

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES  
CARNEGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
March 25, 2011**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Terry Majewski chaired the meeting
2. Meeting called to order at 9:22 AM

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS**

**1. HSRC Committee Members present**

- a. Terry Majewski
- b. Kathleen Henderson
- c. Don Ryden
- d. John Jacquemart
- e. Patricia Olson
- f. Jan Balsom
- g. Doug Kupel
- h. Brooks Jeffery

**2. HSRC Committee Member absent**

- a. John Lacy

**3. SHPO Staff Members present**

- a. Jim Garrison
- b. Vivia Strang
- c. Mary Robinson
- d. Eric Vondy
- e. Robert Frankeberger

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. New National Register Nominations**

**Adams House – Joesler MPDF, Tucson**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the **Adams House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Adams 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: **Balsom**

**Discussion:**

**Jeffery:** The biggest issue I have with this and the other Joesler nominations is with “materials used”. Stucco is the material listed in the nomination as wall material. It is important in this nomination, as with the others. The use of “Burnt Adobe, which is a very important material in this Arizona, should be discussed.

**Janet Parkhurst, Preparer:** Should the wording be “Stucco over Burnt Adobe” and not just “Stucco”?

**Garrison:** Yes the exact materials used should be noted in the nomination.

**Kupel:** Comments given pertain to all the Joesler MPDFs on the agenda. The Statement of Significance in the summary paragraph – It would be easier for the reader if you wrote out context 1 and 2 instead of referring to them. On page 2 – There needs to be an explanation of what a St. Charles Style kitchen is. On page 9 the references to the Joesler document states “Per Others” needs to be clarified.

**Olson:** The period of significance is stated as the “Construction date 1937 through 1956. Was the intent to show the relationship to the MPDF? It should be the construction date only on this particular nomination.

**Majewski:** Summarized Bob Frankeberger’s comments regarding the property.

- “The historical significance of Joesler’s houses is well documented in the MPDF.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



**Corocoran House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the **Corocoran House** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Corocoran House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**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:**

**Garrison:** Exterior material for this property should be “Burnt Adobe Brick”.

**Kupel:** In the Joesler nominations we are considering today, there is good discussion about the changes to the properties over time, but those details are not noted in the section about integrity. A summary of all the changes to the property over time needs to be included in the integrity paragraph. Also, on page 4, there is no date for the pool guesthouse. There were clear indications on the map where the additions to the property were, but it is not the case for all of the nominations. It would be helpful if all the nominations had the same information included on their maps.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



**Fletcher House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson AZ**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the **Fletcher House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Fletcher 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:**

**Jeffery:** Same questions regarding materials and period of significance.

**Parkhurst:** There is an early back addition to the house that, Jonathan Beck, an apprentice of Joesler, designed in the late 1940s.

**Jeffery:** There is no theme of significance to tie Jonathan Beck to the nomination. He should not be used as part of the reasoning for the period of significance.

**Garrison:** It is OK to mention the addition and attribute it to Beck, but the 1940 date will be fine for the period of significance.

**Kupel:** On page 3 of the summary statement, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence mentions the 2<sup>nd</sup> couple to own the home, Murphy and Keaton. Wording in that sentence needs to be clarified as to which couple is being discussed. Also, in the discussion about non-contributors it would be helpful to have more information regarding why these structures were considered non-contributors.

The information about Jonathan Beck being an Olympic swimmer should be omitted. As should the statement containing information about the mobster Chia Petta.

**Balsom:** Jonathan Beck is mentioned throughout the nomination including as an owner. Did he actually own the house?

**Parkhurst:** Yes, he was an owner at one time.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Hall House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Hall House nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Hall 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: **Balsom**

#### **Discussion:**

**Jeffery:** The period of significance needs to be clarified. There is the period of significance and a significant date outside that period of significance. The period of significance goes up to Joesler’s death. Is the significant date for Ann **Rysdale**? You should include her as a significant architect and tell her story or remove her as we suggested with Beck. In that case stay with the Joesler and his story with this house. The Rysdale addition is significant and her biography should be included in the nomination and she can be listed as a living architect. In that case the period of significance should be modified to 1953 - 1957.

**Kupel:** There are 2 dates for the office building 1964 (page 3) or 1965 (page 5). There should only be one date.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Jackson House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Jackson House nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Jackson House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**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:**

**Jeffery:** This is not a Joesler designed house.

**Parkhurst:** The dates for this house indicate it was built during the time Joesler was designing in the area. Didn’t he have exclusive rights to design home in the area?

**Jeffery:** That’s so, but there isn’t proof either that he built it or that he didn’t. It is my opinion that this is not a Joesler house. I have never seen a painted brick by Joesler in the foothills. He always used the burnt adobe or adobes proper; scissor trusses used in this house are not common in Joesler designs. The characteristics commonly found in Joesler designed are absent from this house.

**Parkhurst:** The reason we thought this was a Joesler home is we understood that Joesler had exclusive rights to build in Catalina Foothills Estates at the time. Also, the owner stated this is a Joesler designed home. We will be happy to research it further.

**Jeffery:** It could be eligible under Criterion "A" as a contributing property within the larger Murphy Development under community development.

**Majewski:** Do we withdraw or defer the nomination?

**Garrison:** The nomination should be differed to the next meeting.

**Kupel:** Staff could be given direction to verify whether it is or isn't a Joesler and make the appropriate changes to the nomination.

**Majewski:** The motion needs to be modified.

**Balsom:** I move the motion be withdrawn and deferred until we have an answer.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**7-1 In Favor of Modified Motion to Withdraw and Defer**



### **McFadden House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson**

**Strang -** Provided a brief overview of the **McFadden House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **McFadden House** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "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:**

**Balsom:** Should the period of significance be 1945?

**Jeffery:** Concurred with single date.

**Kupel:** Page 3 in the summary paragraph, which acreage is correct 7.09 acres, but in the first paragraph under location and setting it states that it is 7.24 acres. That needs to be cleared up. In the nomination it states that the outbuilding was built in 1945 and it seems that building is a contributor, but the wording in the nomination is not clear. There are a number of additions referred to on page 4, under interior, the central core is described as 1 room deep and the map shows that it is no longer 1 room deep. Also, there are a number of other changes that have been made to the home over the years. On page 5 in the integrity paragraph there are 7 changes not discussed. Taking all this into consideration, there may be integrity issues with this property.

**Ralph Comey, Preparer:** The exterior fabric fits within the SHPO guidelines.

**Kupel:** The intaglio on the end doesn't look like Joesler-esq work.

**Jeffery:** Honesty of expression of integrity in the nomination. In the other nominations it was clear what was original and what was added on. This home doesn't have that. The diagram is not clear or accurate. No doorways are shown in the diagram, making it difficult to determine what was added and what was not.

**Comey:** The plans can be corrected and made more accurate.

**Jeffery:** Is 34,000 square feet the original size or the current size?

**Comey:** That is probably the present square footage.

**Jeffery:** It states roof terracotta in one place and mission tile in another.

**Comey:** Both are correct terms for the roof.

**Jeffery:** Subjective language needs to be removed.

**Kupel:** Clarify integrity issues and statements throughout nomination.

**Majewski:** These are changes that we have requested on other nominations. Have all changes summarized in the integrity paragraph and modify maps to indicate changes to the structure.

**Olson:** Unless the potted plants and landscape are character defining features they should be left out of the nomination.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Neal Hall House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Neal Hall House nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Neal Hall House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**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:** There were modifications during the period of significance and are those significant dates to include?

**Kupel:** Dates for additions should not be included in the period of significance section in the nomination. Also, the map was helpful showing all the additions.

**Majewski:** Other alterations and their dates should be added.

**Jacquemart:** Wood siding replaced with stucco is a major change.

**Parkhurst:** The change from wood siding to stucco is on the sunroom, which is on the rear of the house.

**Majewski:** Do we resolve the period of significance? Do we do it with one date?

**Jeffery:** Yes, go with 1941.

**Kupel:** On page 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph it mentions a contemporary style in appearance, stucco clad monitor, what is that?

**Parkhurst:** It's a shed and you can see it on page 4.

**Jeffery:** I wouldn't call it a monitor.

**Parkhurst:** We can call it an off set shed.

**Jeffery:** Also, it shouldn't be called contemporary.

**Jacquemart:** On page 6 it states the windows were replaced. Were all the windows replaced and how does that affect integrity?

**Parkhurst:** Yes, they were. It was stated that the windows were replaced as noise abatement with windows that appear to be similar in design.

**Majewski:** When were they replaced?

**Parkhurst:** The windows were replaced in 2006. SHPO guidelines were used as well the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when rehabilitation was planned and completed.

**Majewski:** The year the windows were replaced needs to be included.

**Jacquemart:** Was that the same time the 2-car garage was added?

**Parkhurst:** Yes, the parents were moved into assisted living and the rehabilitation was started.

**Balsom:** The statement “Changes are historic in their own right” needs clarification

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Tout House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Tout House nomination.

Motion: **Olson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tout House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**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: **Balsom**

#### **Discussion:**

**Jeffery:** 1931 should be the sole date for the period of significance. In the form community planning and development are included as areas of significance. Which is Criterion "A" in the MPDF, but it is only listed under "C" for architecture, which is also included in the areas of significance. Do you want to tell the story of this being a spec house to advertise the larger development? Therefore tie it into Criterion "A".

**Parkhurst:** It was understood that community planning and development could also be Criterion "C".

**Jeffery:** The previous nomination was only nominated for its architecture.

**Parkhurst:** Joesler designed it, but Murphy didn't build it. It is, however in Murphy's subdivision. All the other nominations should be nominated with the same criterion. The owner does have the advertisement for this house and the fact that it was a spec house could be given more emphasis.

**Jeffery:** This house is unique because it was a spec house and showcase house, used to bring people into the area to see what it had to offer.

**Comey:** Joesler spec houses were designed to attract a specific clientele.

**Kupel:** In the cover document context 1 of subdivision planning, context 2 is the architecture of Josias Joesler, which would imply that both Criteria "A" and "C" could be used with all the Joeslers being nominated today instead of just "C". In addition on page 4 under the heading Exterior – it is notable for how it grew.

**Parkhurst:** It did grow about itself around the patio.

**Garrison:** There are properties that are used as spec houses to advertise a subdivision and are a critical piece of the development of the subdivision and are related to the "A" planning issue. A standard house designed by Joesler (not the first, best or last) should be under "C". What property is the Cream of the Crop in this subdivision and is local significance enough?

**Jeffery:** There haven't been any that have risen to that level.

**Parkhurst:** What about the first property that is a pueblo revival?

**Majewski:** On this one should it be both "A" and "C"? Should there be more discussion regarding Criterion "A" in this nomination?

**Jeffery:** On page 4, second paragraph, exterior it states that it is burnt adobe. Is it truly burnt adobe or is it sun-dried adobe? If it is not burnt adobe the statement needs to be removed.

**Majewski:** Should the motion be changed to Criteria "A" and "C"?

**Olson:** Moved to modify the motion from Criterion "C" to Criteria "A" and "C". **Balsom:** Seconded the motion.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Van Schaick House, Joesler MPDF, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Van Schaick House nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Van Schaick 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: **Balsom**

#### **Discussion:**

**Jeffery:** Dates of the period of significance in the nomination are 1952-1956. An extension to 1964 is implied. Should the extension be included in the period of significance?

**Parkhurst:** It was the work of the owner and a great deal of information about the owner has been included in the nomination.

**Jeffery:** Is the intent to give context to extending the period of significance beyond the Joesler MPDF to include work done by Mrs. Van Schaick? If so it needs to be reflected in the nomination form. I would abandon Mrs. Schaick and mention her as an interesting person and keep it very clear that the period of significance is tied to the Joesler connection. On page 5 of

the paragraph above interior the last sentence states, "A substantial adobe brick buttress", it should state the material is burnt adobe.

**Jacquemart:** The roofing was changed in 1964. I have a hard time with the statement "Originally clad in cedar shake shingles". Did Joesler use cedar shake shingles in his designs?

**Jeffery:** He did use them in his ranch houses and he may have on this one as well.

**Kupel:** On page 3 in the summary paragraph, "This is the only one that does not open with stating that this property is a Joesler". On page 8 this is the only one representative of only of context 2.

**Parkhurst:** It's not built in Catalina Foothills Estates, but rather built in an outer subdivision. There is no reference to Murphy on the drawings. We can add Joesler's name to these.

**Ryden:** On page 5 in the paragraph above interior the statement "placed asymmetrically on the upper level of the west façade is a triangular base plastered bay window with wrought iron grill" which is an oriel window.

**Majewski:** Keep the descriptive language, but add something like A.K.A. Oriel window.

**Balsom:** Dates on the aerial are different than the remainder of the photographs. Need clarification.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Gordon Residence, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Gordon Residence nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Gordon Residence 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:**

**Jacquemart:** Should it be considered at higher than the local level of significance? There aren't many Cliff May designed homes in Arizona.

**Chris Evans, Preparer:** It is the only residence designed by Cliff May in Tucson. There are several in the Phoenix area.

**Jacquemart:** The properties in Phoenix have been quite altered.

**Evans:** The two I am familiar with have been altered as well.

**Majewski:** Read remarks by Bob Frankeberger.

*"At last a clear winner. This is indeed an exceptional property. If it were only a typical Cliff May mid-century interpretation of the vernacular ranch buildings of New Spain in pre-USA California, celebrated in Sunset Magazine, that would be enough to qualify the property. Cliff May's influence on architectural design as practiced in Arizona during the '50s and '60s is unquestioned, especially in the much prized subdivisions designed by Ralph Haver. But in this property we have the accommodation, and expression architecturally of place, in terms both of climate and culture, that confirms his status as a master.*

**Bob Frankeberger, SHPO:** This is a nomination for an actual ranch house as opposed to all of those that are imposter houses that are called ranch houses.

**Jeffery:** What's a Heric Cliff ceiling panel?

**Evans:** It's a brand name. It is a structural panel that spans from one beam to the next and it also acts as an insulator.

**Kupel:** Criterion Consideration G on page 6, the wording is "Criterion Consideration G is applied to the Gordon Residence" and a more accurate wording would be the "Gordon Residence is subject to " Criterion Consideration G. On page 14 in the paragraph about Criterion Consideration G, there isn't enough proof given. There needs to be more proof of its exceptional significance. The information about the ocotillo roof should be on page 13 used as an indicator as to why this home is of exceptional significance. There also be a paragraph about Cliff May from page 6 and why he is important should also be included in the section about why this home is exceptionally significant as well.

**Majewski:** A summary in the significance section referring back to the earlier information.

**Garrison:** An editing job should be done in the section regarding the exceptional significance, strengthening it. State that this is the only known example of this type and the only know example of Cliff May, in Tucson instead of this may be the only known example.

**Majewski:** Do we want to modify the motion to reflect a change in level of significance?

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the nomination be modified to change the level of significance to **State** level of significance.

**Henderson:** seconded the motion.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Barrio Anita Historic District, Tucson

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Barrio Anita Historic District nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Barrio Anita Historic District on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**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:**

**Kupel:** This comment is for both Barrio Anita Historic District and Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District. Use the English name for the "The Gadsden Purchase" instead of the Spanish one "Venta de La Mesilla". There were interactions between Hispanics and Anglos. There were not the divisions between the two cultures until the railroad was built to Tucson. There needs to be expansion of the section referring to the City Farm. More information.

**Jeffery Morgan** gave credence to the Mexican concept of space, the yardscapes. The research and scholarship involved and applied was excellent. The word circa shouldn't be used in reference to the period of significance. There is a problem end date to the period of significance. 1940 was used to coincide with the plat changing to Barrio Anita form McKinley Park. The City Farm was added to the neighborhood in 1955 and should the date be extended to include the City Farm.

**Majewski:** Bob Frankeberger's comments:

*"The Plat included in the nomination is called McKinley Park, which begs the question of the title Barrio Anita. Although the photographs support the presence of row houses and other building types characteristic of the period, the map does not indicate the district boundaries, that might explain the almost equal numbers of contributors and non-contributors; nor does it locate contributing and non-contributing properties in illustration of the concentration and continuity uniting the district.*

*Moreover, there is no explanation of what constitutes the inappropriate alterations that determined non-contributing status."*

*The favorable reaction to a property that is found to be unaltered and in original condition sometimes diminishes adequate consideration, for alterations that should be found consistent with the Standards, so that the altered property would be determined to contribute to the district's historical significance.*

*The disconnect, between determinations of eligibility and findings of effect, is an ongoing problem of disparate perspective. Designations tend to favor a static history locked into a period of significance; while findings accommodate history's changing dynamic, guided by treatment standards and guidelines.*

*Once designated, districts usually experience reinvestment, including alterations and additions to buildings, in response to the economic stimulus of the State Property Tax (SPT) reclassification and reduction. There is the inevitable comparison, made by owners of non-contributing properties, between new alterations that are approved, and old alterations that were found inappropriate and which have disqualified their participation in the program of property tax relief.*

*Unless those alterations can be shown, unequivocally, not to meet the Standards, and that, unquestionably, the historic integrity, i.e. the ability of the building's characteristic features to convey the property's historic significance has not been preserved, we can expect changes.*

(Above quote is for both Barrio Anita and Barrio Santa Rosa)



**Majewski:** The district nominations are not done, strictly speaking, for history's sake. It has to be acknowledged that challenges received, after a district is on the National Register, relate to this. We have problems with the dynamic changes within a neighborhood, such as carports.

**Kupel:** How do we know with only small photographs to judge integrity by?

**Majewski:** I think Bob wants more discussion in the text in order for SHPO staff to determine eligibility issues.

**Jonathan Mabry, Tucson Historic Preservation Office:** Did you see the statement at the top of page 6? It is right before the list of contributors and non-contributors. There is a sentence that says, "Inappropriate alterations are defined as those made after the period of significance that have changed the basic form or character of the building as seen from the street to the extent that the building no longer retains historic architectural integrity." The consultant is making a straightforward definition of what are alterations that make the building a non-contributor. If it is necessary to make it more complex then provide direction.

**Kupel:** Then there are only 5 non-contributors due to inappropriate alterations.

**Majewski:** Is that statement enough to take care of the issue?

**Frankeberger:** It doesn't really state what is the signature or signs of historic importance that is supposed to be seen. Have the alterations obscured the historic significance of the property irrespective of the additions and alterations past the period of significance. There is an imbalance when the nomination is written the same consideration should be given to each specific property. Has the property been altered to the point that it no longer conveys historic significance for listing in the National Register? That information is never very clear. It is usually just a matter of stating that "its changed or it hasn't changed". That is not sufficient to draw the line between contributor and non-contributor. When that decision is challenged when changes are allowed after designation that kept other properties non-contributing. We have no argument to use against that. We need to look at the alterations and determine whether it was a proper treatment and when making that determination between contributors and non-contributors have the criteria really been defined that's being conveyed. The statement is not accurate enough.

**Garrison:** We need to look at the inventory forms to determine if loss of integrity is apparent or not.

**Mabry:** The forms of the 5 non-contributors need to be checked and the reasoning for their status placed in the nomination itself. In other words what are the character defining features and did the alterations remove obscure or change too many of those. That is what should be used to measure integrity.

**Frankeberger:** Concurred.

**Balsom:** There are some discrepancies in the addresses of photos and the photo key.

**Garrison:** The Davis School is not mentioned in the nomination, but it is inside the district boundary.

**Mabry:** It is a contributor

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### **Barrio Santa Rosa, Historic District, Tucson**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the **Barrio Santa Rosa, Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Barrio Santa Rosa, 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: **Jeffery**

#### **Discussion:**

**Majewski:** Bob Frankeberger's comments are similar to the ones for Barrio Anita.

**Kupel:** Stated that comments about this nomination are similar to the ones made for Barrio Anita. On page 11 agro pastoral economy and how it disappeared during this time, but the agro pastoral economy disappeared earlier in Tucson. On page

13 the quote about dangerous socialism is gratuitous and unnecessary. If this area is not covered by the Sanborn Maps, then the reference to it should be removed.

**Balsom:** I have the same comment about the photographs - there are some discrepancies in the addresses of photos and the photo key.

**Majewski:** The preparer should make sure the photos match the key.

**Kupel:** There are 5 non-contributors forms in this nomination as well that need to be checked and the reasoning for their status placed in the nomination itself.

**Mabry:** An important difference between these two barrios is Barrio Santa Rosa is more of an extension of Barrio Libre and is more of an urban Barrio.

**Garrison:** In the percentage by style, the Sobin System is discussed, but it is unclear whether early transitional or late transitional are parts of the system or not.

**Mabry:** There is a discussion, on page 15, of that in which he contrasts Sobin's typology with Elisabeth Husband's. He points out that in Sobin's system there are certain types that span his categories, for instance the ones you mentioned. Everything doesn't fit neatly into types.

**Garrison:** There seems to be 2 typological systems used that are not quite resolved.

**Jeffery:** They shouldn't be classified as technologies, described as they are.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Valley of the Moon, Tucson

**Strang -** Provided a brief overview of the Valley of the Moon nomination.

**Garrison:** This property is already on the State Historic Register and the nomination should reflect that.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer forward the Valley of the Moon nomination to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**A & C**" at the Local level of significance. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

#### **Discussion:**

**Majewski:** Read Bob Frankeberger's comments into the record.

*"I'm not convinced that Spiritualism can be credited as contributing to the broad patterns of history, or that any of the features of the property are typical or characteristic expressions of Spiritualism; and I'm not sure that Storybook Style is a distinctive type, or that garden architecture is other than a designed landscape.*

*However, since the bulk of the Narrative Statement of Significance is devoted to the life and works of George Phar Legler, one could expect the nomination to be presented under Criterion "B", as well as "A" and "C".*

*The style would more likely be characterized as Folk Art, albeit with a thematic program of literary references. It exhibits the signs and signature of the type of creativity that distinguishes Watts Towers, or in Arizona, Mystery Castle, which was also a tourist attraction, and in particular the Sunnyslope Rock Garden.*

*The nomination would perhaps be best served in the following the example of other Folk Art listed in the National Register.*

**Jeffery:** Concur with Bob's statement. How is Spiritualism is classified as style? Also, under areas of significance you have architecture, art, entertainment, landscape architecture, and performing arts. There isn't an individual context or thematic context. Should the focus be on one context and strengthen that one.

**Demion Clinco, Preparer:** This property was designed when the idea of fairies was strong within society at large. This was designed specifically where children would go and might see them. The idea of fairies, being a subset of the Spiritualism Movement and this Fairy garden being the only one of its kind in southern Arizona and perhaps the Country makes it unique.

Legler never distinguishes himself in any other way other than this property. That's why I chose to go with "A & C" and not add "B".

**Balsom:** This nomination is neither "A" nor "C". It is all about Legler and what he did to create this place.

**Mabry:** Demion is correct that Spiritualism was a real historical movement, so it is appropriate for Criterion "A" and this proposed district represents an architectural expression of that historical movement. As far as "B", what is Legler's historical significance? His significance is what he did on this property and because of that there is a stronger argument for "A" than "B".

**Ryden:** How did Legler's creation influence people beyond the people who came to see it?

**Kupel:** It didn't have to; it was an expression of the Spiritualism Movement. Criterion "B" isn't appropriate. Is spiritualism part of religion? Stay with Criterion "A" for its association with Spiritualism and Criterion "C" for Folk Art. The problem with using Criterion "B" is there is nothing known about Legler.

**Mabry:** This property is vernacular storybook architecture. Walt Disney was part of this Spiritualist Movement; his Disneyland was the corporate expression of that.

**Demion:** Should the nomination be Criterion "A" alone?

**Kupel:** Strengthen "A" and leave "C" off or leave "C" in as an expression of "Folk Art".

**Balsom:** This still reads as a narrative about Legler, a story about the person.

**Garrison:** The advice is to narrow the context down to 1 or 2 and focus on those to strengthen.

**Balsom:** On the map show the property location clearly.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### el chaparral, Phoenix

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the el chaparral nomination.

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the el chaparral 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: **Jacquemart**

#### **Discussion:**

**Majewski:** Bob Frankeberger comments read into the minutes:

*"It's a big house on a big lot, is architecturally undistinguished, and posited as exemplifying early rural estate development in what is now the Arcadia area of Phoenix. The proposed historic context in which the property's significance is founded is the Community Planning and Development of, supposedly Arcadia. This would seem to be leading to a contributor status, rather than to individual eligibility, should Arcadia reach designation as a district.*

*However the property's historical significance would more logically be associated with the advent of winter residence by Midwesterners, principally Chicagoans like Wrigley and Heard, and concurrently with development of resorts such as Castle Hot Springs that benefited from the rail connection between Chicago and Phoenix.*

*The reference to the influence of the Spanish Colonial Revival Style is not supported by the identification of any features of the property typical and characteristic of this distinction."*

**Kupel:** Concurred with Bob's statement. It is nominated under Criterion "A" and not architecture. The contexts used are first - agricultural and rural estate development and the second - architectural style. In the narrative is nominated for simply being a home. "It's a rare and well maintained example of a rural estate home." There is no pattern of development mentioned. Is this a part of the rural estates MPDF?

**Jacquemart:** No it's not part of that MPDF.

**Majewski:** Bob stated that this property could be a contributor in a District Nomination for Arcadia rather than as an individual listing.

**Kupel:** It's still listed as an architectural significance nomination.

**Ryden:** Why isn't the name of the property capitalized?

**Vince Murray, Preparer:** That was the decision of the owners and everything refers to it in lower case.

**Kupel:** On page 6 the date for citrus grove development is incorrect. It's not in the 1890s but is developed after the dam is built in the 1920s.

**Murray:** According to family members, citrus was grown in the area. It may not be as widespread and in the 20s, but it was grown at that time. The name for the area is Citrus Homes referring to growing citrus there.

**Kupel:** Also on that page it states, the Salt River Valley Water Users Association started in 1902 and it actually started in 1903. The Water Reclamation Act was in 1902. Also, why Criterion "A" and not "C" for architecture?

**Murray:** The architectural aspect was difficult. The "A" approach was more in line with a national register nomination. Plus there have been modifications to the property. There was not an architectural plan for the house; a model was used instead. The owner put together what the house would look like and then had draftsmen draw up plans. A photographer was the architect of record. Also, it is across from Arcadia, but not in Arcadia. It was a winter home with a Caretaker year round.

**Jacquemart:** The plat for Citrus Homes Development predates Arcadia.

**Majewski:** I Criterion "A" sustainable as a nomination?

**Henderson:** When the Pearlman platted Citrus Homes Development did they plan it for larger estates?

**Murray:** That was the intention.

**Henderson:** In terms of "A" there should be more information about Citrus Grove Development.

**Murray:** Perhaps tying it in with the Development of Orangewood Development; intended to be developed as larger estates as well.

**Garrison:** USGS maps show a couple of properties developed prior to 1956.

**Murray:** There were very few homes in the area at that time.

**Majewski:** Use aerial maps to show how the area developed.

**Murray:** That would be easy to do. A historic aerial and a contemporary one to show the development would be best.

**Ryden:** The association with Arcadia needs further discussion. Also the period of significance ends when Arcadia was annexed to the city of Phoenix.

**Murray:** The whole area including el chaparral was annexed.

**Majewski:** What should the period of significance be?

**Ryden:** Is it part of a larger development and are there examples of this thematic context? When was the last mansion built?

**Murray:** We can check into other examples, perhaps in Orangewood and Ingleside. There is not much to use for examples.

**Majewski:** Perhaps a better explanation for why date was chosen.

**Garrison:** SHPO will assist in finding a stylistic term for property.

**Olson:** Are there any integrity issues?

**Murray:** The additions were designed by an architect and are in keeping with the house's style.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**



### Koontz House, Phoenix

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Koontz House nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Koontz 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: **Balsom**

#### **Discussion:**

**Majewski:** Bob Frankeberger comments read into the minutes:

*"Clearly, this property meets the architectural qualification relative to the multiple property listing: North Central Phoenix Farmhouse and Rural Estate Homes 1895 – 1959."*

**Kupel:** On page 3 it should be flood irrigation. On Page 5 in the narrative statement should be tied to Criterion “C” for Mediterranean Revival Style under that context. Criterion “A” is the Rural Estate Plan context.

**Majewski:** As with the Joesler MPDF, mention need to be made of how this property reflects the MPDF context.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility –**



## 2. National Register Historic Places (NHRP) Integrity Policies Review and Update

a. Survey and Inventory: provide direction regarding integrity of a property and its integrity after modification.

**James Garrison:** Gave a copy of Policy with changes in the current policy

- Overview of current policy written in 1991 by Roger Brevort to deal with the Arizona Heritage Fund and criteria to be used to determine recipients using the parameters of what was the lowest bar for that determination.
- Other issues that have arisen
  - Additions
  - Carports
  - Landscapes
  - Walls
  - Porch
  - Infill
- Bill Collins suggested that everything should be united under one policy statement
- Using the Secretary of Interior Standards to determine policy in evaluating non-contributors
- Garrison gave examples of proposed changes which were discussed
- Discussed Building Additions policy and took suggestions from the committee and SHPO

**Majewski:** Why not implement it or test it out as is to work the problems out.

**Jeffery:** It can be adopted and revised as needed.

- Discussed wall and landscapes policies taking suggestions from the committee and SHPO

**Garrison:** The Carport, Additions and Wall policy could be adopted and further work be done on the Landscape policy

Motion: **Jeffery** moved to accept the National Register of Historic Places (NHRP) Policies with the amended language.

Motion Seconded: **Balsom**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
**8-0 In Favor of Eligibility.**

b. Table Stylistic Issue tabled for another meeting.

Jan Balsom left due to other appointments. There was still a quorum.

## Ghost Ranch Lodge, Tucson – Revised Information

**Ryden:** Provided a brief overview of the **Ghost Ranch Lodge** significance. In order to retain the Part 1 tax credit the owners need to know what buildings are eligible. SHPO has been consulted. The Ghost Ranch Lodge, a Joesler designed

property, has been altered over its lifetime. The first 3 layers of this property are eligible and the last strip of buildings is not eligible. It may be nominated for “C” for Joesler’s design and the further alterations that are in keeping with his design style. A new typology of “Destination Courtyard Motor Lodge” was suggested, which influenced the designs of other motels built thereafter. A Criterion “A & C” nomination was forwarded to the Keeper. Roger Reid sent a letter from the Keeper’s Office stating the ins, and the outs. Based on that letter the design architect proceeded with his project.

**Discussion:**

**Majewski:** Is the committee being asked to sign off on this nomination?

**Ryden:** Yes, we are trying to get the part 3 completed and this ready to go to the keeper in the next month or so.

**Garrison:** The issue is that all of the things described in the original nomination are now gone, and that is why Ryden is revising it.

**Majewski:** What is the drop-dead date?

**Strang:** The Keeper stated one of the contexts to be Tourism.

**Majewski:** A conference call to discuss this will be completed.



**Webb Grocery, Phoenix – Eligibility Recommendation Review**

**Strang -** Provided a brief overview of the **Webb Grocery** eligibility review.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the Historic Sites Review Committee recommend to the State Historic Preservation Officer that the **Webb Grocery** is considered eligible for listing on the National and State Registers of Historic Places under Criterion “C” at the **Local** level of significance. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

**Discussion:**

**Frankeberger:** The property is not eligible due to lack of integrity. It has no architectural style or vernacular.

**Jody Elsner, City of Phoenix:** Spoke in favor of the property being eligible.

**Kupel:** Looking at it as an example of a method of construction it may be compared to the Hispanic Church in Glendale that used the same Rock Construction method. Also, it could be viewed as a roadside attraction.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**7-0 In Favor of Eligibility.**



**D. OLD BUSINESS**

**Approval of the November 5, 2010 HSRC minutes**

**Jeffery:** Moved to accept the November 5, 2020 minutes. **Jacquemart:** Seconded the motion

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**7-0 In Favor of Eligibility.**

**E. STAFF REPORTS**

1. Carol Griffith has retired from SHPO, but was rehired for 8 hours a week until June to work on the Preservation Conference.
2. Bob Frankeberger has retired from SHPO, but will return part time
3. Erick Laurila has been hired in capacity of Archaeology Compliance Staff
4. Garrison gave an overview of SHPO and agency business

**F. Public Comment - None**

**G. Call for Agenda Items - None**

**H. Time and Date of the Next Meeting - July 29, 2011**

**Adjourned at 3:15 PM**