

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARDROOM IN THE BASEMENT
January 29, 2010**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Terry Majewski chaired the meeting
2. Meeting called to order at 10:06 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present
 - a. **Terry Majewski**
 - b. **Kathleen Henderson**
 - c. **John Lacy**
 - d. **Jan Balsom (conferenced in)**
 - e. **Don Ryden**
 - f. **John Jacquemart**
 - g. **Patricia Olson**
 - h. **Doug Kupel**
2. HSRC Committee Members absent
 - a. **Brooks Jeffery**
3. SHPO Staff Members present
 - a. **Jim Garrison**
 - b. **Bill Collins**
 - c. **Vivia Strang**
 - d. **Mary Robinson**

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **New National Register Nominations**

Bisbee Residential Historic District, Bisbee

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Bisbee Residential Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Olson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Bisbee Residential Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.

Motion Seconded: **Lacy**

Ryden: Ryden recused himself from voting having worked on the survey.

Discussion:

Lacy: On page 4, the reference to the geographic and environmental sections discussing the geology of "the new mountain being peculiar due to hydrothermal alteration" is incorrect. Hydrothermal alteration is quite common throughout the mineralized areas of Arizona. Delete peculiar from the sentence. Change term house prostitution to brothel or some other more appropriate term.

Olson: Suggested listing at State level of significance. References to being one of the few communities in our state with landscape planning that conforms to the natural landscape and that it is also one of the few to be pedestrian oriented.

Motion: **Olson** amended the nomination from **Local** level of significance to **State** level of significance. **Lacy** seconded the amendment.

Kupel: On page 15 the discussion about non-shelter infrastructure – the language in that paragraph was not specific enough. Are those structures meant to be a representative sampling or is this a comprehensive list?

Collins: It's a sample of these types of structure.

Kupel: There should be some sort of rationale as to why these particular structures were cited.

Majewski: Why isn't age noted for each property on the Property Summary Table?

Collins: For a majority of the properties the ages had to be estimated, since there were no actual records containing that information.

Majewski: The Integrity discussion is vague in the table. There needs to be an indication of how integrity has been lost.

Collins: A note preceding the table will be added to explain loss of integrity.

Majewski: On page 49 there is a discussion about Phelps Dodge being the only mining company remaining in Bisbee. Hasn't Freeport McMoRan Copper and Gold bought Phelps Dodge?

Lacy: Freeport- McMoRan Copper and Gold purchased Phelps Dodge and that should be noted in the nomination.

Majewski: Jan's Comments – There were problems with the properties table, photographs and maps. The table should include a discussion of property types. It would be helpful to have photographs of each of the property types, in order to make it easier to distinguish the various property types i.e. buildings and structures.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Indian Ridge Historic District, Tucson

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Indian Ridge Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Indian Ridge Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Ryden: Where did the term Modern Contemporary Sonoran Ranch Style originate?

Demion Clinco, preparer: It is a made up term. The houses are definitely classic ranch style, but they also have a unique contemporary quality and are constructed from contemporary materials.

Lacy: On page 13, section 31 the term "sold squatters rights" is incorrect. The correct term would be "preemption rights", since it was under the Preemption Act of Rights. In the paragraph beginning with, "In 1897 north half of the northeast part" should be phrased "northeast quarter and northeast quarter of the southwest quarter". On page 18, it stated, "Lusk would then borrow on the land to create capital" right at the end of that it states. "These early developments exhibit an emphasis on construction quality. Should there be a citation for that statement?"

Clinco: That's from field observation.

Majewski: Jan's Comments – On page 3 are limited architectural options the same as tract homes?

Committee Consensus: Not in this nomination.

Majewski: Jan's Comments – Why weren't streetscapes considered as part of the district?

Clinco: I did discuss them, but I didn't list them separately as contributing elements.

Garrison: There could be a statement about the landscape feature and road patterns contributing to the overall character of the neighborhood.

Majewski: The neighborhood needs to determine what they consider important to the character of the neighborhood and include those in the nomination.

Ryden: Ribbon curb, the rolled curb might be mentioned in the nomination and by including that language possibly protect these elements when public works are planned for the area.

Olson: On page 6, there are properties that are less than 50 years old as contributors. Is that due to the period of significance extending through 1964?

Collins: Yes

Doug Harbaugh, Indian Ridge resident: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Kupel: Is there an issue with the carports and how they were utilized to confirm or deny eligibility?

Collins: There is one property with an issue regarding the modification of its carport. Staff along with the preparer is using the nomination form for that property and will work it out. In addition there have been continuing problems with the current Carport Policy, as written by Brooks Jeffery specifically for the Winter Haven Historic District. Should we be applying the Winterhaven Carport Policy to all Historic Districts from the 50s?

Majewski: The Carport Policy that HSRC adopted was for more than just Winterhaven?

Garrison: No, SHPO may go over the carport policy with the preparer in order to adapt it to a specific neighborhood. SHPO will work with Mr. Clinco on a case-by-case basis to determine property eligibility. When the carport policy is modified, it will be brought before HSRC.

Ryden: The carport modifications in Indian Ridge need to be reviewed on an individual basis and notations made for the record. Include photos of both good and bad examples of those modifications for future use.

Lacy: Broaden the carport policy to cover additional properties and districts.

Garrison: It would appear a policy is needed regarding the ability to enclose a carport. The policy should meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Multiple Property and Documentation form of The Architecture and Planning of Josias Joesler and John Murphy, Tucson

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place **Multiple Property and Documentation form of The Architecture and Planning of Josias Joesler and John Murphy** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Ryden: There are a variety of styles mentioned such as Sonoran Revival Style and the Joesler Ranch House Style. More adequate discussion, regarding aspects of each of those styles, than was found in the Multiple Property Documentation Document should be discussed in the individual nomination.

Ryden: Also, more information should be included regarding the combining of styles and how Joesler accomplished that. After all it is his approach to design that makes him an important architect.

Majewski: It is mentioned in the nomination that Murphy used the Homestead Act to acquire land to start out with. Is the portrayal of that process acceptable?

Lacy: The title was initiated through the Homestead Act and there were limitations on the amount of land individuals could acquire. These 7,000 acres would have been a compilation of many homesteads. If owners couldn't pay their taxes developers bought up the land.

Majewski: In Section E page 2, it stated that Murphy served on the Board of the Arizona Pioneers of Historical Society until his death. Had the name of the board changed to the Arizona Historical Society (AHS) before then if so that is a small error to be corrected?

Lacy: The change to the AHS was in 1974 and I didn't find it to be a big issue, since it was close to his death.

Majewski: What does the committee think about the Registration Requirements? We will be using them as we consider the several properties today. They begin in Section F Page 15.

Kupel: On page 15 it states - there are some things not covered by this MPDF. On page 18 it discusses properties that are not part of the study for this submission and that information belongs in section H on pages 23 and 24. I don't think it is true that the Joesler/Murphy Properties haven't been looked at as part of their work. They just are not part of this study.

Majewski: Staff is this section a problem

Collins: If someone notices it, then it becomes a problem. It can be amended later as required in future studies.

Majewski: Are committee members OK with registration requirements for single-family residences? I have a question regarding the addition of a front porch being added to meet today's needs as an acceptable rehabilitation. The nomination states that Joesler was fond of exposed front entries and roof decks, so would that rehabilitation be acceptable. This is in Section F page 17. Also, there is the statement that converting a screened porch into an Arizona room. Is that a reasonable rehabilitation? Is there an example of one, possibly in the back of a house?

Ryden: As with the Carport Policy there are correct ways to do these renovations. A screened in porch can be enclosed, but it still must be the expression of a porch.

Jacquemart: That is discussed with Type A at 2101 East Water Street. The example has a new front porch.

Ralph Comey, preparer: On page 7 photo # 3 shows the front porch addition. The façade of the house is still apparent and we thought it would be an acceptable addition to the house.

Janet Parkhurst, preparer: The porch addition is tiny and does not impact the view of the façade.

Kupel: Leave the statement regarding the porch out of the MPDF and mention, in the actual nomination, that a small roof has been added on and it doesn't impact the integrity of the property.

Majewski: We need to be satisfied with the registration requirements. It is stated on page 17, section F, "In all cases the integrity of the primary façade is paramount". If that stays in the MPDF, delete the statement, "the addition of a front porch where by today's standards one is needed it is acceptable" then it can be dealt with in individual nominations. Any changes to the primary façade will be handled sensitively. Jim, can we state that Joesler Churches were equally important outside as well as inside.

Garrison: Yes

Majewski: Is landscape important to these properties, because in the MPDF states that zeroscape is fine?

Henderson: Most of these properties appear to be zeroscaped to begin with so it is not an issue.

Ryden: The geometry and special relationship of the landscape between the solid space of the buildings and the areas around them are the important issue. In that respect, the importance is not whether the landscape is zeroscaped or not.

Majewski: Bill could you work with the preparers regarding the landscape issue.

Collins: Yes, we can work on strengthening that statement.

Linda Mayro, Cultural Resources Manager, Tucson: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility

HSRC meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:00 pm



HSRC meeting reconvened at 12:35 pm

Caldwell, Erskine P, House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Caldwell, Erskine P, House** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Caldwell, Erskine P, House** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded:

Henderson

Discussion:

(There are comments in this nomination that address all the Joesler/Murphy Nominations)

Majewski: The location indicated on the included map is incorrect, so we need a new map.

Ryden: These following statements apply to all the Joesler/Murphy houses and their nominations. On the hand sketched floor plans there are no north directional arrows. On the plats there are no indicators for the houses being discussed. Also, the USGS map needs a larger "A" as the location indicator on the map.

Kupel: In section 7 page 2, 2nd paragraph "zoning" is referred to a house that has its interior divided. That is not the common usage for the zoning. Land use zoning is the first thing I think of, so another term to describe the division of the house.

Ryden: In box 7 "Sonoran Revival" is used as a style and that term is not acceptable to the keeper. There are "Late 19th and 20th Century Revivals". Would it be better to use Spanish Colonial Revival "Sonoran Revival"?

Collins: If there were no matching sub heading you would use the accepted term "Late 19th and 20th Century Revivals".

Ryden: If, in any of these nominations, you want to call the style Sonoran Revival then you should define the term.

Parkhurst: There is a slight difference between Territorial Ranch and Sonoran Revival Ranch. Territorial Ranch has more amenities and is more open than Sonoran Revival. This Joesler building is more articulated and closed by doors from room to room and does not have openness between kitchen and living room.

Ryden: Perhaps a discussion about how the internal space is divided would be a character-defining feature of Sonoran Revival. Compare and contrast what you are trying to define.

Garrison: In your definition you need to reference what you are trying to revive. Perhaps give examples of Sonoran architecture.

Ryden: The houses are described as finished in stucco. You need to discuss what the stucco finish is over.

Olson: This nomination doesn't have a current floor plan, just the original.

Parkhurst: There have been relatively few changes in floor plan on these nominations.

Olson: More photos and a sketch map for each nomination are needed.

Majewski: Called for the vote
7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Don Martin Apartment House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Don Martin Apartment House** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Don Martin Apartment House** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:
Minor discussion and corrections

Majewski: Called for the vote
7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



First Joesler House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **First Joesler House** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **First Joesler House** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: There needs to be a definition for the Wind Flag.

Ryden: Arizona Room should be more generic.

Parkhurst: We can substitute Sun Room.

Majewski: Is the integrity discussion acceptable in section 7, page 2? Do we need more information about the nonconforming front windows of the converted garage?

Ryden: Did large arched windows replace windows that were square?

Comey: The large arched windows replaced wooden garage doors.

Ryden: Are the arches the original shape of the windows?

Parkhurst: We don't have photographs of the original windows.

Ryden: Do these windows adversely affect the integrity of the building?

Majewski: 75% of the façade is still intact. When was the garage converted?

Comey: There aren't good records for this house.

Olson: It says former carport not former garage.

Majewski: Can that be researched?

Parkhurst: We will try.

Majewski: You could phrase it, in filled carport or garage.

Olson: A floor plan of the studio would be helpful, since it is a significant portion of the house at least an x marking where it is?

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Gabel House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Gabel House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Gabel House 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: In section 7, page 3 the Drum Tower is mentioned and it needs to be described in the text.

Ryden: This is called a Ranch House?

Lacy: This is Joesler's interpretation of a real ranch, not the stereotypical version that we are familiar with.

Ryden: There is a means to handle a combination of styles in the Style Bulletin, allowing the Keeper to understand what you are attempting to explain.

Majewski: The map is incorrect regarding the location of the property. The nomination needs to be specific as to materials used on exterior walls. Also, the west addition is less than 12% of the square footage and has been built on a secondary wing and impact on the front façade is minimal. Addition needs to be shown on a sketch plan.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Haynes Building

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Haynes Building nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Haynes Building 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Ryden: Is term “two part commercial block” a quote from the Richard Longstredts book?

Parkhurst: Yes

Ryden: Two-part commercial block generally refers to a full 2-story building; this appears to be a 1 part commercial block with a little extra.

Parkhurst: We called it 2 part because it has a loft.

Ryden: The term is confusing and should be omitted.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Hecker House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Hecker House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Hecker House 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Olson: Is the master bedroom addition on this floor plan?

Parkhurst: There are sketches of the original floor plan and the addition will not be on them.

Olson: That should be indicated.

Kupel: In section 8 page 3, under Registration Requirements, there is the term “Semi Urban Sort”. Is that one of the property types?

Parkhurst: No, many Joesler buildings cannot be viewed from the street. This is one is part of the streetscape and therefore of a more urban nature.

Kupel: It would be better to use the word “Suburban”. Also, the statement, “The small front porch, acceptable renovation by today’s standards”, so have standards changed or would the renovation have been unacceptable previously.

Majewski: It should state by The Secretary’s Standards and not just any standards. It may be a functional front porch, but it still has to meet the Secretary’s Standards.

Kupel: The nomination could state that the small porch defers to the style of the remainder of the house. It doesn’t block the door. That language will make the addition of a small porch acceptable to the keeper.

Majewski: When integrity is discussed, dates for the additions along with the rational as to why integrity isn’t affected by them should be included.

Henderson: Does this include the Master Bedroom addition, which is on the rear of the house?

Parkhurst: The bedroom addition is on the back of the house and doesn’t negatively affect its integrity.

Majewski: With the additions does the house maintain its integrity? In the summary paragraph should it state that the Hecker House has very good integrity?

Kupel: Define your terms and be consistent.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Eleven Arches

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Eleven Arches nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Eleven Arches** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Kupel: Is the floor plan a crescent shape?

Parkhurst: It is a crescent shape in breaks and you can see the configuration in photograph # 6. There have been modifications to the interior including the maid’s room. The floor plan you have is the original and doesn’t show the modifications.

Comey: The integrity of the south side of the residence (primary façade) is good.

Majewski: The integrity Statement on section 7 page 2, should be reworded regarding the principal (south) façade remaining unaltered, then mention what has been done to the interior.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Type A at 2101 East Water Street

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Type A at 2101 East Water Street** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Type A at 2101 East Water Street** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Kupel: In section 8 page 3, states “occupied by transients”. It should be phrased differently. Today the word “transients” has a different connotation. Also, the reference to the 1943 City Directory needs to be omitted.

Jacquemart: John J. Radersdorf was mentioned, but there was nothing in the text regarding him.

Parkhurst: He is the current owner.

Ryden: Throughout this nomination the term “Modern Style” is used. What is “Modern Style”? There was a modern movement, which is an attitude regarding how you design. Would you call it a modernist building?

Comey: It is defined in the nomination.

Olson: In the **Field Guide of American Houses**, looked up modern. By definition it is a whole series of different types that are referred to as modern. I would suggest this fits better in what the preparers defined as Sonoran Revival. It may have been built in the modern era, but its character fits better with Modern Era Sonoran Revival.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Type B at 2019 East Water Street

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Type B at 2019 East Water Street** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Type B at 2019 East Water Street** 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Majewski: Are there integrity issues? The nomination states that the property meets Registration Requirements. Should it state what those are?

Ryden: Yes, it should refer back to the umbrella document, since the reader may not know what those requirements are.

Majewski: In section 7, page 2 it states that the building has very good integrity, but elsewhere it states that it has excellent integrity. Language needs to be consistent.

Olson: Use the term “good integrity” throughout.

Ryden: Photo on page 7 the Masonry Units look very large, what are the materials used?

Parkhurst: They are clay bricks.

Olson: In Section 7, page 1; it states exterior walls are built of concrete tiles.

Majewski: Map is not correct and the Urban to Suburban needs to be addressed as in the earlier nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Kerr, Louise Lincoln House and Studio, Scottsdale

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Kerr, Louise Lincoln House and Studio** nomination.

Patty Olson recused herself due to conflict of interest (preparer of nomination).

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Kerr, Louise Lincoln House and Studio** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**B**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.

Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Ryden: The Criterion “B” is appropriate for this nomination but the architecture of the house should merit “C” as well.

Olson: There are protections in place for the building. The stipulations under which ASU acquired the building require ASU to protect the building (state mandate to follow Arizona Revised Statutes to protect historic properties). There is a conservation easement on the property between ASU and the City of Scottsdale. The nomination can be amended to Criteria “B & C” if the committee thinks the nomination is strong enough for both.

Kupel: A discussion as to how the house is connected to the person’s productive life will need to be added. Also, compare this house to others in Ms Kerr’s life showing that this is the most important house.

The Committee: concurred that the nomination should be for Criteria “B & C”.

Motion: **Henderson** amended the nomination from Criterion “**B**” to Criteria “**B & C**” and **Jacquemart** seconded the amendment.

Garrison: The foundation is listed as concrete and I have a photo of the building under construction and it appears to be concrete block?

Olson: We think it is concrete, but we will check further.

Patricia Meyers, Co-chair CCKCC Citizen’s Advocacy Committee, Scottsdale: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Don Meserve, City of Scottsdale Historic Preservation Office: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Village Grove 1-6 Residential Historic District, Scottsdale

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Village Grove 1-6 Residential Historic District nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Village Grove 1-6 Residential Historic District 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 of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Henderson: Need maps in the nomination. Is it flood irrigated?

Don Meserve, City of Scottsdale Historic Preservation Office: No, it is not flood irrigated.

Majewski: What does the committee think about the style terminology?

The Committee: Concurred there was no conflict regarding the style terminology?

Olson: Should this be nominated under Criterion “**A**”?

Collins: Community planning and development is Criterion “**C**”.

Ryden: How many typical tract subdivisions will the National Register endure? What makes this Historic District special? I haven’t been considering these tract subdivisions as individual houses, but considering the subdivision of houses as a whole. What is new and unusual about these subdivisions? I consider this subdivision eligible under Criterion “**A**” as a community development issue and the entire group fits into Scottsdale as a group. The nomination is written as an “**A**” nomination.

Kupel: In section 7 page 1 the subdivision is described as being significant as prototypical. I am not sure what is prototypical about it. If there is a Village Grove 1-6, what about a Village Grove 7-20 and are those also eligible? The discussion of significance on page 8 section 19 is extremely brief. There needs to be more discussion about what makes this subdivision unique, special and prototypical. What makes it eligible for the National Register? On Page 8 section 20 when residential subdivisions in Scottsdale are discussed, there is a better paragraph that speaks about it quite consciously creating an urban car community. In section 8 page 21 the marketing approach is mentioned and that is almost a product placement.

Ryden: How does this subdivision fit in with Allied’s subsequent work?

Marty McCune, preparer: They learned very quickly from this effort.

Ryden: Maybe it is more typical of what the developer learned and started replicating in marketing and developing. Use that information to strengthen the significance of this neighborhood.

Majewski: It is significant that almost 90% of the homes are eligible and that it is so cohesive as a neighborhood. Do we amend this to Criterion “**A**”?

McCune: It was written as Criteria “**A**” originally and SHPO suggested it be Criterion “**C**”.

Jacquemart: It is significant, because this area is still intact as compared to other developments by Allied.

Motion: **Henderson** amended the nomination from Criterion “**C**” to Criterion “**A**” and **Jacquemart** seconded the amendment.

Lisa Simpson, Village Grove Resident: Spoke against the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote
7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Frasier Fields Historic District, Mesa

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Frasier Fields Historic District nomination.

Doug Kupel recused himself from Frasier Fields and West Side Clark due to conflict of interest (worked on nomination).

Don Ryden recused himself from Frasier Fields and West Side Clark due to conflict of interest (worked on nomination).

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Frasier Fields Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Henderson: Under Architectural Styles it states that there are 4 varieties of ranch styles including Early ranch, Classic ranch, California ranch and? Colonial. Then there is a list of the properties in a table and Early ranch is not on the list.

Ryden, preparer: Early ranch and Classic ranch are being used interchangeably, so just delete Early ranch from the list.

Majewski: Be consistent with names, not as confusing. Need to include what the stucco has been applied over.

Ryden: These will be stucco on brick.

Majewski for Balsom: “Given the importance of streetscapes and vegetation as unifying elements in the district, why aren’t they included as contributing elements. Jan asked if additional discussion be acceptable?”

Balsom: Absolutely.

Ryden: In Frasier Fields the landscape is integrated with each house. There are not street trees in the right-of-way. What is important is individual landscaping of irrigated green yards and mature trees around each home.

Majewski: Streetscape is the term used in the nomination. You need to add a few sentences – the flood-irrigated lots are planted with various plants and the flood-irrigated landscaping is a character-defining feature on a house-by-house basis.

Balsom: You also state in the nomination, “The presence of an intact landscape may serve to mitigate some of the architectural shortcomings” of the associated houses. It seems like landscape is an important aspect of the district.

Ryden: Yes it is.

Majewski: Does the committee have any issues with the integrity of this district?

The Committee: Concurred that there is no issue regarding integrity.

Olson: Should the build out date be listed as a significant date?

Garrison: The build out date should be listed, especially with an “A” nomination.

Ryden: We would use 1962 as the build out date, which were 3 years out, but retained the character of the neighborhood.

Olson: 1946 as the platting of the subdivision and 1962 as the build out date

Majewski: Called for the vote

5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



West Side Clark Addition, Mesa

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **West Side Clark Addition** nomination.

Doug Kupel recused himself from Frasier Fields and West Side Clark due to conflict of interest (worked on nomination).

Don Ryden recused himself from Frasier Fields and West Side Clark due to conflict of interest (worked on nomination).

Motion: **Olson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **West Side Clark Addition** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Majewski, for Jan Balsom: There are no maps of the addition. In the listing of properties there are different numbers of non-contributors are specified (In one place 37 and in another 39). Photos are helpful, but they would be more helpful if they were keyed to architectural styles being discussed, rather than interesting people associated with the property. In the discussion regarding the historic appearance of the district on page 5 there is a discussion of the Clark and Shavers families, but there is no introduction until later in the nomination.

Ryden: There are maps and they can be sent and other corrections will be made.

Strang: The Keeper now requires photos to be separate from the narrative.

Majewski: Called for the vote
5-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Northfield Historic District, Glendale

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Northfield Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Northfield Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A, B, & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.
Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Majewski, for Jan Balsom: On Page 4 summary the dates are 1946 and 1955 and in other places in the document the end date for significance is 1954. The architectural discussion needs to be strengthened. Also, photos for specific buildings highlighted in the narrative, especially for those termed rare examples. Normally an "ABC" nomination would not be encouraged. Why do so in this one?

Garrison: If the nomination is strong enough under all three, then there is no reason to edit it out.

The Committee: Concurred to remove the "B" Criteria and to put the nomination forward under "A & C".

Motion: **Ryden** amended the nomination from Criteria "**A, B, & C**" to Criteria "**A & C**" and **Jacquemart** seconded the amendment

Kupel: On Page 17 there is a section "identification of further research questions".

Collins: No, that is not a recommended thing to do and it should be removed.

Garrison: Properties 49, 50 and 215 are non-contributors and at the edge of the district and as such should not be inside the boundary of the district. They are noted as integrity lost.

Kupel: The boundary used in the nomination corresponds to the original plat.

Majewski: Called for the vote
7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Thunderbird Estates/ McDonald Addition Historic District, Glendale

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Thunderbird Estates/ McDonald Addition Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Thunderbird Estates/ McDonald Addition Historic District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Majewski, for Jan Balsom: There appeared to be a few homes built in 1968 – 69 that are termed non-contributors due to age. These are 2 to 3 years after the cutoff date, should they be evaluated? The theme of Asian Ethic Heritage seems light.

Ryden: We need to re-examine the forms to determine if those later homes still maintain the character of the area.

Garrison: We will check with the preparer regarding the later houses.

Collins: We aren't sure how far we can push the 50-year cutoff with the keeper.

Majewski: This is another issue that should be discussed with the preparers.

Garrison: If we want to add these additional homes into the nomination, then we will bring this nomination back before the committee.

Ryden: Would it be possible to put individual homes that are associated with important people in, with the addition of Criteria "B"?

Collins: It is possible to individually nominate a particular house, within a district, if it is individually eligible.

Garrison: This hasn't been done in the past, but it is important to know which houses are important to the area for additional reasons.

Majewski: What about the Asian Ethnic Heritage Area of Significance?

The Committee: Concurred, leave discussion in, but not under the Area of Significance.

Kupel: Why are the Thunderbird Estates and McDonald Addition combined into one nomination as one unit?

Olson: On page 9 it states, "Thunderbird Estates and its expansion west into McDonald Addition".

Kupel: The preparer needs to strengthen the case for joining the 2 areas into one nomination.

Garrison: This needs to be discussed in the "A" portion of the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

4-2 In Favor of Eligibility



North Central Phoenix Farm Houses and Rural Estate Homes Multiple Property Listing , Phoenix

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **North Central Phoenix Farm Houses and Rural Estate Homes Multiple Property Listing** nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **North Central Phoenix Farm Houses and Rural Estate Homes Multiple Property Listing** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under the Appropriate Criterion at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Discussion:

Committee: Minimal discussion and corrections.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Asbury / Salmon House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the **Asbury / Salmon House** nomination.

Motion: **Asbury / Salmon House** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Asbury / Salmon House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Jacquemart: The chess pieces in the front yard should be considered as non-contributing objects.

Vince Murray, preparer: They will be added to the nomination as non-contributing objects.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Vradenburg House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Vradenburg House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Vradenburg House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A & C**” at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Ryden: In box 7 “Description Architectural Classification there isn’t a style listed.

Murray: I chose not to enter a style. It was described in the narrative as vernacular.

Ryden: I am not sure that vernacular is appropriate, but Tudor Revival would fit.

The Committee: Concurred with Tudor for a style.

Ryden: Change “Arizona Room” to “Enclosed Porch”

Majewski: Change “condition fair” to “condition fair, integrity good”

Mr. Ybarra, owner: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Ralph Converse House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Ralph Converse House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Ralph Converse House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A & C**” at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Committee: Minimal discussion and corrections.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility



Olney / Ellinwood House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Olney / Ellinwood House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Olney / Ellinwood House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**A & C**” at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Olson**

Discussion:

Committee: Minimal discussion and corrections.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Harelson House

Strang - Gave a brief overview of the Harelson House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Harelson House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & C**" at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded:

Jacquemart

Discussion:

Majewski, for Jan Balsom: Unless this property is part of an established district, a discussion should be added regarding why this property is eligible under Criterion "A", community planning and development or should it be under Criterion "C" as a rare and well maintained example of a desert estate home.

Majewski: What's the integrity?

Murray: The integrity of the house is very good. The garage that was added onto the rear of the house, doesn't present a problem for the nomination.

Majewski: The nomination needs to be change from "A & C" to "C" only.

The Committee: Consensus to amend nomination to "C" only.

Motion: **Kupel** amended the nomination from Criterion "**A & C**" to Criteria "**C**" and **Jacquemart** seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility



2. Review of Reclassification Application for property in Winterhaven District

3373 North Forgeus Avenue Tucson

Discussion:

Collins: This is a request from the owner for re-consideration as a contributor to the Winterhaven District. Staff reviewed this property and couldn't agree on its eligibility, which is why it has been brought before the HSRC. The disagreement involves the addition, which is the arched entrance way. Bob Frankeberger argued that the addition of the arch significantly changed the integrity of the property and it should remain a non-contributor. My recommendation was looking at the house as a whole it maintained its integrity.

Majewski: When was the house altered?

Collins: The alterations are not historic.

Majewski: It was originally considered a non-contributor. Is there a picture of the original house?

Collins: No, all we have is the current photo. It was considered a non-contributor due to the alteration.

Ryden: What is the wall finish material? Did they sheath, stucco, to hide the scars of the alteration?

Garrison: This property should be judged as a contributor to the district not as an individual nomination. Does it still convey its significance to the district?

Motion: **Kupel** moved that this decision be deferred until the next HSRC meeting. **Jacquemart** seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility



D. Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes from the May 22, 2009 HSRC Meeting

Motion: Ryden moved to approve the minutes from May 22, 2009 HSRC Meeting. Henderson seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility

2. Approval of Minutes from the June 30, 2009 HSRC Meeting

Motion: Kupel moved to approve the minutes from June 30, 2009 HSRC Meeting. Henderson seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility

3. Approval of Minutes from the October 9, 2009 HSRC Meeting

Motion: Kupel moved to approve the minutes with changes from June 30, 2009 HSRC Meeting. Jacquemart seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

7-0 in Favor of Eligibility



E. Staff Reports

- 1. Collins:** National Register update / listings, property status, workflow –
 - a. Gave an update regarding nominations sent to the keeper's office
 - b. Properties recently listed on the National Register
 - 1) Gist Residence, Tucson
 - 2) L. Ron Hubbard House, Phoenix
 - 3) Villa del Coronado Apartments, Phoenix
 - 4) Palm Lane Gardens Apartments, Phoenix
 - 5) Villa Catalina Apartments, Tucson
 - 6) Roosevelt Addition Historic District, Tempe
 - 7) Buckeye Union High School A-Wing, Buckeye
- 2. Griffith:** Gave overviews of
 - a. Traditional Cultural Properties Workshop
 - b. TCP Conference on May 25 & T26, 2010 in Flagstaff
 - c. Keeper notification that Nantucket Sound is eligible for the National Register (the entire sound) under "A, B, C, & D"
 - d. The Advisory Council holding Section 106 advanced classes on March 10, 2010
 - e. The National Preservation Institute will be giving a workshop on Curation on February 15 - 19, 2010
 - f. We are swamped with compliance
 - g. Working on Topock issue

1. Garrison:

- a. Janet Matthews has returned to Florida and Carol Shull has returned to the position of Keeper
- b. Gave an overview of the state of the agency budget, park closures, staff layoffs
- c. Gave an overview of the legislative move to stop the Property Tax Program
- d. Glendale Sugar Beet Factory will be used to produce Liquor
- e. Gave an overview of the current Centennial 2012 progress

F. Public Comment: None

G. Agenda Items: None

H. Time and Date: The next meeting will be March 26, 2010

Adjourned at: 4:57 PM