

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
CARNEGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
November 18, 2011**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair, Don Ryden called the meeting to order at 9:38 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present

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

2. HSRC Committee Member absent

Terry Majewski

3. SHPO Staff Members present

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

C. New Business

1. Policy on Individual Private Sector Nominations

Strang: Read the Policy and gave an overview of changes to policy and why changes are needed

- Keeper returned 2 nominations for additional information and additional clarification on time frames for modifications to the properties as well as exactly what changes have been done to the properties. In addition the Keeper requested that this information be in the nominations before they are sent to the Keeper. In keeping with the request the policy needed to be amended to insure that nominations sent from this office are as complete as possible prior to forwarding them to the Keeper.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *“All five nominations append the Multiple Property Document MPD entitled “The Architecture and Planning of Josias Joesler and John Murphey in Tucson, Arizona 1927-1956”. The authors of the five nominations also authored the MPD.*

Consistent in both the MPD and the five nominations is the lack of specificity in identifying those characteristics that qualify a property for listing. The MPD states: “A single-family residence must be an intact example in its original location and remain sufficiently unaltered so that its massing, materials and workmanship reflect the original architectural qualities for which it is considered significant”. The vagueness of the terms “intact example” and “sufficiently unaltered” is not clarified in any of the five nominations. There is no consistency among the five nominations in identifying the basis for eligibility or in the effect on eligibility resulting from alterations and additions. The attempt to identify the significance in the stylistic expression of each house is diffused in a pastiche of Sonoran Revival, Several interpretations of the Ranch Style including Mexican Farmhouse, Mission Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival and Pueblo Revival. Indeed, one example materially morphed in style from Ranch to Mission with no apparent loss of integrity, as if it were merely a wardrobe change. However, if stylistic affectations are not of primary significance in the architecture of Joesler, perhaps his formal planning parti is, as it remains constant irrespective of style. The houses are each sited according to topography oriented toward a view, and interaction with the site, from a central living room around which discrete self-contained rooms are organized in extended wings separating workspaces, such as

kitchen etc., from bedroom bath areas. The central living room marks its position within the hierarchy of space division with a cathedral ceiling of exposed beams.

It may be that the style of the Catalina Foothills Estates reflects a marketing strategy as much as an architectural conceit solely attributable to Joesler. This stylistic affectation of a romantic regional design was evidently appealing to newcomers to the Southwest. The execution of this design strategy appears to be a collaborative effort in which the imported tiles and material objects acquired by Mrs. Murphey in her travels to Mexico, as well as the studio works in tin and carved wood of interior designer Leionne Salter and her husband, are intended to embellish Joesler's buildings. It may well be that Joesler's significant contribution to this team enterprise is his formal organization of interior space and the relationship of the house to its setting, irrespective of stylistic expression. The delineation of each room as a separate and discrete space, as distinguished from the free flow of space of modern architecture probably reflects his European training, and the influence of the Sorbonne in development of his parti.

I would suggest that the structure of the nomination should focus on the formal features of Joesler's plan as of primary significance, with the stylistic expression as secondary, and the setting as of tertiary significance. This should lead to a finding that the primary significance is, or not, intact and that the architectural qualities remain, or not, unaltered."

- Changes to Policy
 - Added – Review by Certified Local Government (CLG)
 - Added – Review by Expert in the Field regarding properties in question

Lacy moved that the amended policy be adopted. Motion, seconded by **Kupel**.

Discussion:

- In points 6 and 7, the word notified should be replaced by the word advice. Advice, being the more accurate choice
- A flow chart could be added to illustrate the points made
- Shouldn't be limited to owner, since anyone may nominate and go as far as a formal determination of eligibility
- Should state owners / nominators and not just owners, covering instances where the nominator is not the owner
- In point # 4 the words ", as needed" should be added after "for more information."
- In point # 9, the idea that sending a nomination to an expert is vague and should be omitted. An expert in archaeology or architecture may not be conversant enough in National Register Eligibility to be able to make an appropriate decision
- Point # 9 should be ended with "as appropriate".

Lacy amended his motion to adopt policy pursuant to this discussion. Amended motion seconded by **Kupel**.

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



1. New National Register Nominations

a. Arivaca Schoolhouse, Arivaca, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Arivaca Schoolhouse** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Arivaca Schoolhouse** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criteria "**A & 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: **Lacy**

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments - "The property appears to meet the criteria for eligibility; but the nomination is unfocused and suffers from a plethora of interesting facts that are only marginally pertinent to the task of designating the property. Also there is the repeated, minor but distracting, use of the term "renovation" which is not within the lexicon of historic preservation, and the non-technical "footers" for

footings, and “board” for rafter.

The property clearly conveys the signs, and signature, just in its overall massing, scale and proportion, signifying an early territorial school building in the vernacular, irrespective of the changes over time. The comparison to the 1873 school building in Phoenix, as described on page 15, clearly substantiates this point. It is a rare survivor of a once common type originating during the territorial period, albeit modified with a substantial addition; and in respect of its elevated significance this diminished level of integrity is sufficient.

However, since the property’s stated significance is based in it’s association with the early period of education in Arizona under criterion A, and under criterion C as an example of a vernacular adobe building constructed by local masons during the territorial period, it is unnecessary for the Period of Significance to extend to 1953.

It would appear that this extension was done to accrue significance for the alterations in configuration, fenestration, roofing and the rendered adobe surface all of which modified the property’s territorial appearance to some extent. Extending the period fails to provide relevant significance to these latter additions and alterations as they can only signify their own time place and use. It is sufficient only to report that these alterations did not adversely affect the characteristic Massing, scale and proportion of this building type that qualifies the property for listing.

The period of significance should be established as the building’s date of construction. The building’s significance derives from its association with the initial period of the creation of school districts, public funding and the nascent creation of the public school system in Territorial Arizona, as explained in the nomination’s excellent historical context.”

Discussion:

- On page 13, 1st and 2 paragraphs –
 - 1st paragraph refers to homestead entries as claims, which is inaccurate. Prior to patent they are referred to as entries and subsequent to the patent they are simply homesteads
 - 2nd paragraph there is a statement that both these blocks remain in federal property under the trusteeship of the presiding judge of Superior Court. That’s not true, once the patent is issued it is vested in the probate judge of the county and remains as unsold portions of the townsite
(Lacy gave a copy of the patent to SHPO to be included in the file with this nomination.)
- Reduce the criterion from Criteria “A & C” to Criterion “A” only. The theme is about the oldest extent schoolhouse in Arizona.
- The period of significance in the nomination is correct, since it has the specific ending date derived from when the property was no longer used as a school
- Whether it is the oldest standing schoolhouse in Arizona needs to be researched and if it is not then it could be referred to as one of the oldest standing schoolhouses in the State
- The date the addition was constructed needs to be included the nomination

Linda Mayo, Pima County Cultural Resources Manager: Spoke in favor of the Nomination.

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Strang: The Joesler MPDF was forwarded to the preparers of the Joesler Nominations to be used as guidelines in preparation of their nominations.

Points prior to Discussing Joesler Nominations:

- The 2 returned nominations may be discussed
- Use the 1st Joesler Nomination to discuss all Joesler nominations

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Anderson, Arthur Olaf and Helen S House** nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger’s Comments – “The nomination appends the Multiple Property Document (MPD) entitled “The Architecture and Planning of Josias Joesler and John Murphey in Tucson, Arizona 1927-1956”; and has determined “the residence meets all registration requirements”. However this conclusion is not supported by evidence that the property is “sufficiently unaltered so that its massing, materials

and workmanship reflect the original architectural qualities for which it is considered significant". Absent documentation identifying these extant qualities, there is no basis in fact upon which a reviewer may reach the same conclusion and to concur in the nomination's declaration of eligibility.

Generalities, alone, do not support eligibility. For example: "the residence combines rich textures (not identified) reminiscent of a rustic, regional ranch house (as if no further explanation of this conceit were required) with spatial zoning and other features (not identified) that typify Joesler's earlier Revival Style (as if no specificity of typology were required). Although there is mention that much of Joesler's extensive exterior ornamentation remains today, neither the text identifies what this might be, nor do the photographs illustrate this point. In general, the photographs appear unintended to specifically illustrate references in the text.

The nomination's assertion that "The house has very good integrity"; and that the modifications and additions "do not adversely affect integrity", is a conclusion not substantiated by the identification of those specific characteristics that qualify the property for listing by continuing to convey the historical significance of Joesler's architecture.

The mention that "Only the living room chimney has retained a painted textured brick surface and natural brick coping throughout the decades", is most telling. If the entire house was not originally rendered in stucco, how characteristic was the expression of painted brick with natural brick coping to the historic integrity of the property? It would seem this revelation conflicts with the conclusion that the "original patio includes Joesler's typical brick capped stucco walls". Was this underlying, but now sheathed, painted brick wall surface a signature feature of the "Joesler Ranch House Style" as evidenced in this property?

The nomination concludes confident that "the property continues to represent Joesler and Murphey's intentions", even though the Joesler drawings called for "painted adobe" and "cedar shingle roofing", and both subsequently were replaced by the current stucco wall finish and mission tile roofing in later modifications.

Does the nomination posit that such alteration was anticipated, is prevalent throughout the subdivision and is therefore not only admissible but without effect on the integrity of Joesler's architecture which survives cosmetic change?

Given the extent of major alteration, the integrity issue can only be resolved by substantiation that those defining features and characteristics of Joesler's architecture are currently conveyed through this property, irrespective of current modifications."

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Anderson, Arthur Olaf and Helen S 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:

- There isn't enough information in the nomination for the committee to make a determination of integrity or if the property is even worthy of being forwarded to the Keeper for the National Register. This is also the case with the remaining Joesler nominations before us today.

Additional comments requested from Frankeberger:

- Specific information should be given about a property's significance that is generally missing in this nomination.
- There is a misunderstanding about the definition of integrity. Integrity doesn't mean the property hasn't changed, but still conveys significance. When you are making a determination of eligibility a finding of effect must be done. Have the additions and alterations covered up or destroyed those characteristics and or features that convey significance? Are those features and characteristics still apparent? This document is to be used as a basis for proper treatment of Joesler designed properties including additions and alterations. The descriptive narrative portion of the nomination should contain a directed description of those characteristics and features that convey the significance. Specificity is lacking in this nomination as well as the other Joesler nominations on the agenda today and is not really addressed in the MPDF.

Return to Discussion:

- Using this nomination of a Joesler property as a test for the MPDF it clarifies the fact that the MPDF is not complete enough
- Character defining features need to be added to the MPDF on order to make it valid for defining the significance of a property
- There needs to be honest documentation of changes over time in order to allow assessment of integrity

- Original floor plans in order to assess the changes to a property and to determine the intent of Joesler for future changes to the property. Original and current floor plans would be helpful in understanding changes that have occurred with the property
- Changes in details and ornamentation should also be discussed
- Then discuss the modifications and additions that have happened since then in a documentary way
- Documentation doesn't give the impression of integrity, while the photos do so, and both documentation and photos need to match
- An amended MPDF would be a guide not only for preparers, but for owners of properties who need to know what they can and can't alter or remodel
- Current photos and historic photos of the property taken from the same view point
- Citations of sources need to be reflected in the nomination
- Joesler was eclectic in his work and as such it is difficult to pin his work down to one style, so it is not easy or necessary to label his designs with a specific style
- Maps on all the Joesler properties were incorrect

After Discussion: Between Janet Parkhurst and HSRC it was decided that the Nomination be returned to the preparers for additional work. Work to be completed and nomination resubmitted.

Ryden: Called for the vote on original nomination
7 Nays, Motion did not carry

Kupel: Moved the Anderson House, Brandt House, Brown House, DiCenso House, and the Goodman House be returned to the nominators for additional work in conjunction with additional work on the Joesler MPDF document in line with discussion here today and that they be brought back to the SHPO at such time as the recommendations have been addressed.

Lacy: Abstained from the vote as it relates to the Brandt House, due to conflict of interest.

Ryden: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried



f. Ghost Ranch Lodge, Tucson, Pima County

Don Ryden recused himself from the vote on the Ghost Ranch Lodge, because he is the preparer.

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Ghost Ranch Lodge** nomination.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Ghost Ranch Lodge** 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**

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – "The Keeper of the National Register of Historic Properties certified that the Ghost Ranch Lodge was historic and would likely be listed if nominated by the SHPO following their review of the Part 1 application for Rehabilitation Income Tax Credits. The National Park Service in review of the completed Rehabilitation affirmed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards were met and that the property retains its historic integrity. The nomination substantiates the determination of the Keeper and the finding of the NPS."

Ryden: Discussed nomination and the Joesler involvement –

- The Tax Act passed under Part 1 and the form used was essentially the draft of the nomination
- The Keeper determined it to be eligible

Discussion:

- This project won a National Preservation Honor Award at the 2011 National Historic Preservation Conference
- This is nominated as a property with multiple buildings on it that contribute to its use as a motel.
- The buildings and features are considered components of the property as opposed to contributors to a district and should be reflected as such throughout the nomination
- This property was both marketed and used as a low cost winter residence as opposed to a short-term hotel and as such is considered a “Destination Motor Lodge”. It was the affordable version of the Arizona Inn in Tucson
- If this is the first “Destination Motor Lodge, then there needs to be discussion of others
- “Inwardly centered”- refers to the central courtyard. While, it has been altered it still maintains its overall formality and geometry of the original Joesler courtyard design
- Include the cactus garden as a contributing feature
- Need to update portion regarding the demolished building

Kupel: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried

**Jackson, Lambert L. and Evelyn S. House, Tucson, Pima County**

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Jackson, Lambert L. and Evelyn S. House** nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Jackson, Lambert L. and Evelyn S. 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**

Strang: Frankeberger’s Comments – The nomination is resubmitted to correct the original submission’s attribution of the design to architect Joesler, on the basis that “the residence exhibits traits and materials that are not characteristic of Joesler”. However, there is no identification of what these traits and materials could be. The only basis given for disclaiming Joesler as the architect is the statement that “the Jackson House is undoubtedly the work of an unidentified but *highly skilled* architect”.

The attached photographs do not appear to have been selected to illustrate and support the argument for eligibility; and no floor plan is included. More information would be helpful in making the case for listing.

With reference to the integrity issue, the nomination points to the lack of change rather than identifying those features and characteristics that convey the significance of the Spanish Colonial Style.

Discussion:

- Nomination is incomplete, but needs to be discussed separately from the Joesler nominations, because it falls under Context # 1 – subdivision planning of John Murphey in Tucson 1927 – 1956. This distinguishes this nomination from the Joesler nominations.
- The subdivision planning discussion was not strong enough. There was more discussion about the stylistic contribution of architecture in the nomination.
- It is not nominated under Criterion “A” because Community Planning and Development is under Criterion “C”
- Needs a floor plan
- This nomination falls under the previous group and need to be amended and reviewed at a later date?

Ryden: Called for the vote
4 Ayes & 3 Nays, Motion Carried

Kupel moved to reconsider the motion. **Lacy** Seconded

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Nays, Motion Carried

Kupel moved that the **Jackson, Lambert L. and Evelyn S. House** be returned to the preparer for modifications and revisions in light of the discussion at today's meeting and in light of the modification to the Joesler MPDF. Seconded by **Jeffery**.

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Rillito Race Track, Tucson, Pima County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Rillito Race Track** nomination.

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Rillito Race Track** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**A**" at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Henderson**

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *"The nomination begs the question of the rationale in creating a district of local significance within which there exists a listed property of national significance. It is not clear how the adjacent buildings, constructed at a later date, contribute meaning to the listed property, or how they convey the same historical significance, namely, the origin of quarter horse racing, rather than they are simply the result of that historic event."*

Discussion:

- This is the birthplace of Quarter Horse Racing
- The chute is already listed at the National Level, and the scope of this track according to the map is well outside Arizona. These indicating the Rillito Race Track should be listed at the National Level

Mayro: gave a brief overview of the 2 nominations

- **Collins:** The Keeper rejected this nomination as an expansion of the earlier nomination. The Keeper suggested that the earlier nomination be ignored and focus on this property alone as a district with a Local level of significance for horse racing in Tucson. The Chute, individually listed at the National Level, would be a contributor to the Rillito Race Track, which is at the Local Level. Its period of significance is 1940 – 1964.
- On page 7 under current functions add a topic sentence to that paragraph
- There should be photos of all the contributors
- On page 4 the list of contributors and non-contributors was difficult to understand. Perhaps use a resource table with a contributor non-contributor check box.
- On Page 3 there is a statement that this nomination is going to correct inaccuracies. Those inaccuracies need to be specified
- On page 14 the National level of significance should be included when discussing the significance of the Nationally Listed Chute.

Ryden: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Glendale Gardens Historic District, Glendale, Maricopa County

Kupel: Recused himself from the vote on **Glendale Gardens Historic District** and **Sage Acres Historic District** due to conflict of interest

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Glendale Gardens Historic District** nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *“The nomination posits that the historical significance conveyed in the district is its relatively unchanged appearance which provides perspective into the state of subdivision planning and development in Glendale in the mid 1950s. The emphasis is on the subdivision of real estate as realized in lots of relatively uniform size organized around a street pattern for maximum efficiency. The position of buildings on each lot signifies compliance with the governing zoning ordinance. Plan view of the buildings is not included presumably for reason of irrelevancy. The buildings are undistinguished examples of the ubiquitous consumer product attributed to the California suburban home building industry, which has been the model for Arizona’s developers. Upon reaching the 50 year mark, this group of buildings is relieved of any necessity to be exceptional.”*

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

- The “A” Post World War II discussion is better developed than the “C” argument.
- The architecture is not the important issue, but rather the entirety of the subdivision design, how it was marketed, and how it fits with others surrounding it

Bob Graham, Preparer: This neighborhood stood out because of its integrity, not like others in Glendale that have lost their integrity due to changes made.

- MCR needs to be defined [Maricopa County Recorder (MCR)]

Ryden: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried



Sage Acres Historic District, Glendale, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Sage Acres Historic District** nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *“This multi-family development of four and six-plex buildings is described as of some architectural merit. However there is no plan view included and the photographs hint at architectural significance but are not sufficiently illustrative for a reviewer to concur.”*

Motion: **Lacy** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Sage Acres 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: **Balsom**

Discussion:

- More architecture information and layout would have been helpful

Ryden: Called for the vote

6 Ayes, Motion Carried



Borden Homes Historic District, Tempe, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Borden Homes Historic District** nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *“The nominated district is a post WWII development of housing industry product in suburban Tempe. Architecturally undistinguished, the buildings are identified with the much referenced but often misapplied classification of “Ranch Style” further subdivided into Early, Transitional and Classic. Bearing no relation to the Ranch Style inspired by the rural vernacular buildings of California’s Spanish period, as attributed to Cliff May and popularized by Sunset Magazine, the classification stems from the industry’s marketing strategy intended to evoke a more romantic notion of home ownership than reality would suggest. The district signifies the state of suburban development during the 1950’s including an evolving building technology in a landscape morphing from agricultural uses yet retaining some vestige of flood irrigation for this new crop.”*

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

Discussion:

- An explanation about these homes stylistically and how they fit into ranch style homes as a type. Are they bungalows, minimal traditional, transitional ranch?
- Statistically how many detached garages and carports are in the district in order to illustrate the growing emphasis on the automobile and its place in this neighborhood’s development? A transition from a pedestrian world to an automotive one would be helpful

Ryden: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Sacred Heart, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the **Sacred Heart** nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *The term “starved classicism”, used in the nomination is a variation on “stripped down” classicism both in reference to the more generally preferred Neo-Formalism style. This building is perhaps the best example of Neo-Formalism within all of metropolitan Phoenix and the valley. The style is characterized by the inclusion of abstract classical features within a simplified modern composition. The nomination correctly identifies this period of architectural fashion as the prelude to post-modernism.*

The nomination would benefit from the use of the term New-Formalism, as it is referenced in the NR Bulletin; and reference other local examples of this style indicating its rarity.

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

Discussion:

- One period of significance needs to be established. As written there are several different dates
 - Page 5 states it was constructed in 1954 and was removed from use in 1985
 - On page 6 the period of significance is from 1954 to 1961
 - In the Justification it states from 1954 through the 50 year age criteria to the present time
- Significance of the property
 - Connection to the Hispanic Community

- Due to its traumatic demise
- Period of significance needs to be established
- As a focal point of the Hispanic neighborhood, Criterion “A” fits the nomination. In the Justification section the idea that the church is significant to the present time must be made. 1954 to 1961 would be the period of significance using the 50-year cutoff.
- This building has exceptional significance because it serves as an example of the “Power of Place” in the Modern Urban Community and needs to be preserved. After that, add the Urban Redevelopment Story.
- Strengthen the story about the Church and its importance to the community. A couple of paragraphs will be sufficient.

Erica Finbraaten, City of Phoenix: Spoke in favor of the Nomination

Joe Nucci, City of Tempe: Spoke in favor of the Nomination

Ryden: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried



Sandra Day O'Connor House, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang - Provided a brief overview of the Sandra Day O'Connor House, Phoenix nomination.

Strang: Frankeberger's Comments – *“It is difficult to decide if the building should be classified as moved or reconstructed from some, but not all, of the disassembled materials from the original; or if it should be considered as an interpretative device constructed of both found objects as well as considerable new material. That the addition by the more prominent architect, Cal Straub, was discarded in the project is unexplained, other than it is associated more with child rearing than political ascension. Nor is it understood that the interior modifications are easily subsumed within the whole without effect, while the faux carport addition is unaccountably disassociated as a non-contributor when it is clearly an integral part of the project in its accommodation of the rehabilitated building's re-purposing.*

Although the project is definitely associated with Sandra Day O'Connor, even to the extent of her participation in its design, construction and selection of adobe in reminiscence of her origin in Duncan Arizona, under criterion B relocation is ordinarily considered to compromise historic integrity.

As a rehabilitated, reassembled, reconstruction on a new site, its potential qualification as meeting NR criterion C, for architecture, as either an historic building or object is not addressed in the nomination. If the unique design of the house is preserved, even through reconstruction, as a one of a kind architectural phenomenon, then as an object of art it can move from its original location with no adverse effect to its integrity. But under criterion B, associated with a person, a house is site specific within a context of place.

The nomination should be redirected in support of the property's eligibility under criterion C, with supporting documentation that the rehabilitation of the former residence, to accommodate the new use, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for treatment of Historic Buildings.”

Motion: **Henderson** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Sandra Day O'Connor House, Phoenix on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**B**” at the **National** 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:

- Using “B” Criterion is not appropriate for a house that has been moved to a different location, but nominating it under “C” for architecture would be appropriate
- The addition designed by Cal Straub was discarded and that hasn't been discussed in the nomination
- If this is the only surviving structure related to an important person, it might be nominated under Criterion “B”. This is where Sandra Day O'Connor honed her statesmanship and lived while she furthered her political career
- The house was relocated to save it
- Houses of living persons are traditionally not given National Register Status

- Should have images of her inside the house or any photos of her to help tie her to this house
- James Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer, previously determined the house ineligible because the house has been moved
- It is possible to list it under “C” for architecture, because being moved does not detract from the “C” Criterion since its would be considered as a work of art and as such could be moved
- This house would not even be considered for the National Register if it were not connected with Sandra Day O’Connor, so it is a “B” nomination

Nucci: This property is listed on the Tempe Historic Register

Finbraaten: Spoke in favor of the nomination

Ryden: Called for the vote

6 Ayes and 1 Nay, Motion Carried

2. REVIEW OF RECLASSIFICATION APPLICATION FOR PROPERTIES RE:

Property located in the Willow-Alvarado Historic District at 102 West Cypress, Phoenix, Maricopa County does not currently qualify for the Historic Property Tax Reclassification, due to modifications made to the property.

Discussion:

- The owners have petitioned to be have the house continue as a contributing property in the district and therefore eligible for the Tax Reclassification
- Staff could not come to an agreement regarding its eligibility
- Renovations were made to the house after the house was determined eligible, which now make the house ineligible

Kupel moved the 102 West Cypress, Phoenix be removed from the contributing list of the Willow-Alvarado Historic District.

Jeffery Seconded the Motion.

Ryden: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried

D. OLD BUSINESS

Approval of the March 25, 2011 HSRC minutes

Moved: **Lacy** Seconded: **Kupel**

Ryden: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO Report

- a. Strang distributed the list of nominations that have been accepted by the Keeper for the National Register of Historic Places
- b. Collins gave the update for State Parks
 - 1) Renee Bahl, Director of State Parks announced her resignation effective 12/16/2012
 - 2) Main Street Program may become part of SHPO

F. Public Comment - None

G. Call for Agenda Items

1. Colonia Solano Properties Eligibility

- Jim Garrison as the State Historic Preservation Officer has already determined that these properties are contributors to the Historic District and should be in the pending National Register Nomination

2. Stylistic Issues

H. Time and Date of the Next Meetings

- March 23, 2012
- July 27, 2012
- November 16, 2012

HSRC Members approved the meeting dates for 2012

Lacy Moved to Adjourn **Henderson** Seconded

Ryden: Called for the vote

7 Ayes, Motion Carried

Adjourned: 2:38 PM