

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
THE CARNEGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX ARIZONA
November 5, 2010**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Terry Majewski chaired the meeting
2. Meeting called to order at 9:05 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**
 - a. **Brooks Jeffery**
 - b. **John Lacy**
 - f. **Jan Balsom**
2. HSRC Committee Member absent
 - a. **Doug Kupel**
3. SHPO Staff Members present
 - a. **Jim Garrison**
 - b. **Carol Griffith**
 - c. **Bill Collins**
 - d. **Vivia Strang**
 - e. **Mary Robinson**
 - f. **Eric Vondy**
 - g. **Robert Frankeberger**

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **New National Register Nominations, Quartzsite, La Paz County**

High Jolly Monument, Quartzsite,

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **High Jolly Monument** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **High Jolly Monument** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" 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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

Balsom: Need to be refreshed regarding the last time this property was on the HSRC agenda?

Strang: It was reviewed under the Pyramidal MPDF and not as an individual nomination 5/5/08.

Henderson: The nomination was pre MPDF. The general opinion of the committee was that the nomination was not strong enough and is should be held until after the MPDF was completed and provide context for this nomination.

Ryden: The significant features of the property need additional discussion in order to assist in protecting the property in the future.

Robert Frankeberger, SHPO Architect: Description is often overlooked as a useful tool in a nomination. The attitude can be that if detail regarding a feature is left out then that feature may not be important and that may leave it open to change at a later date.

Oison: Why call it a structure instead of an object? The National Register Bulletin refers to monuments as objects; so, in the nomination that term should be changed.

Dinise Ross, Town of Quartzsite: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Johnson / Stacy House, Clifton, Greenlee County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Johnson / Stacy House** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Johnson / Stacy 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: **Lacy**

Discussion:

Jeffery: Stylistically this house is not a Craftsman Style Bungalow and the scholarship on the style of architecture should be checked. Criterion "A" was not strong enough; a case has not been made in regards to the development of Clifton. Also, the period of significance is tied to the 50-year threshold, but the period of time used should represent the actual period of significance and not the 50-year rule. Define the date of the house and use that as the designated period of significance.

Garrison: What style should it be?

Jeffery: Colonial Revival would be close, since it is a mixture of those two and not a Craftsman.

Lacy: Should the justification be rewritten and brought before the committee at a later date?

Jeffery: The strongest argument is for criterion "C" under architecture that should be strengthened and made more accurate. The argument for criterion "A", the development of Clifton is not strong enough to be used. Yes, the nomination should be rewritten and returned to the committee.

Ryden: The stylistic overlap of the 1908 house displays Victorian Architecture with its fish scale shingles and the fancy jigsaw work on the dormer, the pyramid shape of the roof is Neo Colonial Revival. In the criterion "C" narrative there is discussion of its transitional style. Also, a simple line drawing of the floor plan would be helpful in supporting the statement that it is a four square house.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 - Against Eligibility



La Santa Cruz de Globe, Globe, Gila County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **La Santa Cruz de Globe** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **La Santa Cruz de Globe** 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:

Ryden: Are we reviewing this as a site or an object? It is described as an important cultural place, which will have an impact on the question of integrity. There have been changes over time such as stucco coating and attached electric lights. As a traditional cultural place (TCP) there needs to be expansion in the narrative describing the local community uses at the site. Also, more description of the site would be important.

Jeffery: It is both a site and an object. The boundary description brings the trail into the nomination.

Ryden: Is the trail a contributor to the site?

Jeffery: The period of significance should go back to the inception of the cross.

Balsom: In the bulletin there may be no end to the period of significance. Perhaps this should be the case with this nomination.

Strang: On page 6 there is discussion about the Santa Cruz de Globe as a TCP.

Balsom: There are references to the property as a TCP, but a stronger argument could be made for it as a TCP.

Ryden: The term "Hispanic-Catholic influence" was a new term to me and its meaning should be clarified. Also, further discussion regarding why crosses are on hills as reference to the crucifixion on Golgotha.

Jacquemart: The care and maintenance of the cross by local families and citizens for years is part of the Globe Catholic Culture.

Garrison: Whether this site is an object needs to be clarified. This is the first time a nomination has had two property types. The stronger definition is site, but we need to insure that it is properly defined as an object within a site.

Griffith: It is important to emphasize that this cross is an important part of the on-going culture of the community as a TCP.

Christine Moraigh, Preparer: Spoke in favor of the nomination. She stated that the cross is a symbol to the entire, culturally and religiously mixed, community.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Old Vail Post Office, Vail, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the Old **Vail Post Office** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Old Vail Post Office** 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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

Jeffery: Is the Shrine next to the Post Office on the National Register?

J. J. Lamb, Preparer: No, it is not listed at this time, but there is interest in initiating a nomination for it.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Benson Barrio, Benson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Benson Barrio** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Benson Barrio** 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:

Olson: According to the National Register Bulletin a shed is a structure therefore the shed should be mentioned in the nomination as a building.

Balsom: Criterion "A" is much better developed than "C". Maps section 10, page 29 are not easily understood and made it difficult to locate the district.

Lacy: The translation of "Sal Si Puede" on page 13 is translated, as "run if you can" should be "leave if you can".

Jeffery: The definition of "Vernacular" as "Common Place" seems pejorative. Perhaps "Traditional without Academic Influence" would convey the idea.

Ryden: Should there be a section that discusses the historical archaeological resources on the property. Mentioning things that have potential importance could protect the property at a later date.

Lacy: On Page 14 Tohono O'dham is misspelled.

Majewski: Consider Bob Frankeberger's comments regarding which properties were considered eligible and ineligible. Should we ask the preparer's to expand the list of contributors?

Frankeberger: The designation of non-contributors appears to be based on age, i.e. less than 50 years old. Again, if an addition meets the Standards it should be included.

Jeffery: Is there a natural period of significance that should be applied to this nomination based on building characteristics.

Janet Parkhurst, Preparer: We will re-check properties designated as non-contributors, in order to insure that the list is accurate.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Colonia Solana Residential Historic District Amendment 2010, Tucson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the Colonia Solana Residential Historic District Amendment 2010 nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Colonia Solana Residential Historic District Amendment 2010 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**

Discussion:

Jeffery: How many times do we need to amend Colonia Solana District (or other districts) because properties achieve the 50-year designation? Districts should be nominated with a larger theme of significance to include those properties that are less than 50 years old, but are eligible otherwise.

Parkhurst: In the past we have tried to define the final build out, but I agree that idea doesn't include other issues

Jeffery: A policy needs to be developed to define the process so that when a district is nominated there are clear bookends that define the period of significance so that the need for amendments to districts are fewer.

Lacy: Need clarification regarding the Water Tower. Is it listed?

Jeffery: It was individually listed.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Harold Bell Wright Estates Historic District, Tucson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Harold Bell Wright Estates Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Harold Bell Wright Estates 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:

Jeffery: From an editorial standpoint there is a lot of repetition of text. Need information about Burnt Adobe? In the nomination it states that Tom Gist was one of the initiators of this district. How was that information obtained?

Marty McCune, Preparer: Our architect, Morgan Rieder, compiled that information.

Frankeberger: The use of desert landscape as a character-defining feature in the nomination restricts other properties in the subdivision. There are a variety of landscaping designs in this neighborhood from desert to the more exotic. Tying the neighborhood to a specific type of landscape can create problems for owners who change their landscaping and then may be penalized for not adhering to a strict code.

Also, It is unclear what precipitated the timeline for the “period of significance”; but it seems to revolve around a shift in architectural “style” to something the McAlester’s characterize as “Neo-Eclectic” and which is evidently abhorrent to the author’s prejudicial favoring of “Neo-Spanish” as the obvious, to them, appropriate style for Southern Arizona. This is a subdivision of custom-built houses designed by prominent architects. The cataloging of stylistic variances is a superficial pursuit at best. If the platting of the subdivision is so significant, why stop short of build-out?

McCune: We were asked to expand our definition to include stylistic, for the Keeper. Also styles changed dramatically after the end of the period of significance. If we used build-out for the end of the period of significance that date would be into the 1980s.

Majewski: Committee can we give the preparers some guidance regarding the period of significance?

Balsom: The original lot layouts could be used to determine the end of the period of significance.

McCune: We used types of building materials to assist in determining the period of significance. There are few non-contributing properties in the neighborhood that indicates the chosen period of significance is appropriate.

Jeffery: Density as a character-defining feature should be emphasized more within the nomination.

Frankeberger: According to the Carport Policy, properties with altered carports are considered ineligible, which under the Secretary of Interiors Standards would not necessarily be so. The treatment of the carport was within the Standards.

Jerry Kyle, Preparer: We will take another look at property determinations affected by alterations to carports.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Jefferson Park Historic District, Tucson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Jefferson Park Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Jefferson Park 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:

Balsom: With 60 % contributors and 40% non-contributors Cohesiveness and Integrity are called into question. Also, discussion of Criterion “A” needs to be clarified and strengthened. Community development section was not well written.

Jeffery: This is a difficult nomination and it needed to be crafted in such a way that showed how the subdivision impacted the community thus strengthening “A” Criterion. Also, there are both Perceptual Boundaries and Legal Boundaries. With

the Perceptual Boundary defining the district visually and that being preferred. Also, there are references made to a Southwest Revival Style, but that term is not really defined.

Ryden: The map that showed subdivision overlay printed in shades of gray is illegible. Not enough contrast. Also utilization of tax parcel numbers instead of curb numbers makes finding the properties on the map difficult.

Olson: The inventory list states that there are 813 properties and the summary paragraph in the narrative description states that there are 788 properties.

Scott Solliday, Preparer: 813 total properties were in the original study for this nomination, but the new survey could not support that total.

Jeffery: Did you exclude that little section because the properties are apartments?

Solliday: There was no continuous integrity.

Garrison: The National Register Policy is that non-contributors at the edge are eliminated, by drawing the boundary to exclude them.

Garrison: Several properties were excluded because of landscape screening and façade. Landscape policy will be discussed later today and depending on how that discussion goes there may be several properties, in this nomination, that may be considered eligible after that discussion.

Jeffery: If you are going for Criterion "A" – Community Development a map should be added to show the original subdivision and its growth over time, which would strengthen the argument for Criterion "A".

Frankeberger: The numbers of non-contributors might indicate a lack of cohesion or it might be symptomatic of ill-defined criteria for determining eligibility. Particularly troubling is the exclusion of houses with "obstructed views"; whose numbers indicate that this is a neighborhood characteristic.

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

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Joesler Santa Ana Lane House, Tucson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Joesler Santa Ana Lane House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Joesler Santa Ana Lane 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: **Lacy**.

Discussion:

Jeffery: This house needs to be reviewed in the context of the "Joesler MPDF". Descriptions need improvements in terms of how to describe the house architecturally. This is a unique house for several reasons. Murphy, who was the major developer of the Catalina Foothills Estates, did not build this house. It is also an all-electric house, which was meant to promote electric appliances and it was a model house for that.

Lacy: What is the date of the modification?

Majewski: The preparer is not present and needs to be in order to have questions answered regarding the nomination.

Ryden: The nomination needs to be reviewed later. There is now a context to be used as framework for a nomination.

Lacy: By deferring the nomination would give the preparer time to tighten up the nomination.

Jeffery and Lacy agree to amend the motion to deferring this nomination, with strict instructions from SHPO Staff to the preparer.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Deferring the Nomination to a Later Date



Rose Eisendrath House, Tempe, Maricopa County

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

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Rose Eisendrath 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:

Ryden: The boundary seems to be to close to the house.

Joe Nucci, Historic Preservation Officer Tempe: Rose Eisendrath house had 40 acres in 1930, part of which she sold off, which were divided into several residential developments. The city acquired 9.6 acres, which included the house and designated that acreage as open space. There is a homeland security border adjacent to the house on the west side for the water treatment plant. This property is designated to become a part of the Carl Hayden Campus for Sustainability along with the Sandra Day O'Connor Center for Civil Discourse and Eisendrath House, all of which will be adaptively reused. There is a possibility that the boundary could be opened up.

Ryden: More explanation is needed regarding the property and the area surrounding the house.

Nucci: With the surrounding land planted in desert landscape the house has excellent desert views. The whole area works together as a site.

Garrison: The open desert in front of the house is a natural setting for the house. The other sides of the house are not as important. Also, it needs to be noted that parking lot on the map is already on disturbed desert landscape.

Jeffery: Setting was emphasized in the nomination, so you either need change the border or the nomination. Also, there should be a better explanation of the alterations completed in the 1940s. The period of significance needs to be changed to include the 1940s alterations.

Nucci: That can be done.

Garrison: Are you going for LEED Certification?

Nucci: We are going for LEED Gold Certification.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



1st Presbyterian Church, Peoria, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **1st Presbyterian Church** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **1st Presbyterian Church** 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:

Lacy: In reference to the oldest continuously operating church in the State. Some of the Catholic Churches have been in operation for a longer period of time.

Priscilla Corks, Member: The 1st Presbyterian Church was founded in 1892.

Majewski: San Xavier has been in operation since the late 1700s.

Garrison: There are other churches that have been operating and in continued use for longer periods of time. There is an Episcopal Church that was founded in 1879. This property could be the oldest Presbyterian Church in the State.

Majewski: The Keeper will want proof of the statement about being the oldest continuously operating church in the State.

Olson: In Section 8 there was description of the development of the church, but not a description of its strong connection to the community. The importance of this church in the broader community needs to be developed.

Majewski: We are just trying to assist you in making this a successful nomination.

Jeffery: The Period of Significance needs to include the founding of the City of Peoria. Connecting the Church to the community. There also need a chronology of the changes to the architecture of the church.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Sands Estates Historic District, Glendale, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Sands Estates Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Sands Estates 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:

After minimal discussion:

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Silk Stocking Neighborhood Historic District, Chandler, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Silk Stocking Neighborhood Historic District** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Silk Stocking Neighborhood 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: **Jeffery**

Discussion:

Lacy: References to Dr. Chandler need to be more accurate and complete.

Jeffery: Need a district map. The nomination stated that this was the first zoning in Arizona and that fact needs to be verified. The period of significance should not be to the 50-year threshold, but should be to the build out.

Kevin Weight, City of Chandler: Spoke in favor of the nomination. As to the period of significance, after much discussion with SHPO it was decided to compromise and end the period of significance at 1957.

Jeffery: Was there a stylistic change at that time?

Weight: Houses in the 1950s were ranch style and the houses in 1960s – 70s were quite different including multi-family housing.

Ryden: Are all the streets concrete.

Weight: No, only Washington Street.

Ryden: Facts need to be accurate in the nomination.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



George M. Halm House, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the George M. Halm House nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the George M. Halm House 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: **Lacy**

Discussion:

Balsom: When properties are being submitted as part of a MPDF it would be helpful to have the summary sheet from the MPDF for reference.

Jeffery: This house is not Mission Revival.

Vince Murray, Preparer: That was the closest style for this house in the MPDF.

Ryden: The hip roof with the bell cast eaves and the ridge vent with the finials implies Mission Revival. Are the arches segmented?

Murray: Yes they are.

Jeffery: These are farmhouses not textbook examples of specific styles. They are variants of different styles and there should be language that reflects those variations.

Garrison: Use the word influence.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Tempe Butte, Tempe, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the Tempe Butte nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tempe Butte on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria “**C & 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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

Olson: Criterion “C” deals with construction. What is the connection between Criterion “C” and Tempe Butte? Criterion “D” is the stronger argument for listing and everything in the nomination fits into “D” criterion. This includes the petroglyphs, their style and the information provided about the culture.

Jeffery: At what point does this site lose its integrity if the site is further developed?

Nucci: The Salt River-Pima Indian Community is assisting Tempe in removing technologies off the Butte. The Butte covers 59 acres and the existing properties (Sun Devil Stadium and a Catholic Church) act as buffers around the property. There is building around the Butte, we but are trying to be sensitive to the site and maintain its integrity.

After some discussion:

Griffith: It is important that Criterion “C” be used. “C” is not being used for the artwork, but for its design element. During solstices the sun and other elements in the sky, line up with the artwork and are considered culturally significant for tribal rituals. Therefore blocking the site with higher development might be curtailed therefore protect the site.

Nucci: Tempe Butte is in an at risk area being so close to a Light Rail Stop, as well as other properties in the area, so we want to do what we can to protect this site.

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



Temple Beth Israel, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Temple Beth Israel** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Temple Beth Israel** 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:

Weight: The City of Phoenix reviewed this building as part of its CLG review. It was disappointing to see that there were no references of the period of time that it was occupied by the Chinese Baptist Church. It was also troubling that the Craftsman Bungalow located on the property and was built at the same time was not considered as a contributing part of this nomination.

Bob Graham, Preparer: The owners of the property want to list the property under Criterion “C”, because at some point in time the plan is to demolish the 1957 addition to the rear of the property, which would be a problem if it were to be considered under Criterion “A”. About 2 years ago we were before this committee – There were older properties that needed to be demolished to make way for the parking lot. At that time SHPO thought the properties were related to the Synagogue, but we were able to show that they had no relationship to it. With Kevin’s assistance we were able to prove that they were not a rare resource, but that there were a number of examples in Phoenix. The bungalow is in the same situation. It is not related to the Synagogue or to the architects for the synagogue, Lescher and Mahoney. The only way the bungalow can be nominated is, as an individual nomination. Since monies used to rehabilitate the Bungalow were from a Phoenix City Preservation Grant there is an easement on the building, so it is protected.

Jeffery: If the boundary is redrawn to exclude the bungalow, the bungalow is protected under the easement by determination of eligibility and no longer has non-contributor as a status.

Larry Bell, Preparer: Boundary justification was probably current ownership. If boundary were to be changed to the historic property line the bungalow could be considered separately.

Weight: If the intent is to only nominate the Synagogue as a building designed by Lescher and Mahoney then the boundary should be redrawn.

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



Bohn House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)

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

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

Murray: I will retake photos for the nomination.

After minimal discussion:

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Conway House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)

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

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

Discussion:

Ryden: What is the evolution of this house? Seems to be a hybrid of several styles.

Olson: What is the date of the garage addition? Is it original with the house?

Murray: In early aerial photos the garage is present.

Jeffery: This nomination should be Criterion "C" only.

Murray: I chose to do Criterion "A" because this house is Monterey Revival and as such is a rare.

Frankeberger: Houses of this type were built to be a large country house. They were built to impress and that becomes a style in itself.

Majewski: Use a few terms from the MPDF to back up statements in the nominations for all the houses we are discussing today.

Motion: Modified to remove Criterion "C" – Balsom Moved and Jeffery Seconded.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



Diller House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)

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

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

Ryden: Get rid of the Bungalow Reference and it will be accurate.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility**England/Lawrence House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)**

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **England/Lawrence House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **England/Lawrence 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:

Jeffery: Materials should be concrete and adobe and not stucco. Are the roof shingles actually concrete?

Murray: I will check and make corrections if necessary.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility

**Judge Fred C. Jacobs House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)**

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Judge Fred C. Jacobs House** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Judge Fred C. Jacobs 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: **Lacy**

Discussion:

After minimal discussion:

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility

**Morgan/ Bronson Jr. House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)**

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Morgan/ Bronson Jr. House** nomination.

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Morgan/ Bronson Jr. 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:

After minimal discussion:

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



Walter Lee Smith House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Walter Lee Smith House** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Walter Lee Smith 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: **Jeffery**

Discussion:

After minimal discussion:

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



Courtney and Hilda Stubbs House, Phoenix, Maricopa County (Farmhouse MPDF)

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Courtney and Hilda Stubbs House** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Courtney and Hilda Stubbs 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:

Jeffery: Why not Criterion “C” as well.

Murray: The porch on the front of the house has been enclosed.

Jeffery: With all the modifications to the other houses that were accepted this one modification shouldn’t preclude Criterion “C”.

Weight: In the MPDF written earlier this was used as an example of vernacular architecture. Even though modifications have been done to the house they were completed during the period of significance and changes were in keeping at that time. I think it could qualify under “C”.

Motion: Modified to add Criterion “C” – Lacy Moved and Henderson Seconded.

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



Wickenburg Boetto Amendment, Wickenburg, Maricopa County

Olson: Recused herself – due to conflict of interest (worked on the nomination)

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the Wickenburg Boetto Amendment

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer amend the National Historic Register expanding the Wickenburg Boetto House Nomination to include the Pioneer Cemetery Property on the Arizona Register of Historic Places 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:

Henderson: Where is the cemetery in relation to the house?

Olson: The cemetery is about a quarter mile from the house. It was originally part of the Wickenburg property, but has been since been divided.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Eligibility



2. Review of Delisting of National Register Properties

a. 2803 East Via Rotunda, Sam Hughes Historic District, Tucson, Pima County

Discussion:

Eric Vondy, SHPO: Approximately a year ago Pima County Assessor's Office contacted me with information regarding this property. They had appraised the property and it appeared that a large portion of the original house had been destroyed and an addition had been placed onto the house. At a later date, while in Tucson, I drove by the property and took a couple photos of the property. The resulting action was the determination that it not a contributing property. In subsequent conversations with the homeowner I was told that she had obtained advice from Bob Frankeberger, Brooks Jeffery, and Marty McCune regarding the design of the house prior to any work being done. The architect, who worked on the house, stated that even prior to his work on the house, he did not consider it eligible. Also, neither Bob nor the architect recalls having a meeting with the homeowner regarding this house.

Jeffery: Recused himself from this agenda item.

Majewski: Called for a motion.

Motion: Ryden moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer delist the property located at 2803 East Via Rotunda due to loss of integrity. Motion seconded: **Henderson**

Balsom: Would this property be eligible today as it is?

Jeffery: I received an email from Lisa Harris, property owner, stating she is unable to attend your meeting. We met with you twice regarding the alterations to the house and whether it was a Joesler House. Would either call or email me with your recollection of those meetings? My response was, "*Full Disclosure, I serve on the Historic Sites Review Committee that will be reviewing the proposed delisting next Friday. My recollection of our conversation and visit was that you wanted to see if indeed the house was a Joesler. My recollection was, that it is not. You wanted to enlarge the house in a manner that was consistent with Joesler's signature elements that reflected another house in your immediate surroundings, with a round tower. Your architect did incorporate some of those elements, but our conversation did not revolve around your intent to make the historic character to maintain the original historic character of your house. Your argument was that the house was too small for your family and any expansion would need to modify the street elevation that incorporated those Joesler elements. As it is this original elevation that contributes to the streetscape that defines the overall character of the district any significant modifications will compromise the house's original integrity. I would be happy to talk to about this over the phone, but I am out of town at the time.*" There is a Joesler designed home, in a cul-de-sac, with a tower that does reflect some of the features that are now part of this contemporary design. She was going after a Joesler-esque approach and not one related to the original historic character.

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



b. Phoenix Gateway Airport – AZ U:10:61(ASM), Maricopa County

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the Hohokam Land Use and Settlement along North Queen Creek Delta Multiple Property be amended to exclude **Archaeological Site AZ U:10:61(ASM)** Motion seconded: **Balsom**

Discussion:

After minimal discussion:

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



- 3. **Review of Reclassification for property 825 West Edgemont, Encanto Manor, Phoenix, Maricopa County**
Currently considered a Non-Contributor. The HSRC has a request to consider the eligibility of the property.

Jinyi Allee, Owner: Spoke in favor of the changing the designation to eligible.

Majewski: The City of Phoenix does not consider this property as eligible.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the property at 825 **West Edgemont** continue to be classified as a non-contributor to the Encanto Manor Historic District. Motion seconded: **Henderson**

Discussion:

Garrison: Between the time of the original survey and the time of nomination this porch was added. Is the addition so severe as to make this house ineligible?

Alee: Stated they were told not to make the porch blend in, but to make it look different by the City of Phoenix Preservation Office. So, it is an obvious addition and can be recognized as such.

Jacquemart: In 2001, before this area was designated a district no records would have been kept concerning this house, even if there had been a question about the porch.

Ryden: The question for me is – Is the porch compatible, but distinct.

Frankeberger: SHPO didn't agree on the eligibility of this house in their review. The issue is not whether the porch is right or wrong, but does the house still convey its historic significance. The porch is not a detriment to the integrity of the house. I don't consider the porch addition egregious enough to for the house to be determined a non-contributor.

Majewski: Which SHPO staff voted no on this property.

Garrison: Vivia and Bill voted no on eligibility.

Ryden: I think the porch takes away the horizontal elongation of the ranch house in such a way as to make it ineligible.

Frankeberger: The porch reinforces the pattern of elongation.

Jacquemart: The homeowner did due diligence and should not be penalized.

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 In Favor of Making this Property a Contributor to the District



4. National Register Historic Placer (NRHP) Integrity Policies Review and Compliance

Garrison: Passed out a draft statement that he rewrote combining policies and requested the committee review them and at a later date discuss. It will codify policies to ensure that we are consistent.

Also, there is a document with information to assist us in setting stylistic terms for the State.



D. OLD BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes from March 26, 2010 HSRC Meeting

Moved: to Accept Minutes Jeffery

Seconded: Balsom

Majewski: Called for the vote

8-0 Accepted the Minutes With Corrections

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO Report

a. National Register Update - Strang

1) Flagstaff Southside Historic District	3/31/10
2) AZ Army National Guard Arsenal	3/31/10
3) Asbury/ Salmon House	4/8/10
4) Converse House	4/8/10
5) Harelson House	4/6/10
6) Olney / Elinwood House	4/8/10
7) Vradenburg House	4/8/10
8) Louise Kerr House and Studio	4/14/10
9) Menlo Park Historic District	4/23/10
10) Tumamoc Hill Archaeological District	4/5/10
11) Northfield Historic District	5/10/10
12) Village Grove 1-6 Historic District	5/10/10
13) Brentwood Historic District	6/9/10
14) Campus Vista	6/10/10
15) East Evergreen Historic District	6/10/10
16) Encanto Manor Historic District	6/10/10
17) Encanto Vista	6/10/10
18) Garfield Historic District	6/10/10
19) Los Olivos Historic District	6/10/10
20) North Garfield Historic District	6/10/10
21) Villa Verde Historic District	6/10/10
22) Woodlea Historic District	6/10/10
23) Yapple Park Historic District	6/10/10
24) Thunderbird Estates &	

McDonald Addition Historic District	6/30/10
25) Indian Ridge Historic District	7/16/10
26) Fraser Fields Historic District	8/5/10
27) West Side / Clark Addition Historic District	8/5/10
28) Robles Ranch	9/3/10
29) Caldwell House (Joesler)	9/9/10
30) Don Martin Apartment House	9/9/10
31) Eleven Arches	9/9/10
32) First Joesler House	9/9/10
33) Gabel House	9/9/10
34) Haynes Building	9/9/10
35) Hecker House	9/9/10
36) Type A at 2101 E Water Street	9/9/10
37) Type B at 2019 E Water Street	9/9/10
38) Bisbee Residential Historic District	10/15/10

b. SHPO staffing

- 1) New Staff Member: Jim Cogswell - Compliance Specialist, Archaeologist
- 2) Compliance – Griffith gave an overview of current projects
- 3) AZSITE Project on Target
- 4) NPI Training Brochures
- 5) Planning a Landmarks Session at the Conference
- 6) Legislative Issues – There is an attempt to get full funding for the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), which funds the SHPO Offices, Grants and Programs at 150 million a year instead of about half that amount with about 40 million coming to the states.
- 7) State Parks went from 38 million to 19 million funding with leaving in place the growing smarter open space initiative reverting back to the general fund. There is going to be an 800 million dollar deficit, which will need to be addressed. The main thing being discussed is the privatization of State Parks. The agency is doing a good job of welcoming such discussions within the parameters of resource protection.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

G. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS – None

H. ADJOURNED AT – 4:10 PM