

ATTACHMENT C

PreserveHistoricPHX 2025: Historic Preservation Plan Update Village Planning Committee Summary Results

Village	Recommendation Date	Recommendation	Vote
Ahwatukee Foothills	6/23/25	Approval with direction	10-0
Alhambra	7/22/25	No quorum	-
Camelback East	6/3/25	Approval with direction	17-0
Central City	6/9/25	Approval with direction	8-0
Deer Valley	6/17/25	Approval with direction	10-0
Desert View	6/3/25	Approval	12-0
Encanto	6/2/25	Approval with direction	14-0
Estrella	6/17/25	Approval with direction	5-0
Laveen	6/9/25	Approval with direction	10-0
Maryvale	6/11/25	Approval with direction	13-0
North Gateway	6/12/25	Approval with direction	9-0
North Mountain	6/18/25	Approval with direction	9-0
Paradise Valley	6/2/25	Approval	14-0
Rio Vista	6/10/25	Approval with direction	5-0
South Mountain	7/8/25	Approval with direction	14-0



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 23, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	10-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Helana Ruter, the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer, provided a presentation regarding the draft Historic Preservation Plan update, highlighting the public outreach, the plan goals, and next steps, and asking the Committee to provide any final comments and make a formal recommendation.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Broberg asked about archeological resources in the village. **Ms. Ruter** replied with examples, including those found at South Mountain, noting that preservation of archeological resources is required by ordinance.

Committee Member Blackman asked about the limits on development resulting from historic designation. **Ms. Ruter** replied that HP designation is a zoning overlay and requires that any exterior renovation must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Office for design review. **Ms. Blackman** followed up with a question about windows. **Ms. Ruter** replied that windows only require review when the size is changed.

Committee Member Jain asked if there will be changes to address the state legislation. **Ms. Ruter** replied that the City cannot supersede state law, and the task is to figure out how to allow the mandated density while adhering to the design review.

Chair Gasparro asked about the incentives for historic preservation. **Ms. Ruter** noted standardized plans for ADUs and that the City is looking to make HP compatible ones, and highlighted the incentive program in downtown code and grant programs funded through the recently approved bond.

Committee Member Maloney asked how an HP designation starts. **Ms. Ruter** stated that it needs to be community driven because of Proposition 207, noting that the City wants at least 80% of property owners to sign waivers in order to consider HP designation and that the City is looking at an honorific designation to avoid the Proposition 207 concerns.

Chair Gasparro asked about tax incentives. **Ms. Ruter** replied that non-income producing properties on the National Register qualify for a reduction in property taxes.

Vice Chair Mager asked about the implications and enforcement of HP designation. **Ms. Ruter** replied that HP properties have a stay of demolition, but then a building can still be demolished, noting creative solutions are achieved such as a house downtown being moved in order to preserve it and allow development.

Committee Member Barua commended the Historic Preservation Office and the vision they have looking to the past and to the future.

Committee Member Fisher asked about the reason behind historic designation beyond simply looking at age, noting that a neighborhood of a certain age isn't necessarily interesting. **Ms. Ruter** stated that age is only one component and that 50-years is a standard benchmark used around the country, reviewing the details of the other two factors for determining designation, which are significance and integrity. **Mr. Fisher** noted that a 50-year time span today is not as significant as it was in the past and we should be looking for something unique or significant.

Vice Chair Mager commented about looking at today's development as creating the historic districts of the future.

Committee Member Broberg stated that the City of Phoenix owns land that could be used for developments that are more unique, which could stand out in the future, particularly noting that land is being used to house the un-housed population. **Ms. Blackman** noted that it would require an architect who wanted to leave a legacy.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Eric Gilmore introduced himself and spoke about concerns with the recently passed state legislation addressing missing middle housing, noting that it would significantly impact 22 historic neighborhoods within one mile of downtown and asking the VPC to vote to approve with direction to add an analysis of the impact of the legislation on historic neighborhoods.

Committee Member Broberg asked about the purpose of the analysis. **Mr. Gilmore** stated we cannot change the state law, but there should be analysis done of the impact of it. **Vice Chair Mager** noted that it could be beneficial to at least put the impact on the record. **Mr. Fisher** asked if staff has a position on the suggested motion. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the City doesn't have any concerns with adding the language to the plan, noting that they will be doing annual reporting as well.

Chair Gasparro asked if the analysis would be done in-house. **Ms. Ruter** replied that it would likely be done in-house.

Committee Member Jain asked if the Historic Preservation Office will be able to review permits for new homes built under this legislation. **Ms. Ruter** stated that there would still be a design review.

Committee Member Strem asked about determining what meets the criteria for designation. **Mr. Gilmore** replied that it is an analysis of the history of a building while understanding the need for new housing.

Chair Gasparro suggested looking at the original plats for any restrictions, which might be a practical solution to the issue.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee Member Jain stated a concern with the proposed motion from Mr. Gilmore, noting the cost of doing the analysis.

Committee Member Blackman stated that without the ability to control historic preservation, the historic areas will be lost.

Committee Member Broberg stated that this could be something that happens in Ahwatukee in the future.

MOTION

Darin Fisher made a motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Law (A.R.S. Section 9-462.13, HB 2721) will impact historic districts within one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District. **Toni Broberg** seconded the motion.

VOTE

10-0; motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction passed; Committee Members Barua, Blackman, Broberg, Fisher, Golden, Jain, Maloney, Strem, Mager, and Gasparro in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.

**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)**

Date of VPC Meeting	June 3, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	17-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Helana Ruter, the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer, provided a presentation regarding the draft Historic Preservation Plan update, highlighting the public outreach, the plan goals, and next steps, and asking the Committee to provide any final comments and make a formal recommendation.

Committee Member Whitesell asked if the plan has language relative to the impact of state legislation on historic preservation, noting a concern with the House Bill to expand the boundaries of the Central Business District. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the City is aware of the issues and that the plan must be approved by the end of the year.

MOTION:

Committee Member Whitesell made a motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction that considerations of the actions of the State Legislature be reflected in the report.

Committee Member Williams seconded the motion.

VOTE:

17-0; motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction passed; Committee Members Abbott, Augusta, Beckerleg Thraen, Eichelkraut, Garcia, Langmade, McClelland, Noel, Schmieder, Sharaby, Siegel, Swart, Todd, Whitesell, Williams, Paceley, and Fischbach in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 9, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	8-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item and did not indicate support or opposition.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Helana Ruter, staff, provided a presentation regarding the Historic Preservation Plan Update. Ms. Ruter introduced the project timeline, described the plan's five goals, described studies conducted on the impact and challenges of preservation, shared the results from a public survey, and explained that her team is coordinating with the City's Archaeology Department. Ms. Ruter requested final comments from the Committee, asked for a recommendation of approval, and stated that the plan will be ultimately adopted by City Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Committee Member Jordan Greenman asked about mechanisms for historic preservation similar to those available for adaptive reuse and asked whether the Historic Preservation Office is exploring incentives beyond the existing framework. **Ms. Ruter** explained that the Downtown Code includes a sustainability bonus that may be applicable in certain situations, stated that her office is interested in expanding these types of tools, stated that rehabilitation grants are available, and expressed a goal to build stronger partnerships with the Office of Customer Advocacy.

Committee Member Greenman asked if there are specific areas the Historic Preservation Office is targeting for designation. **Ms. Ruter** stated that there are no

geographic priority areas at this time and explained that the office is supportive of efforts such as the National Register nomination for Grand Avenue the Miracle Mile corridor. Ms. Ruter explained that staffing and funding resources were significantly reduced after the recession, stated that capacity is gradually returning, and explained that the office generally responds to community-initiated requests.

Chair Cyndy Gaughan asked whether properties eligible for historic designation have a defined path to being listed and recommended that a timeline be established to guide those efforts. **Ms. Ruter** stated that her office develops a survey designation plan each year, explained that there has been a focus in recent cycles on postwar-era properties, and stated that updates are underway for the City's ethnic heritage survey. Chair Gaughan asked whether community-based resources are being leveraged to support this work and help lighten the load. Ms. Ruter stated that this was a valuable comment.

Vice Chair Darlene Martinez asked how information about the City's rehabilitation programs is being shared with the public. Ms. Ruter responded that outreach is being coordinated with the City's Public Information Office and explained that efforts include posts on social media, updates to the department webpage, neighborhood outreach, and the development of online tutorial content. **Chair Gaughan** stated that City Council offices distribute information regarding historic preservation programs through their regular email newsletters.

Chair Gaughan asked about the proposal to extend the 30-day demolition hold. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the current policy applies to commercial properties over 50 years old that are either eligible for historic designation or located within areas covered by the Downtown Code and explained that the plan proposes increasing the hold period to 60 days.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Opal Wagner introduced herself, stated that she serves on the Encanto Village Planning Committee (VPC), and explained that the Encanto VPC considered the plan at a recent meeting. Ms. Wagner explained the Encanto VPC voted to recommend approval with the condition that the plan includes an analysis of the impact of the Missing Middle Housing Bill. Ms. Wagner stated that the state legislation will allow multifamily housing on properties currently zoned for single-family use and will enable further subdivision of lots, expressed concern that the Bill will incentivize demolitions in historic neighborhoods, and explained that the Bill is not addressed in the draft Historic Preservation Plan.

STAFF RESPONSE

Ms. Ruter thanked Ms. Wagner for her comments, stated that the Encanto Village has a large number of residential historic districts, stated that similar concerns have been raised in other villages, and confirmed that the impact of the Missing Middle Housing Bill on historic properties will be incorporated into the Historic Preservation Plan.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Committee Member Edward Vargas asked for clarification on the specific concern.

Ms. Ruter explained that under the new legislation the R1-6 zoning district would allow up to four dwelling units per lot, stated there are concerns that the Bill will encourage demolition of existing historic homes, and explained that there is a one-year demolition stay for properties with official historic designation.

Committee Member Janey Pearl Starks asked whether the legislation limits the number of stories that can be built. **Ms. Wagner** stated that the Bill allows for a maximum height of two stories.

Motion:

Committee Member Zach Burns made a motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan, per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the Historic Preservation Plan to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Law (ARS Section 9-462.13, HB2721) will impact historic districts within one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District. **Vice Chair Darlene Martinez** seconded the motion.

Vote:

8-0, motion to recommend approval the Historic Preservation Plan, per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the Historic Preservation Plan to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Law (ARS Section 9-462.13, HB2721) will impact historic districts within one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District passed, with Committee Members Ban, Burns, Greenman, Johnson, Starks, Vargas, Martinez, and Gaughan in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 17, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	10-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Kevin Weight, staff, gave a presentation regarding the update to the city's Historic Preservation Plan. Mr. Weight stated that the city's first comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan was adopted in 2015 and the current update was the result of a collaborative effort that began with two consultant studies in 2021 and 2024, both of which included focus groups and outreach, the results of which were incorporated into the plan update. Mr. Weight stated the plan update supports and expands upon the historic preservation goals outlined in the recently adopted general plan update, and details the public benefits of historic preservation, while providing a legal and historical background for preservation both nationally and in Phoenix. Mr. Weight stated that the plan update includes a timeline of historic preservation activities in Phoenix over the last 100+ years and outlines the functions of the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission, Historic Preservation Office, and City Archaeology Office, as well as listing the city's accomplishments since the adoption of the 2015 plan. Mr. Weight added that the plan update includes five goals, those being to protect archaeological resources, protect historic resources, explore preservation incentives, develop community awareness, and promote partnerships. Mr. Weight summarized the timeline for approval stating that the Historic Preservation Office has been presenting to the various villages with the intent of seeking a recommendation from each village. Mr. Weight summarized the upcoming Historic Preservation Committee meeting, Planning Commission, City Council Sub-Committee meetings, and City Council formal sessions, with final approval to occur in October of this year and an effective date in January 2026. Mr. Weight asked for input from the Village Planning Committee and that the Committee recommend approval of the plan update.

Questions from the Committee:

Chair Gregory Freeman asked if there were any historic districts in the Deer Valley Village. **Mr. Weight** stated there were no historic districts but there are some individually eligible properties in addition to the Deer Valley Rock Art Center and some early 20th Century buildings. Mr. Weight stated it is a shifting 50-year mark and that more properties will surface over time.

Committee Member Ricardo Romero asked about community engagement. **Mr. Weight** stated they had presented to the Historic Preservation Commission, which is a nine-member body appointed by the City Council. Mr. Weight stated that the Historic Preservation Commission has committed to being more active. Mr. Weight stated they have had a presence at certain activities and community events and have been working their way north into areas that have not had much activity in the past. Mr. Weight stated they have been working to establish partnerships with non-profit groups.

Committee Member Trilese DiLeo asked about the criteria needed to receive Historic status. **Mr. Weight** stated that the city's criteria mirrors that of the National Park Service and the State of Arizona, which requires the site to be at least 50 years old, with some exceptions, that the site be significant in terms of local, state or national history, and that the site retain its integrity with respect to location, materials, design, and workmanship.

Committee Member Gerrald Adams asked about the presence of archeological sites. **Mr. Weight** stated that Historic Preservation and Archeology are separate entities within the city and that he is not a trained archeologist but that there are locations in the area such as the Deer Valley Rock Art Center. Mr. Weight stated there are state laws in place that protect archeological sites and that if a site is known to have archeological significance, then monitoring of the site would be required during the development of the site to allow documentation of any findings. Mr. Weight stated that such findings do not necessarily stop the development of a site but allow the site to be managed in a way that is sensitive to the archeological resources, so they are not lost. Mr. Weight stated that some sites might be so significant that they are listed on the Register, which does protect the site. Mr. Weight stated that if human remains are found, the tribes are notified and the remains preserved per tribal customs. Committee Member Adams asked about time limits associated with the findings of human remains. Mr. Weight referenced a project at Tovrea Castle where a human body was discovered during clearing activities related to the caretaker's quarters and police were called in to investigate a crime.

Public Comments:

Tom Doescher identified himself as a member of the Encanto Village Planning Committee. Mr. Doescher stated that a couple weeks prior, the Encanto Village Planning Committee voted to approve the proposed Historic Preservation Plan update with direction to require the plan to include an analysis of the effects the Missing Middle Housing Bill would have on Historic Preservation efforts within the City of

Phoenix. Mr. Doescher stated that the bill was passed in late 2024 with an effective date of January 1st, 2026 and that the bill affects cities with greater than 75,000 population, allowing duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes up to two stories in height in and within one-mile of the city's Central Business District. Mr. Doescher stated that 22 of the 33 historic districts in Phoenix are located within that one-mile border. Mr. Doescher stated that the bill will have devastating effects on historic neighborhoods. Mr. Doescher stated that he resided in the Willo District, which received historic status in 1986 under a conservation plan, prior to the Historic Preservation Ordinance having taken effect. Mr. Doescher stated that the first house in the district was constructed in 1913. Mr. Doescher stated that under the new Bill, a developer could buy a property, let it sit for a year, then tear it down to build affordable housing. Mr. Doescher stated that the Willo District was designated largely as single-family homes, with two multifamily exceptions. Mr. Doescher reiterated that the bill will have a devastating effect on the neighborhood and will not provide affordable housing. Mr. Doescher gave two examples of projects in the area that were constructed in a manner that was out of character with the neighborhood. Mr. Doescher stated that the Encanto Village Planning Committee has received a consensus among the other Village Planning Committees to give direction that the plan update include an analysis of the effects that House Bill 2721 would have on historic neighborhoods in Phoenix. Mr. Doescher stated that other cities within the state that have historic neighborhoods will also be affected by the bill and that the City of Tucson prepared a 77-page analysis on the subject. Mr. Doescher stated that the Willo District tried to get an amendment to the bill, but it was too late in the legislative session and that they would seek changes to the bill during the next legislative session. Mr. Doescher reiterated his request to the Village Planning Committee.

Committee Member James Sutphen asked what can be done if the law has already been passed. **Mr. Doescher** stated that the Committee could give direction to staff to look at what can be done to exempt historic districts from this law. Mr. Doescher stated that he understands that this might be perceived as being against affordable housing but also stated that the Willo District and others were supportive of the law concerning accessory dwelling units, citing examples of garage conversions that had taken place over time. Mr. Doescher stated they were not opposed to affordable housing but did not believe that House Bill 2721 will have any effect on a statewide housing shortage when applied to historic neighborhoods. Mr. Doescher stated that the city must have an ordinance adopted by January 1, 2026.

Committee Member Sandra Hoffman asked if they had looked at placing deed restrictions on the properties. **Mr. Doescher** stated that they all have restrictions and are looking at Proposition 207.

Staff Response:

Mr. Weight stated that the other Village Planning Committees were in agreement that the effects of House Bill 2721 present a challenge that needs to be addressed in the plan update, and that staff is in support. Mr. Weight stated that the process of updating the plan began prior to the passage of House Bill 2721 and that a Text

Amendment to implement that bill is in progress. Mr. Weight stated that other municipalities such as Tucson have already begun working on the issue.

Discussion:

Committee Member Trilese DiLeo asked who wrote the Missing Middle Housing Bill. **Chair Freeman** stated that it was the State Legislature that wrote the bill. Committee Member DiLeo asked how a building could get torn down and if there would be any sort of rezoning process. **Mr. Weight** stated that if the property is listed, the Historic Preservation Office can delay the demolition of the building for a period of one year, during which time alternatives to the demolition of the building would be identified. Mr. Weight stated that under the current ordinance, the owner can propose a suitable replacement, which would be evaluated based on its density and character; however, under the new law, that density could be dramatically different than the adjacent neighborhood. Committee Member Dileo asked for clarification that if any home was to be destroyed by fire, could the owner come back with a fourplex as opposed to like-for-like as currently written in the ordinance. Mr. Weight clarified that would be the case within the Central Business District and within a one-mile radius of that district. Mr. Weight stated that it does not currently affect the Deer Valley Village but it does affect about two-thirds of the historic districts, primary those that are south of Thomas Road.

Committee Member Adams asked about rezoning the property. **Mr. Kuhfuss**, staff, stated that any property owner would have the right to file a rezoning application but that granting the rezoning request is not a foregone conclusion. **Chair Freeman** summarized that the new law prevents the city from stopping this type of development from occurring within this area. **Committee Member DiLeo** asked for confirmation of the maximum number of units. **Mr. Weight** stated the maximum number of units is four.

Mr. Weight stated that other recent changes to state law such as accessory dwelling units have been implemented fairly well within the historic districts, but that House Bill 2721 allows the replacement of relatively small buildings with much more density. Mr. Weight stated that he would appreciate the Committee's support and that if the Committee wanted to take into account Mr. Doescher's request to include an analysis on the effects of House Bill 2721, they would gladly comply.

MOTION:

Committee Member Trilese DiLeo motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction for staff to include an analysis of the effects of House Bill 2721 in the plan update. **Committee Member Ricardo Romero** seconded the motion.

Additional Discussion:

Committee Member Hoffman stated that she wanted the analysis to include both the positive and negative aspects of House Bill 2721.

VOTE:

10-0, motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction for staff to include an analysis of the effects of House Bill 2721 in the plan update passes with Committee Members Adams, Clark, Davenport, DiLeo, Herber, Hoffman, Hoover, Romero, Sutphen and Freeman in favor and none opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 3, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	12-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Michelle Santoro returned, bringing the quorum to 12 members.

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Kevin Weight, with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office, introduced himself and provided an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025). Mr. Weight discussed what the update includes and its collaborative effort. Mr. Weight shared the goals and the vision statement of the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan. Mr. Weight concluded with the public hearing schedule and stated that staff recommends the Village Planning Committee provide any final comments and take action to recommend formal City Council approval of the plan.

Questions from Committee:

None.

Public Comments:

None.

Staff Response:

None.

Discussion:

Chair Steven Bowser stated that Phoenix is in its infancy of historic preservation. Chair Bowser complemented the picture on the cover of the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan of a historic building on Central Avenue and Osborn Road.

Committee Member George Birchby concurred.

Committee Member Reginald Younger asked who the Arizona Veterans Memorial Coliseum is owned by. **Mr. Weight** responded that it is owned by the State and is part of the Arizona State Fairgrounds. Mr. Weight added that they have been working with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office to encourage the Fairgrounds to preserve it. Mr. Weight stated that they have been somewhat non-committal, but they have not demolished it, which is good. Mr. Weight stated that it is on their list of significant historic properties for the post-World War II era.

Chair Bowser stated that there are interesting resources available about historic properties and historic preservation.

MOTION:

Committee Member Gary Kirkilas made a motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Jason Israel** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

12-0; the motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025) per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Barto, Birchby, Carlucci, Israel, Kirkilas, Kollar, Nowell, Reynolds, Santoro, Younger, Lagrave and Bowser in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 2, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	14-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item in opposition.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Helana Ruter, Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Phoenix, provided an overview of the Preserve Phoenix 2025 Plan and its current progress and noted that this is the City's first comprehensive, citywide historic preservation plan, which was originally adopted by the Phoenix City Council in 2016. Ms. Ruter stated that the planning process began with a consultant study which included focus groups and identified both challenges and opportunities in historic preservation. Mr. Ruter stated with this foundation, staff initiated a public engagement process to refine and prioritize preservation goals and strategies. Ms. Ruter said that Preserve Phoenix 2025 is a supplement to the City's General Plan and supports its vision and core values by highlighting the role of historic preservation and heritage resources in shaping Phoenix's future. Ms. Ruter stated the updated plan builds on the previous 2015 efforts and considers emerging tools, policies, and actions to address current needs. Ms. Ruter acknowledged that the process has evolved over the last 18 months, especially in response to recent state legislation focused on housing and new laws have introduced challenges by limiting local zoning and design review authority, which affects how Phoenix can enforce overlays and guidelines that protect the character of historic properties and neighborhoods. Ms. Ruter stated that language addressing these challenges will be included in the updated draft plan and the plan includes updated tools and policy recommendations that will require extensive public engagement to address

evolving issues. Ms. Ruter stated the importance of balancing growth with the preservation of Phoenix's unique historic character and that not everything can be preserved, and the city must be strategic about what and how it preserves. Ms. Ruter stated the Historic Preservation Commission is a nine-member advisory body that will review the progress during its annual work session in August and in that session, it will help assess achievements, identify gaps, and plan future actions. Ms. Ruter stated the city's continued commitment to protecting historic resources within the constraints of new legislative limitations and that the final draft of the plan will reflect public comments and, upon completion, will be presented to the Phoenix City Council. Ms. Ruter stated once adopted, the updated plan will not only guide staff efforts but also serve to elevate public awareness and reaffirm the city's dedication to historic preservation.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

Committee Member Warnicke stated that they understood federal funding for the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) may be ending, and it was unclear what alternative funding options might exist for the SHPO. Committee Member Warnicke asked how the SHPO's inability to operate effectively would impact the City's ability to protect historic resources and fulfill the objectives of the Preserve Phoenix 2025 plan.

Ms. Ruter responded that while the City's Historic Preservation Program is somewhat insulated due to being city funded, the city is still facing broader budget challenges. Ms. Ruter stated that the city does not directly receive federal funds for its preservation program, but it does regularly consult with the SHPO and noted that grants for privately owned historic properties often flow through the SHPO and they are crucial in the federal compliance process. Ms. Ruter said if the SHPO were unable to operate, all required consultations would have to go directly to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, creating delays and complications. Ms. Ruter stated that the city's Government Affairs Office is aware of the issue and is working to advocate for the continuation of SHPO funding.

Committee Member Wagner thanked Ms. Ruter for the presentation and asked whether any changes had been made to the draft plan since the previous presentation in April and if it remained the same. **Ms. Ruter** responded that there had been some updates, particularly related to how the plan addresses legal and policy challenges stemming from new state legislation. Ms. Ruter stated that she has been working closely with the City's Law Department to carefully craft language that explains these challenges, especially those posed by the missing middle housing law without drawing unwanted attention or concern from the legislature. Ms. Ruter explained that while the city aims to continue its current design review processes, there are specific provisions in the new law, such as limitations on restricting building heights to two stories, that require careful legal interpretation, and these considerations are still being refined for inclusion in the final draft of the plan.

Committee Member Kleinman asked if the draft version is currently available is intended to be the final version presented for adoption, or if a more complete version will be developed. Committee Member Kleinman expressed concern that, while a draft had been made available, it may not yet reflect all relevant updates, particularly given recent developments, and asked for clarification on the timing for a finalized version.

Ms. Ruter responded that a draft version of the plan has been available since April and that it included a link for public review and comment and noted that beyond recent updates related to state legislation, no significant additional comments had been received to date. Ms. Ruter stated that she is actively working on incorporating further comments as they are submitted by Village Planning Committees. Ms. Ruter stated the Planning Commission will receive the plan as an information item this month in June, and it is scheduled to return in August for a formal recommendation and the goal is to compile all feedback into a final draft by then.

Committee Member Wagner asked why a recommendation was being requested at this stage when key information especially regarding the impact of recent state legislation had not yet been fully incorporated. Committee Member Wagner questioned asked if there was a compelling reason to move the plan forward now rather than delaying it until all outstanding issues could be addressed and if there was a specific funding-related deadline or another reason for moving forward. **Joshua Bednarek**, Director of the Planning and Development Department, responded that staff would welcome a recommendation from the committee, including direction to address state legislation as part of that recommendation. Mr. Bednarek stated that due to the political sensitivity surrounding recent laws passed by the state legislature, staff have been advised to proceed cautiously in how that language will be incorporated. Mr. Bednarek stated that while the legislation affects only a small portion of the plan, the overall significance of Preserve Phoenix 2025 lies in its reaffirmation of the city's and the community's commitment to historic preservation. Mr. Bednarek encouraged the committee to make a recommendation on the plan while also providing guidance on how to address legislative challenges in the final draft.

Committee Member Kleinman asked for clarification, inquiring whether staff was requesting the committee to submit language that would be legally binding, or whether this would be more of a policy recommendation. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that the committee could choose to recommend approval of the plan along with direction to staff to incorporate language addressing the challenges posed by recent state legislation. Mr. Bednarek stated that this would not be legally binding but would serve as policy guidance and that such a recommendation would help emphasize the importance of the issue as the City Council considers the plan.

Committee Member Perez asked whether previous public feedback submitted prior to the most recent legislative changes had been incorporated into the draft. Committee

Member Perez expressed concern that while the committee was being asked to comment on the new legislative language, it was unclear whether earlier feedback had already been addressed and asked how the committee could confirm that their prior input had been meaningfully considered. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that in addition to incorporating forthcoming comments on state legislative language, any feedback already submitted apart from the new legal concerns has been reviewed. Mr. Bednarek encouraged committee members to notify staff if there are any previously submitted comments that appear to be missing from the updated draft. Mr. Bednarek emphasized that comments about the legal and practical impacts of state legislation are being addressed in collaboration with the Law Department and will be reflected in future revisions.

Committee Member Wagner stated that the only comments previously provided appeared to be focused on the missing middle housing legislation. **Mr. Bednarek** confirmed that those legal concerns have been received and that staff are working with the City's Law Department to find appropriate language to incorporate into the plan. Mr. Bednarek invited any additional input and reassured the committee that the issue is being taken seriously.

Committee Member George asked what the overall expectation was for the committee in relation to the proposed plan. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that it is important to support the goals and strategies outlined in the plan and that staff recommends forwarding a recommendation of approval to the City Council, along with any additional direction the committee may wish to provide, especially regarding recent state legislation.

Committee Member Procaccini asked whether property taxes are addressed in the proposed plan. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that he did not believe the plan addresses property taxes and could not speak with certainty on whether such provisions were included in any associated legislation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Eric Gilmore introduced himself as a resident of a historic neighborhood and addressed the committee, expressing concern about the state legislation and the status of the Historic Phoenix Plan. Mr. Gilmore noted that while the plan includes technical details, it could benefit from additional emphasis on the cultural and demographic aspects of historic preservation. Mr. Gilmore recommended incorporating more data on demographics such as older adults, youth, and marginalized communities and emphasized the importance of preserving the city's cultural fabric. Mr. Gilmore also referenced prior reporting and urged staff to ensure that findings from earlier studies are adequately reflected in the updated plan.

Committee Member Wagner stated that there are remaining comments and questions, noting that while the legal issues had not been discussed in detail, it was important to

clarify that under the new legislation, developers could potentially demolish existing historic homes on single-family lots and construct multi-family units of up to four dwellings. Committee Member Wagner asked whether this interpretation was accurate, emphasizing its potential to significantly alter the character of historic neighborhoods. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that staff is preparing a text amendment to bring the City into compliance with the newly enacted state law. Mr. Bednarek cautioned the committee against engaging in detailed discussion on the forthcoming amendment, as it would return to the committee as a formal agenda item and asked committee members to submit questions in advance to help facilitate a productive discussion when the text amendment is presented. Mr. Bednarek reiterated that the text amendment and the historic preservation plan are separate items, though related. Committee Member Wagner acknowledged the clarification but stated that the text amendment, the state law, and the preservation plan are inherently linked due to their shared impact on historic districts. Committee Member Wagner reiterated concern about moving forward before fully addressing these issues.

Committee Member Doescher commented that the committee was being asked to support the preservation plan while significant concerns remained unresolved and that the request for approval without complete information felt premature. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that the preservation plan is a policy document and does not carry the legal authority to modify or enforce state legislation. Mr. Bednarek clarified that while there is a connection between the preservation plan and the state mandated text amendment, they are distinct in function and the text amendment will be developed and adopted separately to meet the January 1, 2026 compliance deadline set by the state. Mr. Bednarek stated the preservation plan is intended to guide the city's long-term preservation efforts but does not have regulatory power over zoning or development entitlements.

Vice Chair Matthews closed the discussion and called for a motion.

STAFF RESPONSE:

None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE:

MOTION:

Committee Member Wagner made a motion to recommend approval of the Preserve Phoenix 2025 Historic Preservation Plan Update, per the staff recommendation, with direction:

Motion to approve the Preserve Historic Phoenix 2025 Historic Preservation Plan Update to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Law ARS

(Arizona Revised Statutes) §9-462.13/HB (House Bill) 2721 will impact historic districts with one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District.

Committee Member G.G. George seconded the motion.

VOTE:

14-0, motion to recommend approval of the Preserve Phoenix 2025 Historic Preservation Plan Update, per the staff recommendation, with direction passes with Committee Members Cardenas, Doescher, Garcia, George, Kleinman, Mahrle, Perez, Picos, Procaccini, Schiller, Tedhams, Wagner, Warnicke, and Matthews in favor.

Committee Member Warnicke commented that the state has become the biggest single threat to the city's neighborhoods.

Committee Member Wagner stated that the legislation poses a clear threat to historic preservation and should be prioritized in the plan's list of identified challenges.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 17, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	5-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Two members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Helana Ruter, with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office, provided an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), noting that the plan will set the framework for historic preservation in Phoenix for the next 10 years. Ms. Ruter stated that the plan is an update to the 2015 plan. Ms. Ruter discussed what the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan includes and the five goal areas of the plan. Ms. Ruter concluded with the public hearing timeline and stated that staff recommend that the Village Planning Committee provide any final comments and take action to recommend formal City Council approval of the plan

Questions from the Committee:

Kristine Morris asked if only government buildings or residential buildings could be listed as historic. **Ms. Ruter** stated that a historic preservation overlay is not limited to government buildings or residential buildings and noted examples such as grain silos. Ms. Ruter noted that the recent bond allowed people to apply and encouraged a diversity of buildings and structures. **Ms. Morris** asked for more information regarding identifying historic properties because she was the superintendent of a school that was currently restoring a schoolhouse from the 1920's. **Ms. Ruter** noted that there were land surveys from the 1980's through the early 2000's but that that stopped during the recession. Ms. Ruter stated that with this updated plan, there is a larger initiative to start surveying properties again. Ms. Ruter requested Committee Member Morris to follow up with her regarding the schoolhouse.

Chair Parris Wallace stated that numerous of these historic neighborhoods consisted of the working class. Chair Wallace asked how the update would address gentrification. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the way properties are identified as historic was by rezoning the site to include the Historic Preservation Overlay in the zoning designation. Ms. Ruter added that that designation would have to go through the public hearing process and be approved by

the City Council. Ms. Ruter stated that there is a certain classification that does not require rezoning the property. Ms. Ruter added that this would give individual properties the recognition of historic designation without it being regulatory. Ms. Ruter noted that a historic preservation overlay doesn't limit development, if the property meets all the requirements. Ms. Ruter provided some examples like keeping the building façade.

Chair Wallace asked how the update would impact future development or redevelopment. **Ms. Ruter** stated that if a property was over 50 years old, then it is put on hold for 30 days to allow the Historic Preservation Office to analyze the property and possibly save it from being torn down. Ms. Ruter added that some property owners do not want the historic designation on their property but that their department requests small features to tie the property to the past.

Vice Chair Lisa Perez remembered the Circles Records and Tapes store that faced a lot of backlash when it was demolished. Vice Chair Perez stated that Phoenix does not have a deep history. Chair Perez mentioned the historic building on 3rd Street and Osborn which was able to restore the façade, but the building was used for a different use.

Ms. Ruter stated that with the update, she hoped that there would be more initiatives such as grants to assist these developments and improvements. **Vice Chair Perez** mentioned the rezone case that consisted of a historic laundromat and how there were a wide range of opinions.

Ms. Morris asked why historic properties were not included in the General Plan Update discussions. **Vice Chair Perez** noted that the General Plan Land Use Map focused on land use and not necessarily the historic property designation.

Ms. Morris asked how they provide feedback regarding the update. **Ms. Ruter** noted that they were seeking a recommendation from the committee but that she would be happy to discuss any comments and comments can still be provided now or via email.

Marcus Cenicerros asked for more information regarding the amtrack, and the old train station located in downtown Phoenix. **Ms. Ruter** stated that that property was owned by a private entity but that it was both on the National and Phoenix Historic Registry.

Public Comment:

Opal Wagner stated that she was on the Encanto Village Planning Committee and noted that she lived in the oldest historic districts in the city. Ms. Wagner noted that the Encanto committee has requested the Historic Preservation Office to amend the plan to address the missing middle housing. Ms. Wagner voiced her concern on how the state level initiatives could affect over 22 different neighborhoods. Ms. Wagner noted that many of the houses located in these historic neighborhoods are one story and that the initiative could potentially cause a lot of demolition to allow for additional houses. Ms. Wagner requested the Estrella committee to include the same direction in their recommendation as the Encanto committee.

Aaron Montano noted that he was also on the Encanto Village Planning Committee and that he echoed and supported the comments and request presented by Opal Wagner. Mr. Montano agreed that Phoenix does not have many historic buildings and noted that these historic neighborhoods dated back to the 1930's. Mr. Montano stated that he supported affordable housing but that the updated needed to be updated to address the missing middle housing.

Committee Discussion/Motion/Vote:

Vice Chair Perez noted that there was a collision that focused on the missing middle housing movement. Vice Chair Perez was skeptical that this approach would provide affordable housing. Vice Chair Perez thanked both members of the public for coming to the Estrella Village Planning Committee meeting to provide their comments. Vice Chair Perez noted that she was familiar with the level of engagement and passion by residents that live in these historic neighborhoods. Vice Chair Perez voiced her support to add the same direction as the other committees.

Chair Wallace thanked the members of the public for their comments but noted that four houses would help serve the community more than one.

Ms. Wagner noted that they were not opposed to additional or affordable housing but would like the updated plan to assess how it would affect historic neighborhoods.

Motion:

Vice Chair Lisa Perez motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Middle Housing Law, ARS Section 9-426-13, House Bill 2721 will impact Phoenix historic districts. **Kristine Morris** seconded.

Vote:

5-0, motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction passed with Committee Members Cenicerros, Dominguez, Morris, Perez, and Wallace in favor.

Staff Comments Regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 9, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	10-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Three members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Kevin Weight, with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office, introduced himself and provided an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan update. Mr. Weight shared how to access the plan. Mr. Weight discussed what the update is for and the collaborative effort of the plan update. Mr. Weight shared what the plan update includes and the goals of the plan update. Mr. Weight concluded with the public hearing timeline and stated that staff recommends the Village Planning Committee provide any final comments and take action to recommend formal City Council approval.

Questions from the Committee:

None.

Public Comment:

Chair Stephanie Hurd asked Phil Hertel if he would like to speak since he submitted a speaker card. **Phil Hertel** noted that he did not need to speak.

Dan Penton voiced his support for the preservation plan. Mr. Penton noted that one of the plan's goals was identifying and protecting the neighborhood heritage concept. Mr. Penton stated that numerous properties in the Laveen village would meet the 40–50-year criteria to be identified as a heritage neighborhood. Mr. Penton requested more historic preservation enforcements that would prevent historic properties from being neglected or demolished. Mr. Penton added that South Mountain Park should be designated as cultural property to further protect it from future development.

Tom Doescher stated that he was there representing the Willo Historic Neighborhood. Mr. Doescher requested that the updated plan address the missing middle housing. Mr. Doescher stated that historic houses could be torn down and converted into four units, thus eliminating history. Mr. Doescher reiterated his request to add a recommendation to address missing middle housing in the updated plan.

Staff Response:

Mr. Weight appreciated the support voiced by the members of the public and noted that they have discussed the request to include missing middle housing during the Encanto Village Planning Committee meeting. Mr. Weight added that the committee was supportive of the direction and approved the updated plan. Mr. Weight noted that this would not affect Laveen but understood the community's request to preserve single-family houses. Mr. Weight stated that he would not oppose the Laveen committee's decision if they wanted to add direction to address missing middle housing.

Committee Discussion/Motion/Vote:

None.

Motion:

Kristi McCann motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Middle Housing Law, ARS Section 9-426-13, House Bill 2721 will impact Phoenix historic districts. **Mixen Rubio-Raffin** seconded.

Vote:

10-0, motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction passed with Committee Members Darby, McCann, Nasser-Taylor, Ortega, Perrera, Rouse, Rubio-Raffin, Serrette, Barraza, Jensen, and Hurd in favor.

Staff Comments Regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 11, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	13-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Lupita Galaviz arrived during this item bringing the quorum thirteen.

One member of the public registered to speak on this item.

Helana Ruter, City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer, indicated that the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan is an update to the first historic preservation plan adopted by the City of Phoenix ten years ago. Ms. Ruter noted a firm and focus group were employed to provide recommendations which kicked off a public engagement process. Ms. Ruter said the majority of the historic districts are on the periphery of downtown. Ms. Ruter stated there was an effort at the state level with legislation trying to limit municipal design review and zoning to keep buildings more affordable.

Ms. Ruter added that coming later in the Fall to the Village Planning Committees is a text amendment related to the missing middle housing. Ms. Ruter said she mentioned it as it applies to the historic areas around downtown and it will impact the historic districts. Ms. Ruter noted the plan outlines what the City's Historic Preservation and Archaeology Office does and outlines their goals. Ms. Ruter said the original five goals of the 2015 plan are still relevant but this plan now provides background information and recommended tools or policy action items which vary in complexity. Ms. Ruter said it's a broad overarching document and mentioned she would be going out to the other Villages to make this presentation. Ms. Ruter said that today she was ultimately looking for a recommendation of approval.

Vice Chair Derie asked for the criteria for a building. **Ms. Ruter** said it could be archaeological resources and the built environment. Ms. Ruter said the Maryvale Terrace is a neighborhood of important significance. Vice Chair Derie asked for

the results of the David and Gladys Wright House. Ms. Ruter said the house was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and a historic conservation easement was put on the house. Vice Chair Derie asked because it was about an event center.

Al DePascal asked if it is mainly for the downtown area. **Ms. Ruter** said this is citywide and the plan looks beyond the city to be more innovative.

Vice Chair Derie asked if the Western Savings building was considered historic. **Ms. Ruter** said it was not designated but eligible. Vice Chair Derie said the City of Phoenix used to not see the significance of preserving historic structures.

Warren Norgaard asked if the actual plan was the link from the QR Code. **Ms. Ruter** said that was the 55 pages and outlines goals as a summary of the different resources and tools they'd like to implement over the next decade.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Opal Wagner from the Encanto Village Planning Committee said that her village has some of Phoenix's largest and oldest historic areas in the City. Ms. Wagner brought to the attention of the committee the missing middle housing legislation in the areas near downtown. Ms. Wagner said the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommended approval of the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 Historic Preservation Plan update with the stipulation that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Law (A.R.S. Section 9-462.13, HB 2721) will impact Phoenix's historic neighborhoods.

Ms. Wagner added the Camelback East, Central City, Laveen and Rio Vista Villages adopted the same amended language. Ms. Wagner shared her concerns with the plan update and asked if the Maryvale Village Planning Committee would consider doing this.

Al DePascal asked if the State Legislature and what the State passed would allow the demolition of historic structures and build 2-story homes in place of them. **Vice Chair Derie** asked if the suggested recommendation would be to amplify the voice together of the different Villages. **Ms. Wagner** said yes and the suggestion would make the report better.

Ken DuBose thought what was being asked was not a whole lot.

Al DePascal asked what the Governor said and Ms. Wagner said she had signed the House Bill.

Vice Chair Derie asked if they had information about the plan update before and **Mr. Moric** said the Village Planning Committee received a brief update at a

previous meeting and the Historic Preservation Plan staff report was provided in the monthly packet.

Motion

Patricia Jimenez motioned to recommend approval of the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction that the staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Law (A.R.S. Section 9-4692, 13, HB2721) will impact Phoenix's historic neighborhoods. **Vice Chair Derie** seconded the motion.

Vote

13-0, Motion to recommend approval of the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 Historic Preservation Plan update, per the staff recommendation, with direction passed, with Committee Members Acevedo, Alonzo, Demarest, DePascal, DuBose, Ewing, Galaviz, Jimenez, Norgaard, Ramirez, Weber, Derie and Barba in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 12, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	9-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item, with concerns.

Staff Presentation:

Helana Ruter, with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office, provided an overview of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), noting that the plan will set the framework for historic preservation in Phoenix for the next 10 years. Ms. Ruter stated that the plan is an update to the 2015 plan. Ms. Ruter discussed what the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan includes and the five goal areas of the plan. Ms. Ruter concluded with the public hearing timeline and stated that staff recommends that the Village Planning Committee provide any final comments and take action to recommend formal City Council approval of the plan.

Questions from Committee:

None.

Public Comments:

Tom Doescher introduced himself as a member of the Encanto Village Planning Committee, with concerns. Mr. Doescher stated that the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommended approval of the plan with direction. Mr. Doescher stated that the Arizona State Legislature passed a bill called the Missing Middle Housing bill (HB 2721) a year ago, which will allow duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in single-family residential areas within a mile of the central business district. Mr. Doescher expressed concerns with the impacts HB 2721 would have on historic single-family districts and historic single-family homes, noting that a majority of the historic districts are within a mile of the central business district in Phoenix. Mr. Doescher stated that the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommended approval of the plan with direction to include an analysis of how HB 2721 would impact historic neighborhoods. Mr.

Doescher requested that the North Gateway Village Planning Committee include this same direction in their recommendation.

Staff Response:

None.

Discussion:

Committee Member Paul Carver asked for clarification if the request would be to take HB 2721 into consideration. **Mr. Doescher** responded affirmatively, noting that the Encanto Village Planning Committee tried to get an amendment to the bill to exempt historic districts from the bill, but it was at the end of the legislative session and would not be heard. Mr. Doescher stated that the State Legislature encouraged them to come back to the next session to consider it. Committee Member Carver stated that a consideration would not remove the problem to leave the historic districts untouched. Mr. Doescher clarified that the recommendation would be approval with direction to staff to look at how HB 2721 would impact historic districts. Committee Member Carver responded that he would be supportive of this recommendation.

Chair Julie Read stated that the City must comply with State law and cannot exempt historic districts if the law does not allow it. Chair Read stated that the direction could be for staff to note it and look into it. Chair Read added that Committee members could testify at the next legislative session speaking as a member of the Committee, but not on behalf of the Committee.

Ms. Ruter stated that the City is working on a Text Amendment to address HB 2721, which has to be adopted by the end of the year.

Committee Member Paul Li expressed concerns with adding a stipulation that is fairly vague.

Adrian Zambrano, staff, stated that it would not be a stipulation, but rather would be direction for staff to look into this topic and include it in an updated version of the plan.

Vice Chair Michelle Ricart asked for clarification if it would be included only if staff is able to include it. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that this is a policy plan and is not regulatory, so that information on how the bill affects historic neighborhoods could be included.

MOTION:

Committee Member Li motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction to include an analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing bill (HB 2721) will impact historic neighborhoods. **Vice Chair Ricart** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

9-0; the motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025) per the staff recommendation with direction passed with

Committee members Carver, Crouch, Li, Manion, McCarty, Salow, Stein, Ricart and Read in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 18, 2025
Request	Adoption of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	9-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Two members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Helana Ruter, staff, stated that the draft plan is available online and directed the Committee to either the link in the staff report or the QR code in the flyer. Ms. Ruter stated that the current plan update is an update to the first plan that was adopted in 2015. Ms. Ruter stated that the city contracted with a consultant to prepare a report and hold various focus groups that identified challenges with historic preservation. Ms. Ruter stated that the report was published in 2023, but since that time things have come up including recent state legislation, which will have an effect on some of the historic districts within one mile of the downtown area. Ms. Ruter stated that she anticipated hearing public comments later in the evening and looked forward to providing additional information in the plan update to address those concerns. Ms. Ruter stated that plan update serves as a framework that discusses the underpinnings of historic preservation, the legal basis for historic preservation, accomplishments over the last ten years, and outlines the goals for the coming ten years. Ms. Ruter stated that the original goals of the 2015 plan were still very relevant but that certain tools needed to achieve those goals were missing. Ms. Ruter stated that the city has a city archeologist who operates within the city's Archeology Office under the Arts and Culture Department. Ms. Ruter stated that Chapter 8 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance includes protections of archeological resources but needs some bolstering. Ms. Ruter stated that the Historic Preservation Office worked with the city's Archeology Office to provide policy guidance in the plan update to address these needs. Ms. Ruter discussed the implementation of the goals of the plan update and their timing, as well as the role of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Ruter reminded the Committee of the historic preservation video that was presented to the Committee a couple months back. Ms. Ruter stated that they were looking to take the plan update to the Historic Preservation Commission for recommendation in July, with City Council action in the Fall. Ms. Ruter stated they were looking for a

recommendation from the Committee as well as any direction the Committee may have.

Public Comments:

Aaron Searles identified himself as the Chair of the Encanto Village Planning Committee and the Vice President of the Willo District Neighborhood Association. Mr. Searles stated that the plan update is missing a discussion regarding the effects of the Missing Middle Housing Bill that was passed into law and represents one of the greatest challenges to historic preservation that has happened in the last 40 years as it represents a radical change to historic neighborhoods located within one mile of downtown. Mr. Searles stated that the new law essentially allows historic neighborhoods to be torn down and redeveloped as fourplexes without a single-story restriction. Mr. Searles stated that the majority of the homes in the Willo District are single-story and that the new law would drastically change the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Searles stated that the city does not have a lot of history and cannot afford to erase what history it has. Mr. Searles stated that when the plan update was presented to the Encanto Village Planning Committee, the Committee included the following direction for staff: "I move that the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommend approval of the Preserve Historic Phoenix 2025 Historic Preservation Plan Update with a stipulation that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing Bill will impact Historic districts within one mile of the Central Business District." Mr. Searles stated that they had been out talking to the other Village Planning Committees regarding this issue and that he hopes that the North Mountain Committee will join the effort so that others will know the potential impact the bill will have on their communities. **Committee Member Joshua Carmona** asked for clarification that the intent was that the plan update includes data and other information that discusses how the redevelopment of sites as fourplexes etc. are affecting historic neighborhoods. Mr. Searles stated that was correct and that the law goes into effect in January of 2026. **Committee Member Massimo Sommacampagna** asked if they had contacted other entities. Mr. Searles stated that they had contacted Save Historic Arizona to raise awareness and that they had collected over 2,000 signatures. Mr. Searles stated that he has yet to hear anyone state that they knew anything about this bill. **Committee Member Ricardo Romero** asked that the plan provide clarity as to the neighborhoods that are affected and asked if they were looking for any mitigation efforts. Mr. Searles stated they were only asking for the Committee's recommendation to include a requirement that information regarding this issue be included in the plan so that people are aware.

Eric Gilmore stated that he was on the local board with Mr. Searles and was in agreement. Mr. Gilmore stated they were not opposed to middle housing but wanted to protect the integrity of their historic neighborhood.

Staff Response:

Ms. Ruter stated that she understands what they are trying to accomplish and has no issues with providing that information. Ms. Ruter stated that a Zoning Text Amendment would be forthcoming and that she anticipates that it will be business as

usual with respect to Design Review, but the city cannot prohibit the types of housing that state law allows.

Discussion:

Committee Member Heather Garbarino asked if the inclusion of the requested information will impact the timing of the approval process. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the Zoning Text Amendment has not been drafted and that the challenge will be to figure out the functional mechanics of how this will be implemented. Ms. Ruter stated that the plan update sets up an outline and does not have a lot of narrative attached, and that it might be an ongoing effort to analyze the effects of the legislation. Ms. Ruter stated that absent the law being repealed, the city does not have the option of not complying with the law.

Committee Member Arick O'Hara stated that he had been paying close attention to the bill from a public safety perspective since it could result in additional people living in a neighborhood that was designed for something different. Committee Member O'Hara stated that the bill discusses the central business corridor as being a one-mile buffer around that area but does not go into specific detail as to where that might occur. Committee Member O'Hara asked if the city has already defined the boundary. **Ms. Ruter** stated that her understanding was that the intent was to make the downtown area the Central Business District, and that the law would apply to that area and a one-mile buffer. Committee Member O'Hara asked if that would include the Willo District. Ms. Ruter stated that it would include 22 historic neighborhoods including the Willo District. Committee Member O'Hara asked the committee if there was any interest in entertaining Mr. Searles' request and while clarifying that he was not making a motion, read Mr. Searles' proposed motion into the record as follows: "I move that North Mountain Village Planning Committee recommend approval of the Preserve Historic Phoenix 2025 Historic Preservation Plan Update with a stipulation that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis of how the Middle Housing Law, ARS Section 9-462-13, House Bill 2721 will impact historic districts within one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District." **Committee Member Gabriel Jaramillo** asked if that should be amended to include the forthcoming coming Zoning Text Amendment. **Mr. Kuhfuss**, staff, stated that the text amendment was not on the table for discussion and that the Committee would potentially be looking for staff to include an analysis of the house bill in the plan update. Committee Member Garbarino stated that she would like to add potential mitigation measures. **Committee Member Jim Larson** stated that he understood that the Committee was to vote on the plan update and asked for clarification as to how mitigation measures would be included in the plan update. Committee Member Garbarino stated that it would be included in the discussion.

MOTION:

Committee Arick O'Hara motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction that staff amend the report to include an assessment and analysis, and possible mitigation, of how the Middle Housing Law, ARS Section 9-462-13, House

Bill 2721 will impact historic districts within one mile of Phoenix's Central Business District. **Committee Member Heather Garbarino** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

9-0, motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction with Committee Members Alauria, Carmona, Garbarino, Jaramillo, Knapp, Larson, O'Hara, Sommacampagna, and Matthews in favor and none opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 2, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	14-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Kevin Weight with the Historic Preservation Office provided an update of the City's Historic Preservation Plan update. Mr. Weight noted this was an update to the city's first Historic Preservation Plan which was adopted in 2015. Mr. Weight added that a collaborative effort began with a consultant's recommendations for improvements to advance historic preservation in Phoenix which launched a public engagement process to identify goals/tools/actions to create a draft plan update.

Mr. Weight stated the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan supports and refines the goal in the General Plan under Celebrate Our Diverse Communities and Neighborhoods to encourage historic and cultural preservation in the planning process. Mr. Weight added that it details the social and cultural, economic and environmental benefits of historic preservation. Mr. Weight said it supplies a legal and historical background on historic preservation nationally and in Phoenix. Mr. Weight stated it provides a timeline of historic preservation in Phoenix, outlines the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Program, and assesses accomplishments since the adoption of the historic plan from 2015.

Mr. Weight said the PreserveHistoricPHX 2025 plan includes five goal areas, each of which has defined tools, processes or actions to facilitate accomplishment and achieve the vision of the 2025 plan. Mr. Weight stated the goal areas include protect archaeological resources, protect historic resources, explore preservation incentives, develop community awareness, and promote partnerships. Mr. Weight added the Vision Statement for the plan as: Phoenix is a vibrant and dynamic place with many layers of history. Together with PlanPHX's central vision of a "More Connected Phoenix," PreserveHistoricPHX2025 envisions a city linked by an appreciation for its diverse heritage and a desire to sustain it for the benefit of present and future

generations. Mr. Weight concluded his presentation by sharing a timeline for plan approval and noted staff was recommending approval of the plan.

Mr. Wise noted he read about a legislative bill where historic buildings could be torn down to put up multiple buildings like in the Encanto area. **Mr. Weight** said it is the missing middle housing bill and said it was being addressed but not part of the initial plan as the bill was passed a month or two ago. Mr. Weight said it would affect neighborhoods mainly in the Encanto and Central City Villages. Mr. Weight added the Village Planning Committees will work with staff on a text amendment to work through it as gracefully as they can as it is not popular in the historic districts but still will need to meet the intent of the state legislation.

Motion

Roy Wise motioned to recommend approval of the historic preservation plan per the staff recommendation. **Paul Hamra** seconded the motion.

Vote

14-0; motion to recommend approval of the historic preservation plan update per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Balderrama, Franks, Goodhue, Gubser, Hamra, Marcolla, Mazza, Petersen, Schmidt, Sepic, Soronson, Wise, Sommer, and Mortensen in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.



Committee Member Will Holton asked how far back historic preservation goals in Phoenix go and if there is any federal interest in historic preservation. **Mr. Weight** responded that two of the goals in the plan are to protect archaeological resources as well as historic resources. Mr. Weight stated that the historic built environment started when Phoenix first became a city around 1867. Mr. Weight added that there is a lengthy history with indigenous people in Phoenix, which the Archaeology Office works with to protect archaeological resources. Mr. Weight stated that the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office works closely with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service. Mr. Weight added that their office follows the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Mr. Weight stated that the state and federal level also have tax incentives for historic preservation. Committee Member Holton asked what impact archaeological discoveries have on construction. Mr. Weight responded that there are strict laws regarding archaeological resources, especially for human remains.

Committee Member Baden stated that Phoenix used to have trolleys and San Francisco has turned their trolley system into a tourism opportunity. Committee Member Baden asked if the plan addresses the trolley lines in Phoenix. **Mr. Weight** responded that it does not address trolley lines specifically. Mr. Weight stated that light rail has been a big transportation investment in Phoenix, and they have worked with the Planning staff to support light rail and ensure minimal impact to historic properties as the light rail lines are constructed. Mr. Weight added that there are maps that show where the trolley lines were and there are still some rails buried in certain locations along certain streets.

Committee Member Ozzie Virgil asked if there are any maps showing where stagecoach lines were. **Mr. Weight** responded that there is documentation in data archives that shows where stagecoach lines were, noting that some did go as far north in Phoenix as the Rio Vista Village. Mr. Weight stated that this would be of interest for their office to research moving forward for the next 10 years.

Committee Member Baden stated that human remains can typically be found around river corridors, since that is where people used to live. Committee Member Baden asked if there could be opportunities for wayfinding signage or mile markers along the river corridors to incorporate cultural significance into the signage as the river corridors are improved, such as for Rio Reimagined project. **Mr. Weight** responded affirmatively, noting that they would encourage it and it is something that would fit nicely into the plan. Mr. Weight stated that they have done it along the light rail lines for historic properties.

Public Comments:

Opal Wagner introduced herself as a member of the Encanto Village Planning Committee. Ms. Wagner stated that the Encanto Village has many of Phoenix's oldest and largest historic districts. Ms. Wagner stated that there was a bill called the Missing Middle Housing bill that was signed into law last year, which targets all single-family neighborhoods within one mile from the central business district, which includes 22 historic districts, for redevelopment as multifamily. Ms. Wagner stated that each lot could be developed into as many as four units. Ms. Wagner stated that many historic

homes are one-story, but the bill does not allow height restriction less than two stories. Ms. Wagner stated that the bill also allows lot splits into four parcels. Ms. Wagner stated that the plan update does not include anything about the Missing Middle Housing law. Ms. Wagner stated that the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommended approval with a condition to amend the plan to include an assessment and analysis of how the Missing Middle Housing law (HB 2721) will impact historic districts. Ms. Wagner stated that the Central City, Camelback East, and Laveen Village Planning Committees also recommended this.

Staff Response:

Mr. Weight responded that staff supports Ms. Opal's recommendation. Mr. Weight stated that it was not deliberate to exclude mention of the Missing Middle Housing law in the plan but rather a timing issue. Mr. Weight stated that this would be the time to address anything that is missing from the plan.

Discussion:

Committee Member Virgil asked for clarification that Mr. Weight was not the one that left the Missing Middle Housing law out of the plan. **Mr. Weight** responded that he was not. Mr. Weight stated that it was a timing issue, since the plan update began back in 2021 and the law was just recently passed. Mr. Weight added that staff appreciates any feedback of missing items from the plan.

Committee Member Holton asked if there is anything that needs to be tailored to the Rio Vista Village. **Vice Chair Scott Lawrence** responded that there are no historic districts within the Rio Vista Village.

Chair Cotton stated that the only historic property in the Rio Vista Village may be Pioneer Village.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Lawrence motioned to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025), per the staff recommendation, with direction to amend the plan to address how the Missing Middle Housing law (HB 2721) will impact historic properties, per the Encanto Village Planning Committee recommendation. **Committee Member Virgil** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

5-0; the motion to recommend approval of the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025) per the staff recommendation with direction passed with Committee members Baden, Holton, Virgil, Lawrence and Cotton in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Historic Preservation Plan Update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)

Date of VPC Meeting	June 10, 2025
Request	Request to adopt the Historic Preservation Plan update (PreserveHistoricPHX 2025)
VPC Recommendation	Continuance to the July 8, 2025 Village Planning Committee meeting
VPC Vote	11-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item and did not indicate support or opposition.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Helana Ruter, staff, provided a presentation regarding the draft *PreserveHistoricPHX 2025* Historic Preservation Plan Update. Ms. Ruter stated that the plan builds upon the 2015 plan, stated that the plan is intended to guide the City's preservation efforts over the next decade, explained that consultant work for the plan identified key challenges facing preservation, and stated that the project included robust public outreach. Ms. Ruter stated that feedback from Village Planning Committees emphasized the need to reflect recent state legislation, including the Missing Middle Housing Bill, explained that the plan includes five overarching goals, and stated that the plan is designed to be nested under the General Plan. Ms. Ruter requested final comments from the Committee, asked for a recommendation of approval, and stated that the plan will be ultimately adopted by City Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Committee Member George Brooks shared that there are many historic buildings in South Phoenix, expressed concern that there is confusion among residents about how historic preservation regulations apply, and stated that property owners often wish to modify their homes while retaining historic designation. **Ms. Ruter** responded that the goal of the plan is not to preserve buildings in a static or "amber-like" state, but to allow for respectful alterations that maintain historical integrity.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Doescher explained that he is a member of the Encanto Village Planning Committee, described the Missing Middle Housing Bill, explained that the bill was passed by the State Legislature in 2024, and explained that the bill allows additional

residential units within one mile of the Central Business District (CBD). Mr. Doescher stated that most of Phoenix's historic districts fall within the one-mile radius of the CBD, expressed concern that the bill could lead to increased demolition of historic buildings, and requested that the plan include an analysis of its potential impacts.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Committee Member Fred Daniels asked whether funding is being pursued for historic home rehabilitation and referenced a requirement that recipients live on the property. **Ms. Ruter** stated that the City currently has GO Bond funds available for grants, some of which are allocated to residential properties, stated that the funding focuses on exterior improvements, and explained that the funding allows for up to \$20,000 in matching funds.

Committee Member Mark Beehler stated that he did not understand the issue with the Missing Middle Housing Bill and asked for information on the Bill's impact on the Historic Preservation Plan. **Ms. Ruter** stated that a Missing Middle Housing Text Amendment is forthcoming and acknowledged concerns that the bill has not been referenced in the plan. Ms. Ruter stated that she is requesting recommendation of approval and that information will be added to address how state-level changes may impact historic preservation.

Committee Member Kassandra Alvarez stated that she needs more information about the Missing Middle Housing Bill, expressed concern that the plan is vague on protections for archaeological resources, and stated that Indigenous people should be represented in the process. **Ms. Ruter** stated that archaeological protection is addressed by another department that meets with four tribes and stated that protecting archaeological resources is important to the City.

Vice Chair Emma Viera asked what exactly was being requested. **Ms. Ruter** stated that she was requesting approval of the Historic Preservation Plan Update, stated that the plan is intended to be nested under the General Plan, explained the plan would be adopted by City Council, and stated that the plan establish policies that outline what the City wants to accomplish over the next ten years.

Committee Member Kay Shepard asked whether archaeology is handled by another department. **Ms. Ruter** confirmed that archaeology is handled by another department, stated that archaeological protection is within the Historic Preservation Ordinance, and explained that they are looking to partner more with the Archaeology Office.

Committee Member Brooks asked for clarification on what the motion would include. **Chair Arthur Greathouse III** asked how other Village Planning Committees had voted on the item. **Samuel Rogers**, staff, explained that Laveen and Central City Village

Planning Committees had both approved the plan with direction that the plan be amended to address how the Missing Middle Housing Bill will impact historic districts.

Committee Member Beehler stated that he had not seen the updated Historic Preservation Plan and did not want to vote on something he had not seen. Committee Member Beehler asked for clarification on the direction the other Village Planning Committees had provided. **Mr. Rogers** stated that at the other Village Planning Committees there were community concerns that the Missing Middle Housing Bill would incentivize demolition of historic buildings. Mr. Rogers stated that the Committee had received a video presentation on the Historic Preservation Plan Update at the prior meeting.

Chair Greathouse asked what options were available for a motion. **Mr. Rogers** stated that it would be at Ms. Ruter's discretion whether a continuance would be acceptable and stated that the Committee could approve, deny, or take no action on the plan.

Ms. Ruter stated that a hyperlink to the plan was included in the staff report provided in the Committee's packet, but that the full plan was not included in the packet. Ms. Ruter stated that she would ensure a direct link is distributed and stated that she is willing to return next month.

Committee Member Lee Coleman asked how many historic buildings and how many historic neighborhoods are designated in South Phoenix. **Ms. Ruter** stated that she would follow up at the next meeting.

Committee Member Brooks identified two historic properties in the South Mountain Village.

Committee Member F. Daniels asked for the criteria used to determine what qualifies as a historic property.

Chair Greathouse asked for an explanation of the Missing Middle Housing Bill. **Mr. Rogers** stated that staff are working on a Text Amendment to comply with the bill but village planning staff have not yet been educated on the bill yet.

Mr. Doescher stated that the bill would eliminate single-family zoning, expressed that the bill had good intentions but was poorly implemented, stated that legislative overreach will impact South Phoenix, stated that bills are being passed without consideration for how they affect cities and towns, and referenced a study published by the City of Tucson.

Motion:

Committee Member Kay Shepard made a motion to recommend a continuance of the Historic Preservation Plan update to the July 8, 2025 South Mountain Village Planning Committee meeting. **Committee George Brooks** seconded the motion.

Vote:

11-0, motion to recommend a continuance of the Historic Preservation Plan update to the July 8, 2025 South Mountain Village Planning Committee meeting passed with Committee Members Alvarez, Beehler, Brooks, Busching, Coleman, F. Daniels, Falcon, Shepard, Thompson, Viera, and Greathouse in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.