

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES  
THE CARNEGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX ARIZONA  
July 29, 2011**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:35 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. Doug Kupel
- g. John Lacy

**2. HSRC Committee Member absent**

- a. Jan Balsom
- b. Brooks Jeffery

**3. SHPO Staff Members present**

- a. Vivia Strang
- b. Bill Collins
- c. Mary Robinson
- d. Eric Vondy
- e. Robert Frankeberger
- f. Jim Cogswell
- g. Eric Laurila

**C. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. New National Register Nominations**

- a. **Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture, Tucson – Multiple Properties Documentation Form (MPDF)**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture, MPDF nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the Historic Sites Review Committee approve the documentation of the Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture, MPDF Motion Seconded: **Lacy**

**Majewski**: I will read Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect's comments regarding this document.

*"There is little doubt that health seekers were a major factor in the migration to Tucson and affected Tucson's development; and the accomplishments of the more prominent and influential members of this group makes for an interesting read. But in pursuit of the premise that health seekers' buildings, including tents, sanatoria, hospitals, convalescent homes, clinics and boarding houses constitute a unique building type characterized by courtyards and sleeping porches, this context study fails to define the architecture of "sanatoria" as prototypical and distinguished from contemporary building typology and aesthetic style, as a basis for listing properties in the National Register of Historic Places*

*Other than potential archaeological sites consisting of the surviving souvenirs of "Tent City" outhouses, and the surviving features of buildings constructed in compliance with homesteading, the remaining nine properties of this nomination are*

*either already listed or are eligible for the distinctive characteristics of architectural style. The Owen Homestead is no more significant of Health Seeking than of Black History.*

*In none of the cited examples is there any conveyance of the signs; signature or significance of health seeking that couldn't be attributed to the pervasive courtyard and sleeping porch typology in response to climate prior to refrigeration or even air cooling.*

*The MPL is a monumental effort resulting in no applicable function."*

#### **Discussion:**

- The Architecture of Tuberculosis Care is not distinguishable from architecture elsewhere in Tucson
  - Even the drawings show architecture typical across the Southwest
  - The idea that this architecture is prototypical is weak under "C" Criterion
- The nomination is important under Criterion "A" as associated with an important event
- Was 1945 chosen as the closing date for the period of significance
  - Antibiotics were developed and changed the treatment of diseases
  - If so this information should be included as clarification
- E 29 – reference to "Informal Archaeological Investigations – can this be clarified?"
- F23 – reference the term Cultural Landscapes is inaccurate – Community Planning and Development should be used (tent camps sanatoriums) to strengthen Criterion "A"
- F 45 –registration requirements for tent camps should be under Criterion "D" instead of Criterion "A" as these are mainly archaeological sites
- H on Page 51, the introductory paragraph discusses Tucson and states that no known multiple property documentation is available (Sunnyslope in Phoenix could be used as an example of this type of community planning throughout the state.)
- Section H is about identification and evaluation, both should be included in an Individual National Register Nomination and not in a MPDF document
- It would be helpful to include a chart showing what properties are listed already listed on the National Register and what properties are not listed
- H 53 does not belong in this document
- H 56 and H 57 both conclude with the recognition of grant assistance for this document and the process for procuring the grant should be included
- Photographs need to be correctly labeled with the name of the each building with the photo instead of just the view
- There is one architectural type that is unique and it needs to be included
  - The Isolation Cabins were built by the National Youth Administration in the 1930s and allowed the patients to be in isolation while still at home
- Section F – registration requirements need further development
  - A guide for the section is recommended the, very well done, "Indian Warfare MPDF" could be used as a model to strengthen this section
- Focus on Tuberculosis and not the architecture, which is what ties all the properties together
- Are there features of these buildings specifically designed for Tubercular care?
- On the site were there items disposed of i.e. medicine vials and other such items?

#### **Preparer: Jennifer Levstik response:**

- In the informal archaeological investigation many items were found that were directly utilized for Tubercular patients. Including syringes, medicine vials and personal hygiene items, etc
- There are distinctions between these properties as a tubercular care area from the remainder of Tucson
  - Isolation buildings were spaced further from each other than would have normally been done in Tucson residential and commercial areas

- Spacing is not always obvious with the infill around these structures
- Designed setbacks structures had to be a specific distance from the street
- Placement on the lot was very specific to their purpose as well
- Building materials were very specific to sanatoriums
  - Roofing materials were chosen that would absorb the sun's warmth
  - Tile, Clay, and concrete were used because they could be sanitized
- There were manuals with instruction on how to build sanatoriums
- Cabins were constructed in specific manners to encourage cross ventilation and facilitate isolation

**Committee:**

- Don't assume that everything will be understood
- Give your methods of documentation and relate how and why the property was set up as it was
- The committee advised strengthening of Criterion "A" and retaining Criterion "C & D"

**Jonathan Mabry, Tucson Preservation Officer:** Spoke in favor of the nomination

**Committee:**

- Defer action on the motion until the document has been re-worked
- Should the committee wait until this document is accompanied by an actual nomination?

**Modified Nomination**

Modified nomination: **Kupel:** Moved the HSRC approve the Tucson Health Seeker's Architecture, MPDF subject to the comments made today. Second: **Lacy**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**0 - 6 Motion Does Not Carry** (With the understanding that it be returned to the committee along with a nomination)



**b. Woolen, Herbert and Irma House, Tucson, Pima County**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Woolen, Herbert and Irma House nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Woolen, Herbert and Irma 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: **Kupel**

**Majewski:** I will read Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect's comments regarding this property.

*"I suppose by virtue of the Multiple Property Listing (MPL), anything by Joesler and Murphy is assumed to be eligible, even this otherwise unremarkable example. To simply state that the building "meets all registration requirements" (of the MPL) is simply not enough. What are the characteristics, and what features convey those characteristics? Rather than specifically enumerate the MPL requirements as met in this example, the nomination develops a treatise on architectural styles, as if the property otherwise meets criteria C, which is doubtful, independent of the MPL.*

*Joesler had his own style, so it is useless to characterize any of his work as Sonoran Revival, Spanish Colonial, Territorial Ranch or Ranch; but for this particular example to be characterized as Ranch is highly questionable, as that term is appropriately defined in the work of Cliff May, to which this house bears no resemblance. Ranch, as the merchandizing invention of the home building industry's hyperbole, certainly should not apply to a custom built house, except as self-mocking satire.*

*Since the MPL requirements are not specific in terms of identifying architectural features and characteristics we are left with "intact", "original location", and "sufficiently unaltered" as qualifiers for listing.*

*Granted the house hasn't been moved; but the additions to the site are such that the setting for the house is not "sufficiently unaltered". Additions to the house, itself, which may not have left original walls etc. "intact", including a dining room, a "connector space" to the east wing, and a two car garage at the west wing, subsequently converted to living space,*

*likewise contest the conclusion of the nomination that the house is “sufficiently unaltered” to “reflect the original architectural qualities for which it is considered significant”. Without the specific identification of the original architectural qualities, it is uncertain that they remain “reflect”(ed). The “connector” completely altered the original character of the east wing, for example, as did the addition of more living space to the west wing.*

*The nomination leaves the building’s “unaltered” state, and therefore its condition of meeting the “requirements”, in question.”*

#### **Discussion:**

- Simply referring to the MPL is not enough to prove a building’s eligibility
- The citations are not enough as they are now since without the master document they are not easily understood
- The character Defining Elements in this Joesler designed home differentiates it from others and there needs to be supporting documentation within the nomination itself
- What is Joesler’s Crescent Plan Concept? What does it mean? Simply wrapping the house around the topography?
- There was much discussion regarding the views from the house and their importance.
  - His window placement not only addressed the views from the windows
  - Also the solar angle to the windows.
  - It is obvious from his plans that he was designing a more comfortable Arizona home and not solely addressing the views.
- Doesn’t fit into the master document or compare it to other houses in the Catalina Foothills
- Should every single Joesler house be placed on the National Register?
- Most of the alterations were internal and a discussion should be included as to whether these alter the overall architectural style and were they added during the period of significance?
- The description of the house as unaltered is inaccurate.
  - There have been several major changes as evidenced by the main drawing
  - Does this affect integrity?
- Page 6 – The Central Arizona Project (CAP) water actually came into Tucson in 1993 and not 1996
- It is unclear if the freestanding garage contributing or non-contributing

#### **Preparer: Janet Parkhurst response:**

- At the committee’s request Joesler Houses should be submitted under the Joesler MPDF
- The period of significance should be the date the house was built
- In this nomination the period of significance was the completion to Joesler’s Death from 1950 – 1956
- The additions are believed to have been Joesler’s work and they fit within his design style
- It is not a ranch style house
- The nomination will be strengthened to reflect the fact that this is a Joesler designed house worthy of being on the National Register
- Joesler did design this house specifically with the views foremost in his design decisions

Modified Nomination

Modified the nomination: **Henderson:** Moved the HSRC approve the **Woolen, Herbert and Irma House**, subject to the comments made today. Second: **Kupel**

#### **Committee:**

- Should the motion be changed?
- No, vote it down with the understanding that the preparer modify the nomination and bring it before the committee at a later date

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**1- 5 Motion Does Not Carry**

Motion: **Henderson** moved that Janet Parkhurst resubmit the **Woolen, Herbert and Irma House** nomination for consideration to the Arizona Register of Historic Places taking into consideration the advice of this committee. Motion Seconded: **Lacy**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**5 - 1 Motion Carried**



**c. Alston, Dr. Lucius Charles House, Mesa, Maricopa County**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Alston, Dr. Lucius Charles House nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Alston, Dr. Lucius Charles House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & 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: **Henderson**

**Majewski:** I will read Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect's comments regarding this property.

*"The narrative declares: "There have been no major changes to the house since its original construction, with the exception of the second story that was added more than 50 years ago." The second story is "major" and it is unclear that it was done by the Dr. or after his death by persons unidentified; and therefore it is unclear that it is contributing to the property's significance under criteria A or B.*

*It is probably more accurate to say the property has been Rehabilitated rather than Restored; and that it's appearance has been altered, by the replacement of floors, windows and doors, from its appearance during the Dr.'s tenure.*

*While the house conveys physical evidence of the Dr.'s presence in Mesa, it is unclear how it signifies an event important in Black History.*

*While the style of the house is not relevant given that criterion C is not a factor in the nomination; it is not a bungalow."*

**Discussion:**

- The text and the explanation focus on the architecture
  - It should be placed under Criterion "C"
  - It is not being considered in this nomination
- The significance of this house is:
  - A black doctor built it, his presence in the community and how it affected the community
  - There should be more discussion about him in order to utilize Criteria "A" & "B"
- The style is miss-identified:
  - It is not a late craftsman bungalow
  - If anything; it is a vernacular style house with bungalow influence
- As an anchor to the redevelopment of the neighborhood historical influence of it should be discussed
- Part 8 discusses the African American community and the doctor's influence, but nothing is said about the architecture of the house
- Part 8 "A" and "B":
  - Need to be separated out and the narrative needs to be tightened up
  - Be very specific in your statements
- Since the addition dramatically altered the architecture of the house:

- The date that addition was completed is very important to the significance of the house
- Is there a way to confirm that date?
- Under “B” information regarding the addition is important, while under Criterion “A” it is not.
- Need photos from the time the house was in use for comparison to current photos.
- Interview people who lived in the neighborhood to determine when the addition was added to the house is an option.
- If the addition was built during the period of significance then the addition to the house it would not necessarily be detrimental to the original its integrity.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**6-0 Motion Carried**



**d. Palo Verde Ruin, Peoria, Maricopa County**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the Palo Verde Ruin nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Palo Verde Ruin** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**D**” at the **State** 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:**

- The SHPO archaeologists reviewed this nomination and are in favor of it going forward to the Keeper of the National Register.
- The original ruin was 80 acres and the current boundaries are only 19.8 acres. What is the justification for the change in area?
- The acreage that is not part of this nomination has been studied and documented providing information about this area.
- Are the components that make the larger site important represented in the 19.8 acreage?

**Logan Simpson Design, preparers, represented by Mark Hackbarth:**

- There was a question of land ownership. The 19.8 acres are owned by the City of Peoria and the remainder is under private ownership including housing.
- The entire site has provided information about the past and it appears likely that the smaller site will continue to do so.
- The ceramics found in the larger site are similar to what has been found in the smaller site.

**Committee:**

- The Sonoran vegetation is Lower Colorado River.

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**6-0 Motion Carried**



**2. Review of Reclassification Application for Properties**

**a. 6301 South Gila Avenue, Tucson, Pima County**

**Strang** - Staff did not agree on the eligibility of **6301 South Gila Avenue** and therefore it is being brought before the committee for an eligibility recommendation.

**Discussion:**

- This could be classified as the work of a Master.

**Majewski:** I will read Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect's comments regarding this property.

*"International Style is rare in Tucson and this is an excellent example of that philosophy of design. Its significance is exceptional; and supercedes the 50-year guideline."*

- The background presented, talks about the architect. Perhaps he isn't a name we hear everyday, but in his time and in Tucson he was considered a superior architect. He won many awards and there were multiple publications to his credit. Could Bob Frankeberger give us some insight?

**Frankeberger:**

Just because he is not Frank Lloyd Wright does not mean he is not a master. He is someone who received recognition from his peers. He received many awards and AIA recognition, both of which would qualify him as a Master Architect.

**Committee:**

- There is not enough information at this time for an exception to be made under Criterion Consideration G - 50-year rule
- The architect himself is known as more of an educator than a working architect
- His awards were more for teaching and writing and there may have been an occasional award for his actual design
- There needs to be much more information and comparisons to other architects to determine how his work fits in with International Style
- Yes, his work was primarily in teaching and writing,
  - It is clear, however his teaching along with his actual body of work indicate that he should be considered a Master Architect
  - This idea needs to be made stronger in the nomination
- The 50-year rule is the key in this instance

**Builder's Son, Larry Priest:**

- Spoke in favor of the nomination.
- He also stated that William Kirby Lockard was a prolific architect in the City of Tucson
- As well as a writer and educator.

**Committee:**

- Options
  - Go strengthen the nomination and go forward with nomination now, which would make it more difficult to approve.
  - Wait till 2014 when the house will be 50 years old and bring it back before the committee, which would be a simpler process.

**Priest:** Decided to wait till the house is 50 years old and bring it back before the committee.



**b. 404 Oak Street, Bisbee, Cochise County**

**Strang** – The property located at **404 Oak Street** does not currently qualify for the Tax Reclassification Program because it is a non-contributor to the Bisbee Historic District.

**Discussion:**

- SHPO Staff considered the house ineligible because:

- Aluminum siding over existing siding, probably clapboard
- Steel casement windows replaced with wood frame double hung
- Enclosed front porch
- Still looks like a bungalow and conveys its character
- Discussion of 3 strikes rule for ineligibility

Motion: **Ryden** the HSRC advises the Preservation Officer that **404 Oak Street** still retains sufficient integrity to convey its architectural character as a bungalow and thus would be considered eligible as a contributor to the broader Bisbee Residential Historic District. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
**5 - 1 In Favor of Eligibility**



### **3. Review of Delisting of National Register Property, 2325 North 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, Maricopa County**

**Strang – 2325 North 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue** has been significantly altered and therefore is no longer eligible as a contributor to the Willow Alvarado Historic District. Pursuant to regulations the Keeper of the National Register will be petitioned to remove the property from contributor status. With the delisting of the property it will no longer be eligible for the Historic Property Tax Credit.

#### **Discussion:**

- New owners met with the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office;
  - It is currently a contributor to a district under the National Register
  - New owners want to make it habitable and give it some style
  - A letter was sent to the owners stating that the property would be discussed today

Motion: **Kupel** moved the HSTC recommend to the State Historic Preservation Officer that the property located at **2325 North 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue** be removed from contributing status in the Willow Alvarado Historic District and that recommendation be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote  
**6 – 0 In Favor of Delisting**



### **4. Stylistic Issues**

**Strang** – Distributed background materials for a Stylistic Classification discussion composed by Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer. A conference call will be scheduled with committee members Ryden, Jeffery, and Olson at a later date to discuss this issue. The rest of the committee should send their comments to Jim Garrison. It will then be finalized and brought before the full committee.



### **5. Valley National Bank Operations Center, Tucson, Pima County**

**Strang** - Provided a brief overview of the **Valley National Bank Operations Center** nomination.



**Discussion:**

- SHPO Comments
  - Not an excellent example of significance for concrete as proposed as the basis for eligibility, nor for expressionism
  - Must be the best example within its context. This building is little more than a common example of its type
  - Alterations in 1983 damage the building's historic integrity

**Preparer, Chris Evans:**

- Bulletin # 15 – The idea that this building has to be the best building and the best example is problematic. Quote from Bulletin *“In justifying exceptional importance it is necessary to identify other properties within the Geographical area to reflect the same significance or historic associations and to determine which properties best represent their historic context in question. Several properties could become eligible over time, but a few (few not one) will qualify as exceptionally important.”* The best of something is difficult to define
- The original architect, in keeping with the original design intention, designed the addition
- One of the courtyards was filled in when the addition was built
- The building is unchanged on its public face
- A concrete building is difficult to appreciate, but this one does represent a finite time from approximately 1971 to 1977 when concrete was one of the primary expressions in Tucson
- This is the first example of concrete being used not a means to an end, but concrete being the end in itself.
- It expresses concrete in a new and unusual way
- It represents the best of that time frame
- Other buildings in this category are:
  - Pima Community College, West Campus – Built after this building
  - Cherry Bell Post Office, Built after this building
  - Union Bank Building – A curvilinear bank

**Committee:**

- Criterion Consideration G was difficult to grasp. First it was Expressionism, then it was Brutalism, and then Concrete. Needs a finite definition as to its significance. Be specific.
- The building doesn't have to be the best, but it does have to be exceptionally important and there needs to be more documentation of comparison buildings.
- This property was built in 1971 and is several years from the 50-year rule. The newer the property the stronger the reasoning must be that it is exceptional.

**Evans:**

- On page 8 and pages 12 – 13 there are discussions and comparisons to other building of this class
- Brutalism is a subtype of the Expressionist Phase in Tucson
- This building meets 6 character-defining features that were common on modern architecture during this time frame. That makes it a rare example, since few others do so
- This building was scheduled for demolition and we have been trying to get this building determined eligible by an outside entity in order to prove its importance and preserve it

**Committee:**

- Interiors are crucial to modernist architecture. It is part of the whole
- Simplify, be specific, and use comparisons

Motion: **Jacquemart** moved that the **Valley National Bank Operations Center** meets Criterion Consideration G as far as the 50 year. Motion Seconded: **Ryden**

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**4 - 2 Motion Carried**

This vote gives the final decision to Jim Garrison



**D. OLD BUSINESS**

**Approval of the March 25, 2011 HSRC minutes**

**Moved:** Lacy

**Seconded:** Henderson

**Majewski:** Called for the vote

**6 – 0** Minutes Approved

**E. STAFF REPORTS**

**Collins** – Introduced Eric Laurila

**Strang** – Distributed new national register listings since last meeting

**F. Public Comment - None**

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

**H. Time and Date of the Next Meeting** – November 18, 2011 at 9:00 AM

**Adjourned:** 12:40 PM