, to celebrate the Wright legacy in its broadest form and to inspire future generations through educational and cultural programming.

This house is unique in all of Wright's body of work, because it is the culmination of every element of his life. It is the culmination of 60 years developing a living organic architecture, which he regarded as the architecture for democracy. It is a celebration of the Wright family – it is the site where three generations of the family lived together at one time, in homes designed by Frank Lloyd Wright and Frank Lloyd Wright Jr.

It is also an opportunity to celebrate the Taliesin Fellowship. When this house was built in 1950, Frank Lloyd Wright was the head of the greatest architectural firm in the world, but he was also the head and master teacher at one of our country's greatest art schools. And it was not just an architectural school, but the Taliesin Fellowship was an art school. Architects were expected to go from the drafting room to choir practice to music practice. It was about living beautifully, and that meant studying architecture, visual art, sculpture, music, dance, and theatre.

Therefore, as a foundation, they viewed this as the opportunity to welcome students from across Phoenix to the complete Frank Lloyd Wright legacy. The plan is to develop a curriculum that introduces:

- Children from a young age through field trips;
- High school students who are interested in art, architecture and engineering to master work;
- Opportunities for advanced study to college and post-graduate students with hands-on training as the restoration begins; and
- Scholarship program.

Mr. Rawling reiterated Mr. Wright's reference that the house has not been published in the United States since the 1950s, and then more recently published again in the 1980s in Japan. And since it was a private family home, it was not until 2012 when it was threatened with demolition that made this second life possible. Mr. Rawling then stated that since the home is no longer owned by the Wright family, it is his hope to close that chapter of the home's life and welcome it to another where it is part of our shared cultural history. He then referenced the title of the plans for the house as "How to Live in the Southwest", and he thinks we can view this house as Mr. Wright's vision for the best of what American middle-class housing could be in the 1950s. Mr. Wright believed all great architecture embodies the spirit of the age. Mr. Rawling stated the optimism of the 1950s is very much expressed in this building, as is the love of a father and a son, who collaborated on the construction and design of the building for over two years. He also thinks that in the spiral itself you can see Mr. Wright's architecture reaching for the heavens – and for a man who called God 'nature'...this is about aspiring to the Divine.

Chair Scheel thanked Mr. Rawling and then called Vanessa Hickman to speak as the applicant's representative.

Ms. Hickman stated that she was there on behalf of Mr. Rawling and the Foundation. She then displayed photos of the property and made reference to the citrus groves to the north, east, and west – noting that the groves were an integral part of the design and orientation of the house.

Ms. Hickman then referenced the HP staff report from 2012. The report highlighted the importance that the property originally was a large flat tract of land surrounded by citrus trees, with scenic Camelback Mountain in the distance. Although the citrus trees are no longer there, the Foundation intends to restore the citrus in the viewshed toward Camelback Mountain. She also displayed similar photos as referenced in the staff report, again noting the citrus groves around the property that were integral to the design. She also made a reference to the *House Beautiful* article – the house was elevated above the citrus groves with the mountains as the perspective in the background.

Ms. Hickman then reiterated the initial sale that occurred from the five acres, which were part of the David and Gladys Wright House property, was to David Lloyd Wright. The next sale was the lot to the east – referencing a 1969 photo, she pointed out that encroachment to the property had already begun. She reiterated that when Frank Lloyd Wright designed the house for that specific lot, that encroachment did not exist – the design integrity and the setting were based on something that by 1969 was starting to disappear, but part of the goal is to restore that integrity. Hopefully, further speakers and supporters will be able to emphasize the importance of integrity of design and what encroachment can do to a property. She then displayed a photo of the guest house that was taken after Mr. Rawling purchased the property, pointing out homes that were encroaching from the north. Since then, Mr. Rawling was able to remove those homes and restore the vista. Further restoration work is planned to bring back the integrity of the setting and original design of Frank Lloyd Wright. The lines of sight were etched into the paving stones on the property, which led out from the center stone in the courtyard to Camelback and Papago, and were a major factor in the orientation and design of the house by Frank Lloyd Wright.

With regard to the eligibility criteria, Ms. Hickman stated that the application narrative details the criteria on significance, age, and integrity. She emphasized that this is associated with a master architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, and with the relationship between father and son. With the father serving as the designer and the son serving as the general contractor, this was a historical part of Frank Lloyd Wright's life. Frank Lloyd Wright is a figure of national and international significance in the realm of architecture, culture, and society.

Ms. Hickman asked that the boundary criteria be viewed very carefully, stating that there is no prohibition to including the now-vacant acreage to the north. That acreage is now vacant due to the removal of the encroaching homes, which gives the applicant the opportunity to restore the original citrus groves and put in any future improvements that are in line with the philosophy and design guidelines of the Historic Preservation Commission and the Historic Preservation Office. The applicant will return in the future with plans that are in line with the integrity of the site. The boundary criteria are met by this property, and will be detailed in the rebuttal. It is important to understand the vision and the passion with which this project is being approached.

Bob Vint (Architect, University of Arizona, Tucson)

Mr. Vint is in favor of this application. He stated that he has taken his students to tour the David and Gladys Wright House with a focus on its significance, integrity, and sense of place. He noted that the integrity of setting was intact during Frank Lloyd Wright's lifetime, but has since been compromised, and Mr. Rawling would restore it. He stated that there was a precedent for expanded boundaries at the national level with battlefield preservation. He listed several historic homes situated in neighborhoods across the country, which were at one time questioned by neighbors, but now that they are in operation, they are welcomed by the neighbors, who see the houses as something that makes their neighborhood a more special place. He stated his belief that this will also be the long-term effect at the David and Gladys Wright House Museum, enhancing the historic character and quality of both Arcadia and the city of Phoenix.

Victor Sidy (Paradise Valley Village)

Mr. Sidy is in favor of this application. He is a former dean of 10 years at the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture, Taliesin West. He also was active in the process of saving the house prior to Mr. Rawling's acquisition of the property. He then shared a few points to be considered in the deliberation:

- Wright called the concept of living architecture one of his most important lessons
- Wright believed architecture was relative when it was the vessel for life, for community, and for focused activity
- The spiral form, which for Wright represented life itself, was the crowning geometric achievement of his career and was present in only a few of his buildings, to include the David and Gladys Wright House

He also shared that in his work experience in the architectural and historic preservation worlds, not all house museums are created equally. A house museum as static artifact, which is visited passively, is an outdated concept. This is boring to new generations, and it is economically not feasible without an external source (i.e. – a church) supporting the house of the original founder. However, there is a new concept in architectural preservation that focuses on a vibrant infrastructure of educational programming and cultural events for visitors – these create a sense of space for the civic community (i.e. –

Fallingwater and Taliesin West). This is not just a place to be visited, it is a place where activities happen. It is his understanding of the Foundation's intent that those types of activities should be allowed, and in fact, would support the life that Frank Lloyd Wright intended for the place. He mentioned that today's visiting public is interested in experiences, not just to look at something from a distance, they want the experience to be participatory, and that is why these types of programs are important. He noted that UNESCO had made boundary justifications for viewsheds within properties it had preserved. He also stated that under no circumstance should the Wright House be moved, as its context was too important.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Ron Passarelli, Alison King, and Eddie Jones.

Mr. Passarelli is in favor of this application. He supports the HP-L designation for the David and Gladys Wright House and its grounds. He read a prepared statement that had been submitted to the Commission and urged the Commission to unanimously approve this application as filed by the Ownership.

Ms. King is in favor of this application. She agrees that the original estate qualifies as a historical landmark. She disagreed with staff that the proposed boundary would create a false sense of history. She then urged the Commission to give full support of the HP nomination as it was written.

Mr. Jones is in favor of this application. He said he found the opposition appalling. Zach Rawlings really did save the Wright House and was now offering a free gift to the community. He supports the entire six acres for HP-L designation.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Sarah Levi, Jack Gilmore, and Tom Chapman.

Ms. Levi is in favor of this application. She stated that she is the great-great-granddaughter of Frank Lloyd Wright, and the great-granddaughter of David Wright. It is meaningful to her that her great-grandfather's home is recognized by so many as one of Phoenix's most important landmarks. She then shared that the house is where she listened to music on the piano, learned how to swim in the courtyard pool, and played flash-light tag with her siblings in the citrus groves. As a fifth-generation Wright connected to this home, she is living in the home as the first scholar-in-residence. She stated that HP-L status applied to the six acres would preserve one of Frank Lloyd Wright's greatest designs in perpetuity - ensuring the open space and views her great-great-grandfather envisioned for the property. Her hope is for the Commission to place HP-L protections on the six acres surrounding her great-grandparents' home.

Mr. Gilmore is a landscape architect and Arcadia resident, who

formerly worked at Taliesin. He is in favor of this application. He commends Mr. Rawling for his plans for the Wright House property. He hopes the Commission will support the application.

Mr. Chapman noted that he was a former Chair of the HP Commission. He supports the landmark designation and urged Commission to approve the application.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Deanna Vickers, Jim McPherson, and Will Novak.

Ms. Vickers served on the board of advisors for the National Trust for Historic Preservation and had other experience with historic properties. She was unhappy that no one in favor was allowed to speak at the neighborhood association meeting. She called the Wright House a remarkable asset. She is in favor of this application and urged the Commission to support of it.

Mr. McPherson is the president of the Arizona Preservation Foundation, and a past National Trust advisor. He noted that the Wright House had been featured on the cover of the most recent issue of Preservation Magazine. He is in favor of this application. He gives full support for landmark overlay zoning for the David and Gladys Wright House.

Mr. Novak is president of the Phoenix Historic Neighborhood Coalition. He recalled how he slept in his car outside the Wright House when it was threatened with demolition. He is in favor of this application. His understanding of the opposition is regarding the use of the site. The issue is whether or not this is a historic landmark, and it unquestioningly is. He encouraged the Commission to approve the application as filed.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Cynthia Parker, Richard Staats, and Michael Mount.

Ms. Parker is a historian, preservationist, and interior designer. She had worked on the State Capitol and noted that Arizona could have had a capitol designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. She is in favor of this application. She pointed out a similarity between the Wright House and the Wrigley Mansion in that they both were almost lost to demolition, but fortunately both were saved. She urged the Commission to vote in favor of the application.

Mr. Staats is in favor of this application. He said it was unfortunate that important properties such as Sportsman Park had been lost and that the memories that happened at the Wright House can be kept alive with support of the application.

Mr. Mount is in favor of this application. He emphasized the unique and historical value of this house – many Frank Lloyd Wright design

features included all within this one building.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Karen Cook, Scott Jarson, and Donna Reiner.

Ms. Cook is in favor of this application. She is a new docent at the David and Gladys Wright House. She urged the Commission to accept the entire property.

Mr. Jarson is in favor of this application. He stated that the significance of the Wright House was undisputed by any architectural scholar. He urged that this house must be protected and that the HP Commission should support, at a minimum, the staff recommendation of 3.67 acres.

Ms. Reiner is in favor of this application. She noted that she was a former chair of the HP Commission and was on the Commission when they started landmark designations. She suggested that the Commission take a leap of faith on the Wright House HP-L designation and protect the maximum possible.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Will Bruder, Jennifer Boucek, and Brian Spencer.

Mr. Bruder is in full support of the HP staff recommendation of 3.67 acres. It is a master work by a master architect. He stated that Mr. Rawling will plant citrus on the northern acreage regardless of whether it has HP-L zoning.

Ms. Hickman interjected and asked to have the amount of time used by Mr. Bruder to be given back to the speakers in support of the application, since Mr. Bruder was not a supporter of the application as submitted. Chair Scheel approved her request to reinstate time to supporters.

Ms. Boucek was not present when called to speak. She did note on her speaker card that she is in favor of this application.

Mr. Spencer is in favor of this application. He indicated that he had been a licensed architect for 40 years and was an architectural historian. He reiterated that Frank Lloyd Wright is America's iconic architect. It is an investment in the neighborhood, the community, and Phoenix's cultural history.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in favor: Cynthia Scanlan and David Smith.

Ms. Scanlan is in favor of this application. She urged the Commission to approve the application. She said the Wright House has the power to inspire and it had changed her life.

Mr. Smith is the founder of the Tovrea-Carraro Society. He is in favor



of this application. He urged the Commission to vote in favor. He said they were always replacing plants at Tovrea Castle and the Wright House should be able to do the same.

Chair Scheel thanked all those who spoke in support for keeping within the allotted time frame. He wanted to share the list of names, for the record, of those who also submitted comment cards in favor but did not wish to speak:

Brandi Porter, Steve Dreiseszun, Suzanne May, Chris Nelson, Jennifer Culberson, Andie Abkarian, Elizabeth Lockwood, David Kreitor, Kristina Floor, Michelle Fischler, Rebekah Costello, Kim Kasper, Tim Eigo, Rusty Foley, Roger Brevoort, Cindy Dach, Bill Demphy, Anne Bales, Diana Smith, Caroline Lobo, Ryan Smith, Gordon Mueller, Diana Mueller, Greg Esser, Russ Sanders, Lora Hobaica, Dan Hobaica, Roosevelt Action Association, Tristan Jones, Christina Worden, Maria Salenger, Kimber Jones, Janet Traylor, Dan Cook, Phil Booker, Connie Booker, Marietta Strano, Michael Todd, Richard Ross, Patrick Panetta, Diego Delgadillo, Jeff Brodin, Steve Weiss, Howard Handler, Brian Irvine, Patricia Beale, Caitlin Beale, Kendis Muscheid, Greg Lehman, Jessica Lehman, Andrew Davis, Debbie Jarson, Gerald Cook, Covey Groff, Paula Rodgers, Beverly Foust, Serena Fonz, Sharon Anch, Opal Wagner, Marilyn Rendon, Lee Vickers, Deanna Vickers, Patricia DiRoss, Ginger Mattox, Joan Baron, Richard Fairbourn, Philip Reina, Gabriel Cerros, GG George, Yvonne Masters, Jeff Goodman, Erin Goodman, Jack DeBartolo III, Jack DeBartolo II, Lynne Newhall, Jennifer Gunther, Korrine Williams, Pamela Franks, Anne Durning, Sarah Russell, Neil Urban, Monique Urban, Eddie Schlee, Andrew Pielage, Carla Ward, Dianne Barker.

Chair Scheel called the first group of speakers in opposition to the application:

James Furcini spoke on behalf of those represented by the Arcadia Community Association. He is also representing the Sperling Family, who live on the site of the original five acres to the east of the Wright House. This group would endorse an HP designation on the original 2.45 acres or even the 3.67 acres, but they would not support the HP-L designation. This group is concerned that this property would become an event venue. The neighbors are asking to be considered in this application.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in opposition: Gail Andrews, Jennifer Sheedy, and Art Rowland.

Ms. Andrews is in opposition of this application. However, she supports preservation of the house, but not the inclusion of the north lots or commercial use of the house and property. She agreed that including the north lots would ignore recognized boundaries. She asked that the preservation of the neighborhood be considered in the application.

Ms. Sheedy is in opposition of this application. She said the Wright's broke the 50-year history themselves when they sold off parts of the property years later. She was particularly concerned about the Exeter lot, which to her did not qualify. She also shared that she is in support of preserving the home. However, she does not support the landmark designation. She stated that most of the supporters of HP-L were not in Arcadia. She urged the Commission to save the house, and save the neighborhood.

Mr. Rowland is in opposition of this application. However, he supports saving the house, but he does not support the landmark designation. He urged the Commission to save the house, but not to allow it to become a Trojan Horse for commercial development.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in opposition: Craig Steblay, Paul Barnes, and Wally Graham.

Mr. Steblay represents the Arcadia Camelback Mountain Neighborhood Association and is in opposition of this application. However, he supports the 2012 acreage, which was previously approved by the HP Commission. He said he doubted that Frank Lloyd Wright would have approved of an amphitheatre. He recommended not to include additional acreage to north, and not to designate as landmark, which would be harmful to the neighborhood.

Mr. Barnes represented the Neighborhood Coalition of Greater Phoenix and is in opposition of this application. However, he supports HP designation for the 2.45 acres. He does not support the HP-L designation, and does not support inclusion of the north acreage or the Exeter lot.

Mr. Graham is president of the Arcadia Osborn Neighborhood Association and is in opposition of this application. However, he supports preservation of the Wright House and 2.45 acres. He does not support the HP-L designation, nor does he support the expansion of the property boundary. He cited concerns about traffic, a lack of historical association with the north lots, and was concerned about precedent.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in opposition: Thomas Galvin, Charles Jones, and Marvin Borsand.

Mr. Galvin is an attorney with the Rose Law Group, representing the Sperlings and other property owners, and is in opposition of this application. However, he supports the HP designation for the house on the original 2.45 acres. He does not support HP-L designation, which would allow for the commercialization of the property. He noted that if the north lots were excluded, an access easement could be approved.

Mr. Jones is in opposition of this application. However, he supports HP

designation. He does not support commercialization of the property via an HP-L designation. He urged the Commission to give their support for the HP, but not for the HP-L.

Mr. Borsand is in opposition of this application – he opposes the expanded boundary of 6 acres. However, he does support HP designation for 2.45 acres. He does not support the HP-L designation, commercialization of property, and the high-volume traffic and safety issues. He mentioned that bus tours of the Glen Campbell House used to be a problem, and that delivery trucks would get lost looking for the house. He urged the Commission to support the HP designation for only the 2.45 acres.

Chair Scheel called the next group of speakers in opposition: Dorie Duff, Wendell Burnett, Volker Sonntag, Shari Lightstone, and Stephen Earl.

Ms. Duff is in opposition of this application. However, she supports HP designation for the original 2.45 acres of the property. She is against the HP-L designation and the commercialization of the property. She could not understand why the lot on Exeter was included since it was sold by the Wrights and the house built for their son is now gone.

Mr. Burnett is an architect with the Frank Lloyd Wright School. He noted on his comment card that he is in opposition of this application. However, when he spoke, he stated that he is in favor of the full 6 acres as Mr. Rawling had submitted on the application. He explained that landscape was critical to Wright’s work. He urged the Commission to support HP-L designation for the full 6 acres, but not to support the scope of development.

Mr. Sonntag is the third owner of the Stiteler property and the longest by far. He is in opposition of this application. However, he does support HP designation for the Wright House. He does not support HP-L designation, nor does he support commercialization of the property. He said David and Gladys Wright had been excellent neighbors and would not have approved of commercialization.

Ms. Lightstone is in opposition of this application. However, she supports the HP designation of 2.45 acres. She was concerned that the applicant’s public relations efforts contributed to dissention in the community. She urged the Commission to limit the designation to only HP on 2.45 acres, and do not approve the HP-L.

Mr. Earl should have been the next speaker, but Darrell Wadas approached the dais stating that he and his wife submitted cards. Both cards were located. Mr. Wadas did submit a comment card, but did not note whether or not he was in favor or opposed, neither did he note that he wished to speak. When he did speak, he deferred his allotted time to his wife – he urged everyone to listen to every word.

Mrs. Wadas noted on her card that she is in opposition, however, she did not make any note that she wished to speak. She indicated that she had met with staff and had been educated on HP matters. She was concerned that the expanded property no longer retained integrity. She felt it was unnecessary for the property to have HP-L zoning in order to plant citrus trees. She stated Sarah Levi's master's thesis was spot-on for what a house museum should be like. She supports the original application for HP designation on the 2.45 acres.

Then Charles Duff approached the podium. Chair Scheel asked him if he had submitted a comment card. Mr. Duff said that he did submit one. He had noted on his card that he is in opposition – he did not make any note that he wished to speak. Mr. Duff said that he supports only HP zoning and only on the original 2.45 acres. He agrees with HP staff that the north acreage should not be included. However, he asked the Commission to ask the applicant to clarify whether the north lots would be used as a citrus grove, or an amphitheater.

Chair Scheel then called Dorothy O'Connor and RJ O'Connor; they were not present. Both of their comment cards did not have any notation whether they were in favor or in opposition, nor if they wished to speak.

Joan (last name not clear) approached the podium. Chair Scheel asked if she had submitted a card; she did, but her name was not written on card, just her address – she did not mark that she wanted to speak, but did note "only if needed". She also noted on her card that she is opposed to historic preservation.

Chair Scheel called the final speaker: Stephen Earl.

Mr. Earl indicated that he was an attorney representing Volker Sonntag and the Duffs. They are opposed to this application as submitted. However, he is in support of the original HP designation; he would even support HP-L on only 2.45 acres. He said they were okay with the original concept from 2013 but it has since morphed into something much larger – what was once discussed is now a stepping stone to a full-blown events center.

Chair Scheel thanked all those who spoke in opposition for keeping within the allotted time frame. He wanted to share the list names for the record of those who also submitted comment cards in favor but did not wish to speak:

Karen Magnoni, Dominic Magnoni, Thomas O'Connor, Shari Capra, Anne Howard, Judy Flowers, Robert Bailey, James DuMars, Andrew Ogan, Quinton Wake, Robyn Schnitzer, Sarah Brevoort, Kelly Martin, Darl Chryst, Jan Cacheris, Chris Cacheris, Tim Rowland, D Kirk Mcallister Jr, Janet Chamberlin, Bill Bauman, Liz Bauman, Chris Watts, Tom Thomas, Teri Lasley, Mike Fisher, Kendis Drake, Neal Haddad, Karen Beckvar, Linda Bair, Marty Nodilo, Patsy Nodilo,

Richard Spiegelman, Tom Mason, Mackey Martin, Jen Sheedy, Charles Duff, Jim Warne, Joan Warne, James Schmidlin, M Schmidlin, Barbara Cowley, Robert Cowley, Jim Manelis, Donna Manelis, Lynne Sonntag, Jean Massimi, Alexander Massimi, Arlene Salmon, James Salmon, Amina Steblay, Jim Davies, Lorraine Davies, Ronald Jackson, Bob Jackson, Tracy Wadas, Darrell Wadas, Brad Jardine, Joan (last name not noted), and Sally Jo (last name not noted).

Chair Scheel then invited the applicant to rebut.

Vanessa Hickman spoke on behalf of the property owner. She reiterated the issues at hand:

1. To discuss the landmark status of the David and Gladys Wright House – the house meets the historic preservation criteria as a landmark.
2. Property boundaries – criteria may include vacant lots or non-contributing property. The current consolidated 6-acre lot, includes two vacant north lots, on which future plans include replanting of citrus and future improvements. These plans will be brought forward in the future for Historic Preservation Office review, and will follow the process through to HP Commission, if needed, depending upon the scope of those improvements.
3. Special permit application will be submitted when study findings have been finalized.

Ms. Hickman referenced the case of additional non historic property being approved to be included in the Tovrea Castle site. She then concluded that the purpose for the additional acreage to the north of the Wright House is to return the site to a semi-rural setting and restore the original feeling of the home. She states that this is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in reversing the encroachment of an incompatible development that fundamentally altered the context and setting of the original David Wright House and guest house. She also stated that the property owner supports the HP-L designation on the 6 acre lot in its entirety; the property owner does not support any other designation nor any other boundary alignment. She urged the Commission to support HP-L designation on the entire 6-acre lot and to allow the process to work.

Chair Scheel said that some additional cards were submitted in favor of application, and will be noted for the record, but no more speakers will be called:

Lynne Newhall, Jennifer Gunther, Korrine Williams, Pamela Franks, Anne Durning, Sarah Russell, Neil Urban, Monique Urban, Eddie Schlee, Andrew Pielage, and Carla Ward.

Chair Scheel then asked fellow Commissioners if any of them had questions of HP staff, the applicant, supporters, or opponents. The first round of questions was directed to HP staff.

Commission Dombek began by asking for clarification of the HP-L status, specifically that the landmark designation does not automatically warrant a special permit, however, the HP-L designation does give the option of applying for a special permit, which requires additional steps in the process. Mr. Weight agreed that the HP-L designation is not an automatic special permit. The HP-L only opens the door for a subsequent application to be filed for a special permit, which would allow the public use. However, the landmark designation alone does not.

Commissioner Dombek's next question pertained to the property boundaries, specifically the two acres to the north. He asked if those north lots would be eligible for inclusion since they are in line with the view of Camelback Mountain, which was a significant reason for the placement of the house on the property. Mr. Weight said that he could not speak to Mr. Wright's intent for the land to the north of the Wright House property. It is known that the house was situated a certain way to face the mountains (Camelback and Papago) and the citrus groves, which were referenced on the plans. However, the lack of direct association of the two north acres is a problem when the interest is preserving not just architecture but also history.

Commissioner Dombek's final question referred to the five criteria for landmark designation, and what is the minimum number of criteria required for a property to be deemed a historic landmark. Mr. Weight replied that only one criteria of the five needs to be met in order for a property to be considered a landmark. Commissioner Raleigh then stated that this property meets three of the five criteria. Mr. Weight confirmed that three of the five criteria for landmark designation have been met by the Wright House.

Commissioner Rampy asked if it was known if any fencing existed between the Wright House and the citrus groves. Mr. Weight responded that he believed the wall on north of the Wright House property was constructed in 1960s when the houses to the north were built.

Commissioner Horn asked for clarification on whether the Tovrea Castle landmark designation included the addition of land that was not part of the original Tovrea development. Mr. Weight confirmed that it did. He emphasized that of the 210 individual properties listed on the Phoenix register, 209 either follow the historic boundaries or as much of the historic boundaries as was available at the time. Tovrea Castle is the one exception, and it has had an interesting history as far as the designation goes. It was first listed on the Phoenix Register in 1989; then the HP overlay was removed due to the Tovrea heirs seeking to demolish the building. The HP staff reached an agreement with the Tovrea heirs to acquire the castle and limit the designation to only six acres, which included the building, and a small parcel of land extending to Van Buren. Additional view corridors were established where development would not take place. The City of Phoenix then

acquired the entire property through subsequent bond issues. In 2003 the City reestablished historic landmark status for Tovrea Castle and expanded the boundary to include 46 acres. This expansion was done to include all frontage along Van Buren and Washington as well as to preserve the original wall in its entirety along the property line, including the land inside and outside of the wall. Even though the Tovreas only owned the property back into the 1970s, it was confirmed that this property was part of the original Warner homestead, which was recorded in 1907 – establishing an ongoing history of the additional acreage in the current property designated as a historic landmark in 2003.

Commissioner Parisella asked for clarification on the discrepancy of the HP staff report noting 5.99 acres and the other presentations stating 6.1 acres. Mr. Weight stated that the acreage was noted as 6.1 on the application. However, the City of Phoenix IT staff drew the sketch map according to the monument lines in the street and determined that the acreage is 5.99 gross. So to confirm, the Wright House property is 5.58 net acres and 5.99 gross acres where it includes the adjacent right-of-way.

Vice Chair Leonard shared that she would be referring to the aerial photos as factors in her decision. She pointed out some of her observations that would be factored in to her decision. It is necessary to determine whether or not the citrus groves are character-defining elements of the property it potentially designated as a landmark and whether or not the absence of the citrus groves to the north constitutes a loss of integrity for the Wright House property. And since the north acreage was not part of the original 10 acres of the Wrights' property, is the acquisition of the additional vacant acreage to the north necessary in order to restore the integrity of the property to be included in a HP or HP-L designation. Is there a critical loss of integrity with the absence of the citrus groves, and is it necessary to restore the citrus? And if it is necessary, is it to such a degree that it is also necessary to expand the boundary to include the acreage to the north?

Commissioner Noble asked for clarification on whether or not the HP Commission would have purview over the appropriateness of development on the northern acreage within the HP or HP-L designation. Mr. Weight confirmed that if the north lots were approved within an HP or HP-L overlay, there would be a design review process. And depending upon what was proposed, the plans, if minor, would be reviewed 'over-the-counter' by HP Planners, or if more, the plans would need to go before an HP Officer at a public hearing.

Since all Commissioners had the opportunity to pose their respective questions to HP staff, the next segment was focused on additional comments from the Commissioners regarding the application.

Chair Scheel thanked all the attendees for their participation in the

process. He is encouraged by the participation, and that no matter what side of this issue each person stands, it shows that we are all interested in the historic preservation of this important house, and it is worth noting. He stated that as a Commission they make decisions based on standards as set forth in the Phoenix Ordinance. The Commission cannot make decisions on future property use or zoning matters, those arguments are best made with the Planning Commission and ultimately the City Council. He then stated that after hearing from HP staff, the property owner, concerned residence of Arcadia, and preservation advocates across the valley, he found a compelling case for recommending HP-L overlay zoning on the property as set forth in the ordinance. He also stated that he concurs with the HP staff report and that the northern parcels should not be included in this landmark designation

Commissioner Rampy stated that prior to this meeting, she had spent a lot of time talking to preservationists, historians, and zoning attorneys. She shared a couple concerns she has regarding not approving the zoning as the applicant had requested. First, if HP-L is designated on only 2.45 acres, and then a subsequent special permit is approved, how would the special event activities be policed so that they do not extend over that boundary? Second, if HP-L is designated on the full 6 acres, then who would oversee what development happened on the site? She referenced an earlier comment made about precedence, but she believes that designating the full acreage would bring back the original setting and the view corridors so that the citrus groves could be replanted, which were an integral part of the original design. She said that she does not feel that this would be a false sense of history since there was no previous fencing on the property.

Commissioner Briggs asked Chair Scheel regarding the segment for the Commissioners to pose their respective questions to the Applicant. Chair Scheel redirected the format so that the Commissioners' could address the applicant.

Commissioner Briggs invited Mr. Rawling up to podium. Commissioner Briggs then shared that three years ago, he was discharged from the hospital so that he could testify on behalf of saving the David and Gladys Wright House from demolition – as a member of the HP Commission, he felt it was very important to do so then. And he feels this is still just as important to do today. He is very concerned about one major issue, which has caused about 90 percent of the angst in the past, and he asked for clarity now. He did state that it is not the job of the Commission to approve a special permit; the Commission's focus is purely on historic preservation. Clearly a line has been drawn here between HP-L and using this property as a landmark, which some people call commercial, but that is the bottom line. Of course it is inherent with a landmark that it is commercial; just like you would be expected to pay an admission at the Washington Monument. However, the big issue regarding the two acres to the north of the



property has to do with the intended use of the parcel. Commissioner Briggs asked Mr. Rawling directly what his intentions were for the northern acreage. Specifically, Commissioner Briggs asked Mr. Rawling:

- Do you want to replant orange groves?
- Do you want to build something? If so, what is it?

Mr. Rawling stated that the principal use is to restore the view corridor north over citrus groves. The current plans call for a series of berms that will recreate a view north over citrus to Camelback Mountain with enough height to screen the majority of the side walls of the townhome development that is on Camelback Mountain. In addition, those two north acres allow for a direct connection to parking in the church parking lot, which also allow entry directly onto the property. There is currently a plan for a shade structure and a grass bowl – this site plan is under complete review as a result of feedback from neighbors and preservationists. Consequently, the size of the grass bowl is going to be reduced. There are plans for assembly uses, such as field trips, to use the north lot. And the time, size, and frequency of those outdoor events would be constrained by the special permit. It was initially planned for no more than 500 attendees, but the plan is to reduce that number further. He stated that the site plan that was submitted in the pre-application process was preliminary, and that he would be addressing concerns expressed by neighbors, and those made by Will Bruder and Wendell Burnett about the scale of future improvements. He said that it is a work-in-progress, and the proposal ultimately will be a function of continuing conversations with all of the interested parties.

Commissioner Briggs thanked Mr. Rawling and appreciated his comments.

Chair Scheel asked the Commissioners if they had any further questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Leonard then asked about the two acres to the north in that they would be used as a buffer area and that the public entry to the property would now be at the north. Mr. Rawling responded yes, since the north lot is the only parcel owned that is contiguous with the church parking lot – and that they are trying to be invisible and inaudible by keeping all public traffic on Camelback Road. They are working on additional improvements to further restrict any access to Exeter – to include addressing issues regarding delivery vehicles. He said that these issues are part of an architectural overview and discussions with City staff and the Fire Department in order to determine the extent to which they can limit access from residential streets even further. Vice Chair Leonard then asked Mr. Rawling how he envisions this citrus grove figuring in with the planned public entry at the north lot – will it be a true grove, or just planting citrus. Mr. Rawling stated that the north lot is planned to be a true grove, and that the plans reflect 200+ orange trees to be replanted on the two north lots and along the eastern property line. She then asked for

clarification that there would only be citrus and not a grass lawn on the north lots. Mr. Rawling stated that there is a plan for a grass bowl, which would be surrounded by citrus trees on the north lot – he further stated that only citrus would be visible from the house.

Commissioner Rampy pointed out the discrepancy between the 6.1 acreage noted on the application and the notation of 5.99 acres in the HP staff report. How will this technicality be addressed? Ms. Hickman acknowledged the technicality, and she stated that the application has already been amended to reflect the 5.99 acres as the scope of the application.

Commissioner Briggs had some follow up comments for the applicant. He first shared that, in historic preservationists' minds, when they declare something to be historic, they want it to be returned to exactly how it was. That does not mean a grass bowl, it does not mean a shade structure – it means a flat grove of orange trees just as it looked when the house was built and as Frank Lloyd Wright saw it – that is what defines historic. He emphasized that the Commission takes historic landmark designation very seriously. So when this comes back to the Commission for any major development, the Commission will be viewing plans from a purely historic preservation standpoint.

Commissioner Briggs wanted Mr. Rawling to know exactly what he is getting into with future plans for the property. He then asked him, if now knowing that the HP Commission would in fact attempt to block any attempts to put anything other than a citrus grove on the north lot, would he still want HP-L status on that property. Mr. Rawling responded by saying he respects the validity of the preservation philosophy, and that he is willing to submit to the jurisdiction of the Commission for any future improvements that he would be applying for on those two north acres. Commissioner Briggs stated that he was just asking for informed consent by the applicant – he also said that it is important for him to be straightforward with the applicant. Commissioner Briggs did not feel it was appropriate to cast his vote or consider this further without being direct with the applicant.

Commissioner Briggs thanked Mr. Rawling for purchasing and saving the David and Gladys Wright House from demolition three years ago. He also applauded his efforts and investments into the property with no guarantee of return.

Vice Chair Leonard referenced an earlier comment made by one of the supporters of the landmark designation on the full 6 acres – and she fully supports – is that the contemporary house museum does not exist within a vacuum; that to be viable, in addition to visitations it needs to have other uses. She stated that her decision would be based on two issues:

- Are the boundaries of the parcel as presented historically justified; create a historical reference
- If not, is that additional parcel needed to create a non-

historically referent boundary that would protect the integrity of the landmark

Commissioner Noble agreed with the larger context of preserving the original design and views, which are important to the house. She said that she understands that the usage of the property is not the issue at this meeting. However, she does like the idea of the property being used as an educational center. She agreed that the house is a very significant landmark and the boundary is also significant as a protective boundary around the house.

Chair Scheel commended Commissioner Briggs for his contribution to this process. He was the point person on this Commission three years ago to make sure the David and Gladys Wright House was preserved from demolition. Chair Scheel then asked Commissioner Briggs to make the motion, if he wished to do so.

Commissioner Briggs thanked Chair Scheel. He also expressed his appreciation to all those in audience for their participation in the process to voice their opinions no matter what side of the issue they stand. Commissioner Briggs then made a motion that the full 5.99 acres be designated as HP-L as listed in the application.

Commissioner Dombek seconded the motion.

Chair Scheel asked Commissioner if they had any further discussion items.

Commissioner Horn shared that most can agree that preserving this house is the most important issue. He thanked Mr. Rawling for stepping in three years ago to save the house from demolition. The David and Gladys Wright House clearly fits the criteria for the HP-L designation. He said that it is apparent to him that in the drawings done by Mr. Wright, in which the context to the north and the rest of the neighborhood were considered as part of his designs. Commissioner Horn supported the motion.

Commissioner Briggs shared that this was not an easy call to make. He stressed that he does not take his decision lightly. He stated that he had spent time with the owner at the property, and had met with people in opposition, including their representatives. In total, he had spent over 10 hours in meetings on this subject in preparation for this Commission meeting. He said that he is basing his decision on historic preservation, and he restated that this body is the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission, it is not a Planning and Zoning Commission, nor a Village Planning Committee, nor the City Council. He then stated that HP-L gives a three-year period of anti-demolition – this fact should not be trivialized – three years is a big deal, it stops things from getting done in commercialization, and time is money. He made a final point, that although he had encouraged various groups involved and who cared about this to begin direct dialogue among

|    |  |               |
|----|--|---------------|
|    | <p>themselves, there had only been one meeting prior to this Commission meeting – he said that it was a start, but they have a very long way to go yet. He stressed that it would be better for the neighbors to decide what happens in their neighborhood rather than leaving the decision up to volunteers, such as the Commission members. He encouraged them to come together with a consensus plan to present to the City Council. Commissioner Briggs offered his help by extending an invitation to meet with those willing to discuss this subject with him.</p> <p>Chair Scheel reiterated some points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HP-L designation on the entire 5.99 acres would provide more control and more protection on this site</li> <li>- He concurred that HP Commission will review future site plans from a purely historic standpoint</li> <li>- He concurred with the exception to include additional land in a landmark designation to allow for more protection of property, as was approved for the Tovrea Castle.</li> </ul> <p>Chair Scheel said that it was now time for a vote, and determined that it would be a roll call vote. He asked Ms. Dodds to call the roll:</p> <p>Commissioner Noble: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Briggs: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Jones: No.</p> <p>Vice Chair Leonard: No.</p> <p>Chair Scheel: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Parisella: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Horn: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Rampy: Yes.</p> <p>Commissioner Dombek: Yes.</p> <p>Ms. Dodds then stated that the motion passed 7 to 2.</p> |               |
| 6. | <p><b>Public Comment and Communication</b></p> <p>Chair Scheel stated that no comment cards were submitted regarding this agenda item.</p>   | Public        |
| 7. | <p><b>Adjournment</b></p> <p>Chair Scheel adjourned the meeting at 8:01 pm.</p>  | HP Commission |

For further information, please call Bridget Collins, Secretary to the Commission, at (602) 261-8699.

For ADA accommodations, call the Planning and Development Department, Elaine Noble at voice number 602-495-0256 or TTY use 7-1-1.

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