

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES  
TELECONFERENCE RECONVENE OF  
SEPT 28, 2012 HSRC MEETING, ARIZONA  
ON OCTOBER 12, 2012**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

- b. Terry Majewski reconvened the meeting at 10:35 AM

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS**

**1. HSRC Committee Members present on Phone**

- h. Terry Majewski
- i. Brooks Jeffrey
- j. Don Ryden
- k. John Jacquemart
- l. Patricia Olson
- m. John Lacy
- n. Jan Balsom
- o. Kathleen Henderson
- p. Doug Kupel

**2. SHPO Staff Members present at SHPO**

- f. William Collins
- g. Vivia Strang
- h. Robert Frankeberger
- i. Mary Robinson

**3. Guests present**

- a. Janet Parkhurst
- b. Ralph Comey
- c. Demion Klinco
- d. Linda Weed

**Strang:** Gave an explanation of the schedule for sending the Joesler Nominations the Keeper of the National Register Group # 1 – after minor revisions the following nominations will be sent to the Keeper. Vivia requires that the amended nominations be in her office by November 1, 2012. The nominations received at that time, will be sent to the Keeper as a group.

- a. Anderson, Arthur Olaf and Helen S House
- b. Goodman, John and Aline House
- c. Remer, Ross T House
- d. Wilson, Betty-Jean House
- e. Brown, Grace and Elliott House
- f. Craig House

**Jeffrey:** Questioned the addition of Criterion "A" to Criterion "C". Context 1 was linked to Criterion A and Context 2, was linked to Criterion C. This has caused some confusion. Need guidance from SHPO.

**Collins:** In a discussion at the last meeting the committee came to the conclusion that those properties with integrity issues and nominated under "C" only, would be nominated under Criterion A and C.

- ◆ Criterion "C" alone has been the focus of SHPO's MPDF and the guidelines created by Jim Garrison were for "C" level of significance.

◆ There were no guidelines for Criterion "A" within the MPDF document.

**Discussion:**

- ◆ Both Context 1 and 2 may be linked to Criterion "C", either alone or combined.
- ◆ When the discussion refers to Context 1 it speaks to subdivision planning, development, and open space.
- ◆ When the discussion refers to Context 2 it speaks to architecture.

**Brooks** Moved the Committee reconsider the Group 1 nominations of the **Goodman House**, the **Wilson House**, and the **Grace** and the **Elliott Brown House** be amended to Criterion "**C**" only at the **Local** level of significance. Seconded by **Lacy**.

**Majewski**: Called for the vote  
8 Ayes, Motion Carried  
Unanimous

**Brooks** Moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place **Goodman House, the Wilson House**, and the **Grace and Elliott Brown House**, on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" at the **Local** level of significance and recommend these nominations be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Balsom**.

**Majewski**: Called for the vote  
8 Ayes, Motion Carried  
Unanimous

### GROUP 3 REVIEWS

#### JACKSON, LAMBERT AND EVELYN HOUSE

##### Discussion:

- ◆ Joesler did not design three properties on the agenda.
  - Jackson House
  - Brandt House
  - Warren House
- ◆ Submit as stand-alone nominations, not under the Joesler MPDF.
- ◆ Context 1 developer Murphey MPDF and Contest 2 Joesler Architecture.
  - The criterion for Context 1 the property was built and the area subdivided by Murphey. Therefore there is the attribution to Murphey.
  - Also the lots are intact with the original boundaries. The integrity of the site parcel has been maintained according to the Murphey criteria for the Catalina Foothills Estates.
- ◆ Joesler as the supervisory architect would have approved the plans.
- ◆ Move up to # 2 group?
- ◆ Joesler homes should be separate from the non-Joesler homes and continue discussion about the Joesler designed homes.
- ◆ SHPO – Multiple context
  - Every building in the subdivision shares in the unique concept and is designed within the context of the subdivision.
  - The buildings need to be nominated under C and not add A.
  - Property lines are irrelevant. Either the building retains its setting or it doesn't.
  - Non-Joeslers should be nominated under the context of their architectural style as individually eligible houses.
- ◆ These homes that have merit in design, setting and placement by unknown architects who understood the point of subdivision plan and the genre of the styles.
- ◆ Making them stand alone nominations will allow them to move forward and not wait for the Joesler's Group 1 approval as well as the MPDF approval.
- ◆ Give the preparers that option with comments from SHPO and the HSRC Committee.



## WOOLLEN, HERBERT AND IRMA HOUSE

**Brooks** Moved that the **Woollen, Herbert and Irma House** be placed on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "C" at the **Local** level of significance and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Henderson**.

### Discussion:

- ◆ **Parkhurst:** provided a map and a floor plan showing the alterations.
- ◆ There is a letter from the architect, Andy Andersen, who worked on the last revisions or changes to the house.
- ◆ The biggest issue was the intrusion of the porch on the back in 1964. It compromised the outdoor circulation that is one of the character defining features of a Joesler house. The definition on page 8 refers to it as a functionally acceptable rehabilitation. That statement may not be accurate.
- ◆ There are no photos in this nomination showing the details of alterations and changes that have been made to the house.
- ◆ The infill addition does not differ in design from the original portions of the house including materials and design.
- ◆ Aerial Photograph # 1 shows the addition.
- ◆ **Parkhurst:** Why is there so much being made of the rear addition and the Andy Anderson revision. They can't be seen from the front. That doesn't seem like enough to disqualify the house.
- ◆ **HSRC:** The house is not being disqualified for these 2 changes.
- ◆ The connector in the front does diminish the indoor-outdoor flow to the house, which is a Joesler signature effect.
- ◆ **Linda Weed, owner:** In the dining room area the flow from one porch to the other is maintained and still has that connection between the indoors and outdoors. Joesler designed the porch and the windows are 8-foot window maintaining the connection to the outside.
- ◆ Photos must match the narration.
- ◆ With all the Joesler properties in the Catalina Foothills Estates there are no front façades, all elevations must maintain their significance.

**Brooks** the **Woollen, Herbert and Irma House** nomination is subject to the providing of photographs sufficient to meet the concerns expressed, be received by the end of the month, and be distributed to members of HSRC. If any member of the committee thinks that the nomination needs to be reviewed by the HSRC then the nomination will be held for the next available meeting. If the nomination is complete and accepted by SHPO, it moves to Group 1 and if not it moves to Group 2. Seconded by **Henderson**.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
8 Ayes, Motion Carried  
Unanimous



## BROWN, H.H. HOUSE

**Brooks** Moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place **Brown, H.H. House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "C" at the **Local** level of significance and recommend the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Seconded by **Ryden**.

### Discussion:

- ◆ The scale of the additions dwarfs the original house. This creates problems for its significance.
- ◆ There has been no documentation of the additions and alterations including photos that show those changes.
- ◆ The house does not match with Registration Requirements.
- ◆ **Ralph Comey, preparer:** There is a floor plan that shows the additions: expansion of kitchen area, a fill-in on the front façade. I can take more pictures to show additions and changes.

- ◆ **Frankeberger:** "The biggest mistake is - the enclosure of the porch alters the essential form of the principal space. In addition the infill, which subsumes the original attached garage within the body of the house. Together with the extended wings, substantially alters the buildings massing and scale.
- ◆ Would the committee want to see the nomination again with more photos and documentation?
- ◆ There is no differentiation between original fabric of the house and new alterations and additions.
- ◆ No need to see it again.
- ◆ Even with better documentation will it maintain significance?
- ◆ SHPO had concerns with the nomination.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
3 Ayes, 5 Nays, Motion Failed



#### D. TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

a. 9:30 am – November 16, 2012 – Phoenix AZ

#### E. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Demion Klinco, preparer:** Gould-Drexel House. With revisions won't completed in time to be on the November agenda. Will it be on the Spring Agenda?

- ◆ If the nomination is received in time to make it on the agenda.
- ◆ Will be a stand alone nomination and it was moved to Group 2.
- ◆ Move to Criterion "C" only

**Ralph Comey, preparer:** If the HH Brown House nomination were to be reworked could it be resubmitted to the committee?

**HSRC Committee:** No, the house with all the changes no longer maintains its integrity.

#### E. ADJOURNED AT

**Brooks** moved to adjourn at 11:57 AM. Seconded by **Jacquemart**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
8 Ayes, Motion Carried  
Unanimous

