

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
ARIZONA STATE PARKS, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
March 20, 2015**

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order 9:34 AM

B. CALL TO ORDER PUBLIC SESSION AND ROLL CALL

1. HSRC Committee Members present

- a. John Jacquemart
- b. John Lacy
- c. Don Ryden
- d. Doug Kupel
- e. Kathryn Leonard
- f. Brooks Jeffery
- g. Terry Majewski

2. HSRC Committee Members Absent

- a. Patricia Olson
- b. Jan Balsom

a. SHPO Staff Members Present

- a. Jim Garrison
- b. Alyssa Gerszewski
- c. William Collins
- d. Vivia Strang
- e. Eric Vondy
- f. Chris Cody
- g. Paula Scott
- h. Nicole Webb

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORTS

a. National Register Update

- Summary of recent Arizona listings in National Register of Historic Places.
- HSRC briefed on how properties are evaluated for their significance, age, and integrity.
- Update on number of properties in SHPO database that are at least 50 years old and how to anticipate what SHPO will be dealing with in the coming years.
- Currently there are 7,020 properties enrolled in the state property tax program with 21,138 contributors across the state. These are mostly residential, and a small percentage of the properties are in archaeological districts.

- There's potential for many more properties to join the tax program.
- Request for HSRC to develop guidance for selecting properties worthy of preservation. This will allow SHPO to focus on what properties should be given priority for listing.
- Everyone who takes part in the process needs to share in the responsibilities. HSRC could use its expertise and knowledge in planning and to encourage preservation leaders to determine what's important in their communities and come up with creative solutions to these issues.
- It's a great challenge to think about what is important. This should be an ongoing dialogue.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

a. Catalina Foothills Estates Apartments, Tucson, Pima, Arizona

Strang provided overview of Catalina Foothills Estates Apartments.

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Catalina Foothills Estates Apartments** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" at the **local level** of significance and recommended that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motioned seconded: **Leonard**.

SHPO Staff Comments: None

Discussion:

- Mexican Colonial is not a style; it's part of a larger genre of Regional Modernism.
- Spanish Colonial Revival is not appropriate.
- It should be about Juan Worner Baz as a master architect.
- Baz's style is not purely modernist and it's not Spanish Colonial Revival.
- The best solution was to call it what Baz called it "Mexican Colonial".
- Recommend changing to a district nomination with the landscape as a contributing site.
- Elaborate on the master gardener.
- The 4 single buildings are the contributors, not the individual units, modify counts.
- In Section 7 there is a summary paragraph and narrative description, some of it is too descriptive. The rest of it is divided with the 7 aspects of integrity. The narrative description should be describing the resource.
- Section 8 is problematic. The summary statement of significance is somewhat confusing. There are two areas of significance. One is that it's the first multi-family residential property in Tucson exhibiting Mexican Colonial architecture - that term is confusing. The second area of significance is that it served as a design template for future multi-family complexes designed by Worner Baz. Revise this so there is a paragraph for each area of significance in the narrative. Treat the two areas separately with their own contexts.

- Question on the second area of significance and whether this property served as a design template. Is this the best of the best?
- It's the best example of multi-family.
- Explain cantera or call it cantera stone.
- Was Murphey also the builder of complex? Yes.
- Murphey is listed as the developer, but not the builder. Considering Worner Baz as the next generation of the Joesler legacy in terms of a patron architect, it would be good to talk about the building as well.
- Call Broadway Village a shopping center not the first suburban shopping mall.
- Discussion on characteristics of a particular style should include photos.
- Curious about escalators in 2 of the homes – need more information and photos.
- Flat or smooth wall surfaces. In the photos some of the walls were plastered masonry and possibly rusticated. This idea of hybridization needs to be consistently presented in the nomination.
- Glass curtain walls as character defining features. Don't see any in this complex. Big plate glass is seen, but not glass curtain walls.
- Worner Baz Tucson inventory. Since Casa Juan Paisano is already listed, this complex and maybe a few others should be listed. Casa Juan Paisano is the best example of his single-family residences. This nomination is the best of his multi-family.
- One of the problems with defining Worner Baz as a master architect is there isn't sufficient information on his time in Mexico.
- Compared to what has been learned about Joesler and his biography, basically there is little known about Worner Baz. The body of his work is unknown and it's hard to make a case.
- The style is so attributed to Baz. It's difficult to separate them out. Baz is the only person using that style.
- It seems like it's so regional, that to demonstrate its influence in Tucson would be significant enough.
- Baz's work in Mexico is vastly different and not as good.
- Suggest revising and making a stronger case for Worner Baz as a master architect before sending to Washington, D.C. Reorient the nomination to discussing his work and saying it's one of the best.
- What if the focus is on the Regional Modernism aspect?
- It is not Regional Modernism. Baz is not working in Mexico. This is would be talking about a Mexican architect working for an American patron in Tucson and missing the Murphey part.
- Baz's work in Tucson is better than his work in Mexico because of the Murpheys. The Mexican context is missing.
- The region is Tucson. This is the Modernism for Tucson. The Murpheys are key for creativity.
- If going with style, call it something other than Mexican Colonial. It needs to be called something else so it can be classified for future nominations.
- Call it Regional Modernism but put Mexican Colonial in quotations. This is the term Baz used. Need to state the larger trends.
- Somebody needs to create the larger context of subgenres for future properties. The contexts need to be accepted as a scholarly consensus like what the McAlester's have done.

- Use the term Regional Modernism and keep it loose.
- Any issues with the fact that the former entrance is now blocked off? This is a great map. It clarifies the resource count issue. Discuss the contributing design landscape.
- It's very evident what the intent was - having an opening here from Skyline.
- When talking about the contributing landscape and the integrity, mention the changes and reorientation of access. Circulation is an important aspect of landscape.
- Half wall at entrance? Use map to clarify.
- Jennifer Levstick to work with SHPO staff on this nomination.

Motion Carried.

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORTS

g. HP 2015 Conference

- HSRC provided with conference registration updates and information on some keynote speakers.
- Vivian Strang asked Vince Murray to reformat the 2015 National Register session to include multiple case studies and utilize the Recommendation for Preliminary Eligibility (ROPE) form.
- It is not mandatory for HSRC but SHPO would like HSRC to attend the sessions. It would be nice to have one HSRC member at each table to facilitate. So far there are 60+ people registered to participate in this session.
- Will the materials be sent out well ahead of conference?
- Yes, but some of the materials will be distributed during the session.
- Will the ROPE process be discussed at the conference?
- No. There can be a working session in July to discuss ROPE and the number of properties that are becoming eligible.

2. UPDATE ON JOESLER MPDF

Discussion:

- Bill Collins summarized the work of Linda Weed and Janet Parkhurst. This information is the beginning of the final piece and it will be incorporated into the existing MPDF. This should be finished in 2 or 3 weeks. Then there will be a meeting in Tucson to draw the line of eligibility.
- When could the Tucson meeting be held?
- Late May or early June.
- Brooks Jeffrey asked Bill if he was taking the document that Linda and Janet worked on and adding it to the MPDF?

- Yes. The MPDF has 4 parts. I worked on the first 3 and Linda and Janet handled the fourth part, which was to research Joesler. There is so much new information. It will be edited to eliminate ambiguity and make it more concise.
- Thank you to Janet and Linda – a lot of work has been done.
- There is a concern that the tone is different from Bill's work.
- Parkhurst stated this is an incomplete document. The work is in response to the HSRC committee and the attempt to make a case that Joesler should be considered an architect in and of himself, not as a draftsman working for Murphey. New archival material from 3 continents has been discovered. In looking at the arch of their careers, Joesler and Murphey were symbiotic, but when looking at the whole career, Joesler stands on his own.
- Janet and Linda would like to see a more balanced approach. Joesler was more prominent. The name of the MPDF should be changed. Murphey and Joesler were contemporaries and equals.
- HSRC cannot take any action on this issue. The MPDF can be placed on the agenda for the July meeting.
- Janet and Linda said no further work can be done until there is some direction and feedback from the HSRC committee.
- HSRC was reminded that Section F is all that remains.
- The Joesler architects can meet in Tucson in June and finalize Section F.
- All comments from HSRC should be forwarded to Vivia Strang.

3. RECOMMENDATION OF POTENTIAL ELIGIBILITY (ROPE)

Motion: **Kupel** moved that HSRC determine the Date Palm Manor Proposed Historic District and the Tomlinson Estates Proposed Historic District meet all the qualifications and are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance. Motion Seconded: **Leonard**.

Staff Comments:

Strang: Summarizes ROPE process and Date Palm Manor and Tomlinson Estates proposed historic districts. Garrison recommended that the ROPEs come before HSRC since there was staff disagreement regarding the eligibility.

Discussion:

- HSRC is not recommending that these be forwarded to the Keeper today?
- No. Staff disagreement was summarized about the districts and property owner notification issue.
- If HSRC agrees that these districts are eligible the nominations will be heard at the July meeting.
- It is requested that everyone does a ROPE to determine eligibility. The process needs to be consistent.
- There was disagreement among staff about the eligibility, so SHPO has come to HSRC for further discussion and recommendations. The issue is about production

housing after the Second World War and whether these are significant or have no architectural value. Is this architecture?

- Let's start with Date Palm Manor. This has always been a very distinctive neighborhood in Tempe. There was a compelling argument made for the size of those custom houses. Date Palm Manor is eligible.
- There is no comparison in Phoenix or Tucson. For Tempe this is very unique. It also set the standard for what happened in Tempe in the 1960s. Even though it's very simple, it is very striking.
- The date grove is incorporated into the development, making it unique.
- Question about Post World War II Subdivisions, Tempe, Arizona 1945-1960 context written by Solliday in 2001. Was it accepted as a de facto context study that would guide the selection of particular neighborhoods in Tempe?
- Yes. It's been used as a planning document.
- John Southard, Tempe Historic Preservation Officer, spoke: Thank you everyone. The residents of these districts selected Scott to prepare these because he wrote the 2001 context. The context helps us understand the postwar period in Tempe. Date Palm Manor is the best representation of custom housing in Tempe in the 1950s and southward development into the 1960s. Both districts are bookends to a period of history in Tempe's development. They are the best representatives of their respective development styles. I commend Scott's work. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office fully endorses these nominations. Date Palm Manor was placed on the local register after Proposition 207.
- Vince Murray addressed issues with studies, contexts, and eligibility in the past. Now he consults with SHPO about the best approach at the beginning. Some of the roadblocks are inherent. Sometimes ROPEs are brought before HSRC because the preparer or client disagrees with SHPOs assessment.
- Because this is an eligibility issue, the property owners were not notified in advance of the HSRC meeting for these districts to be placed on the agenda for recommendation of listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
- It appears SHPO is having problems with Criterion C not with Criterion A. One recommendation is to focus on A. One concern is the integrity evaluation because of dealing with things like carport infills and other features. It's about the entire character of the neighborhood.
- Another concern is about the process. SHPO is in charge of context development and the Tempe context should be reviewed by HSRC.
- The trouble is SHPO doesn't have the time or the money to create all those contexts. The communities need to step up and some are. HSRC has been asked to do a specific thing here. The ROPE process can be discussed at a later time; it was not placed on the agenda for discussion today. Let's make a decision about eligibility.
- Request for a recommendation of eligibility from HSRC. Provide clarification about which Criterion to use.
- Questions about C is the issue. Is this architecture, or is it A?
- Does the motion need to be modified?
- Yes. Criterion should be on the table.
- Garrison asked Ryden if he understands the C issue?
- Ryden responded: "I believe I do. In my experience, in a production housing subdivision, architecture represents one-fifth of the components involved in producing a subdivision. Even the developers, then and today, look at the houses

not a building, but as product. They don't even call them houses. When you look at subdivision design as the unit, the houses become a component of marketing, finance, layout, and other factors. So the architecture is only a small piece of it. If you're looking at Tomlinson, I see a unit, so Criterion A is more appropriate. For Date Palm Manor, they are individually designed. Architecture is more important within the subdivision. Criterion C is appropriate for Date Palm Manor. These are two different issues."

- There should be a paragraph saying for production housing, these are the best neighborhoods for A and C of the time period in Tempe.
- Vote on Doug's motion and say that they're eligible and the preparer can struggle with the Criterion A and C issue.
- Solliday needs to cite his own context.
- Brooks would you support Criterion A and C for both districts if there was a stronger argument made? Yes.
- Garrison stated the current motion could be used. "I also had questions. Can I give direction if there's staff disagreement without presenting it in front of HSRC? I'm hearing yes. If the CLG and other entities are making decisions, we should honor those efforts? There may be instances when production housing has some relationship with architecture and its development and sometimes not. The main question was if I make a judgment about eligibility, why do I need the committee? That's the process."

Motion Carried.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 14, 2014 HSRC MEETING

Motion Carried.

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORTS

- SHPO Staffing and Program News** – Paula Scott, intern, introduces herself and discusses her projects. Chris Cody, seasonal employee, introduces himself.
- Review and Compliance** – Garrison discusses Oak Flat Traditional Cultural Place east of Superior and contentious issues with the National Register nomination. Garrison provides update on Mountain View Officers Club at Fort Huachuca. There is a draft Programmatic Agreement out for comment. Then there will be a process for accepting proposals to lease or buy the building. Bill updated the National Register nomination for the MVOC and hopefully it will meet the Army's specifications and be forwarded to Washington.
- Survey and Inventory** – Collins discusses update of Coronado Historic District. SHPO is also attempting to write context studies for modernist architecture in Phoenix. Paula is to get advice from Don Ryden.
- Grants** – Garrison discusses State Parks Board approval of raising CLG grants from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

f. **Legislative Issues** – Garrison discusses memorial request passed in the Legislature that directs the Parks Board to recognize the School for the Deaf and Blind in Tucson as a historic place. Summarizes challenges with potential State Tax Credit bill. Discusses state and federal preservation funding. Heritage Fund will not be back this year. New State Parks Director Sue Black arrived in February. Summarizes the new Director’s goals.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Majewski: Jim Ayres passed away.

Garrison: Professor Jannelle Warren-Findley, who worked in Public History at ASU passed away on February 4th, 2015.

G. AGENDA ITEMS:

There will be further discussion with SHPO for a work session on postwar properties and maybe program development.

H. DATE FOR UPCOMING HSRC MEETING:

JULY 24, 2015

ADJOURNED:

12:08 P.M.