

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
CARNAGIE LIBRARY, PHOENIX ARIZONA
MARCH 22, 2013**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:43 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS

1. HSRC Committee Members present

- a. Terry Majewski
- b. Brooks Jeffrey
- c. Don Ryden
- d. John Jacquemart
- e. Patricia Olson Via Phone
- f. John Lacy
- g. Jan Balsom
- h. Doug Kupel

2. HSRC Committee Members Absent

- a. Kathy Henderson
- b. Don Ryden

2. SHPO Staff Members present

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

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

- a. Thompson Draw Summer Homes Unit I Historic District, Payson, Gila County - POSTPONED TO A LATER DATE
- b. Tucson Community Center Landscape, Tucson, Pima County

Strang gave an overview of Tucson Community Center Landscape

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Tucson Community Center Landscape on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**C**" 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: **Balsom**.

SHPO Comments:

"Undeniably Garrett Eckbo is a recognized Master of Landscape Design. The issue at hand is the matter of historical integrity, both in the faithful execution of Eckbo's vision, given the joint venture authorship of the finished work, and the affect of subsequent alterations, additions, and level of maintenance."

Discussion:

- ➡ Committee member spoke in favor of the nomination, but stated that there were problems with the nomination that need to be corrected before it is sent to the Keeper.

- There were no letters of support for the level of “Exceptional Significance” since the property is less than 50 years old. Is it eligible? The nomination didn’t convey the idea that the property was of exceptional significance.
- The features;
 - Features were not listed as buildings, sites or objects.
 - They were not listed in numerical order.
 - There was no overall map to assist the reader in locating features.
- ➔ **Helen Erickson, Preparer:** There are 3 letters of support from the following: Charles A Birnbaum, Founder and President of the Cultural Landscape Foundation; Christopher Stevens, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Historic American Landscapes Survey, National Park Service; and Linda Jewell, FASLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture and Urban Design, University of California Berkeley.
- ➔ In order to make a case for “Exceptional Significance” at the National Level of significance there must be evidence of Scholarly work regarding the property.
- ➔ How many parks did the Work Projects Administration (WPA) create in Phoenix or all of Arizona?
- ➔ **Joe Nucci, Historic Preservation Office of Tempe:** This is the only one in Tempe.
- ➔ **Erickson:** Mark Tribe’s book on Garrett Eckbo focuses on this property. It is also mentioned in the second volume published by the Cultural Landscape Foundation.
- ➔ **Demion Clinco, Preparer:** This property is featured this month in “Dwell”, which is a National Architectural Publication. Also, this is a later work by Eckbo, which may be the reason there are fewer scholarly works regarding this property.
- ➔ The importance of this work needs be strengthened in order to make the point of Exceptional Significance specific to Criterion Consideration G.
- ➔ **Jonathan Mabry, Tucson Historic Preservation Office:** Spoke in favor of the nomination. This nomination is important to the City. Tucson’s Land Use Code protects properties that are considered historic, so the nomination has to be specific as to features and boundaries for the site in order to protect it. Also, several members of the Tucson Historical Commission have reviewed and approved the nomination.
- ➔ Need information regarding awards and any other recognition given this property.
- ➔ **Erickson:** He was given an award by ASLA in recognition of the compendium of his work. Also, awards were not that common at the time of his work.
- ➔ A comparison of his work with other landscape architects on a national level, showing the trends of the time and how his work fits into those would strengthen the nomination. How did his work fit in with the modernist landscape of that time?
- ➔ How the setting is treated with plants, form, design, open spaces, and other elements is important to the nomination. This is a 3 dimensional problem.
- ➔ More should be said about the facades that surround the landscape and how they affected the overall design of the property?
- ➔ It is clear that the document does not do the job it needs to in order to move it forward to the Keeper.
- ➔ The nomination should discuss the history of the property.
- ➔ Need letters from individuals who live in Tucson in support of this nomination.
- ➔ Being nominated under Criterion C, this nomination should not discuss the social aspect of how the property came to be.
- ➔ **Jeffrey:** Given the comments regarding the nomination I would like to rescind my motion and request the preparer revise the nomination and resubmit the revised nomination for HSRC’s review at a later date.
- ➔ **Balsom:** I second the rescinded motion.
- ➔ Clear up
 - Be specific about contributing and non-contributing.
 - Be specific about descriptions and other information regarding features.
 - Indicate which are structures and which are features.
 - Map with references to structures and features.

Strang: There needs to be a specific motion regarding this nomination.

Motion: **Jeffery** moved that the **Tucson Community Center Landscape** be returned to the preparers and revised based on the comments presented today. Motion Seconded: **Balsom**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried



c. Casa Juan Paisano, Tucson, Pima County

Strang gave an overview of **Casa Juan Paisano**

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Casa Juan Paisano** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**B**” at the **Local** level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places. Motion Seconded: **Lacy**.

SHPO Comments:

“The property, except for alterations and additions by subsequent owners, is a refecation of John and Helen Murphey’s design aesthetic.

Nominating this property under criterion ‘B’ for association with John and Helen Murphey begs the question of the importance of these personages within a particular profession or group which seemingly would encompass real estate building / development and interior design. Much emphasis is given to Helen Murphey’s collaborative effort in the property’s design along with architect Worner Baz, and in John Murphey’s success as a developer aided by her interior designs either as a master of that profession or as a dilettante. Yet it is unclear that their work was locally influential or profitably opportunistic within a regional trend.”

Discussion:

- ➡ The pool house is not mentioned in the nomination and it should be included as a non-contributing structure.
- ➡ Committee member stated that this is the best of John and Helen Murphey’s work in Tucson.
- ➡ Strengthen Helen Murphey’s influence in the nomination.
- ➡ **Jennifer Levstick, Preparer:** There is not enough hard proof of Helen Murphey’s role in design of this or any of the Murphey Joesler collaborations. Most of the information regarding her is anecdotal.
- ➡ Why nominate as Criterion B instead of Criterion C.
- ➡ **Levstick:** The architect hired to design the home was just out of school and would not have been considered a Master Architect. When he returned to Mexico his designs were not of the same caliber as the ones he designed in Tucson. Also this is the first time the couple lived in a community they helped to develop, which gives it additional importance.
- ➡ Strengthen Criterion B. You have to compare it to other properties that are associated with the Murphey’s and prove this is the one single property that reflects their work.
- ➡ This is nominated as a couple and under Criterion B it must be nominated under an individual unless they are both individually associated with the property. The issue of whether the property is more closely associated with one of the Murpheys needs to be addressed.
- ➡ More that one individual may be part of the nomination if they are responsible for its significance. John Murphey was the builder of the subdivision and Helen Murphey was the interior designer therefore both are significant in its design.
- ➡ On page 8 of the nomination there are more references to Joesler than there are about either of the Murpheys.
- ➡ The committee considers the nomination ready to send to the Keeper after the HSRC’s comments are incorporated in the nomination (with SHPO’s guidance).

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried



d. Mouer Park, Tempe, Maricopa County

Strang gave an overview of Mouer Park

- Anything nominated that is associated with WPA will receive special attention by the Keeper. There is a movement to get WPA properties listed. WPA projects should be nominated under Criterion A, a political work.

Motion: **Balsom** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Mouer Park** 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**.

SHPO Comments:

“At last a winner!”

It is abundantly clear that this property conveys the signs and signature of a depression era government stimulus project; and is eligible for association with this national program under criterion ‘A’. Nevertheless, eligibility under criterion ‘C’ should not be overlooked, as it conveys that contextual association as an authentic example of the Rustic Style. Its authenticity is derived from actual unskilled labor, working with found material, characteristic of WPA projects. For it’s significance of an important period in the nation’s history, Moeur Park is worthy of preservation for the enjoyment and edification of future generations.”

Discussion:

- The WPA projects didn’t last into the early 60s therefore the dates of significance 1936 to 1962 are inappropriate. A more appropriate choice would be 1936 to 1938.
- **Nucci:** The choice of dates was to assist in keeping the park intact. As the city moves forward it is more likely to pay attention to and maintain those features with Historic Status. Everything in the style and character of the initial development of the WPA project should be included in the nomination as a natural continuation of the style of the park.
- Why were the modern additions (circa 1970) not included, while the 1950 modern additions were included?
- There needs to be additional justifications in the nomination for what is included and what is not included.
- Add “Recreation” to areas of significance of “Community Planning and Development” and “Transportation”. If you add “Recreation” then the park has a continuing role in the community as a recreational resource. That would allow the period of significance to expand.
- The massing and design of the additions from the 50s match the earlier 30s structures and features. Although the 50s feature are constructed with different materials there is still a compatible feel to the structures and features maintaining a connection to earlier work.
- Visitors to the park in the 30s used the shade of the palm trees to rest under while today there are picnic shade structures. How did adding structures to the park affect the integrity of the park?
- The statement of significance leans toward Criterion “C” instead of “A”. Need to strengthen Criterion “A” if that is to continue to be your focus.
- The association of the social political history of the WPA needs to be strengthened at least in the summary paragraph.
- There are good source materials about the WPA in Arizona, which might be of use to you in beefing up that section.
- Go into more detail about the history of the park.
- Need explanation of boundary – boundary justification.
- Compare to other WPA parks that were created - both those still in existence and those no longer in existence.
- Need a clearer aerial map in that indicates features and structures.
- Period of significance will be 1936 to 1955 if recreation is added to the areas of significance.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6 Ayes, Motion Carried



e. Hacienda Cocinero, Phoenix, Maricopa County

Strang gave an overview of Hacienda Cocinero

Strang: Distributed a letter from the City of Phoenix regarding this nomination. The Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) considered the nomination of Hacienda Cocinero under the “North Central Phoenix Farmhouses and Rural Estate Homes, 1895 – 1959” MPDF. The HPC voted to recommend against nomination of this property based on the following.

- Only .7 acres of the original 160 acres of land, which included a citrus orchard, remain a part of the property.
- It is closely surrounded by homes built in the 1950s and later.
- The house was originally significantly smaller; at 3,218 square feet, it’s approximately three times the size of the original.
- The 1993 addition extends significantly into the front yard and us the most visible element of the building.
- While the primary resource on the property maintains its integrity of location, it does not retain sufficient integrity of materials, feeling and association to be eligible for the NRHP.

Thus, the HPC requested that a letter be forwarded to the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee recommending that the property not be listed on the NRHP.

Motion: **Jeffrey** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Hacienda Cocinero 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: **Kupel**.

SHPO Comments:

“It seems this property influenced Community Planning and Development in Phoenix less than overrun and somewhat obliterated by it. It’s significance is more an example of the architectural style of its time which exemplified a regional affectation inspired by the historical precedent of New Spain’s architecture. Although difficult to ascertain integrity from the photographs, the nomination would more likely succeed under criterion ‘C’ than ‘A’.”

Discussion:

- ➡ The current property looks nothing like the original property. It is hard to see what is original and what is not.
- ➡ **Vincent Murray, Preparer:** There was a 1935 addition that is in the period of significance and there is no historic photograph of that addition. The current mature landscaping makes it difficult to photograph the house and show what is original and what is not.
- ➡ The setting has changed so much that it no longer looks like a farmhouse.
- ➡ **Murray:** The MPDF takes that into consideration. These properties change over the years as a natural course of events. This property was constructed as a farmhouse and remains so today. It was not constructed as a rural estate with farming as a side business.
- ➡ If this is to be considered under Criterion “A” then a context for community development seems to have been compromised.
- ➡ **Murray:** Farmhouses are going to be on reduced lots as the area around them is developed. The buildings have to retain the features important to their identity. This house maintains the character of the original farmhouse. The barn behind the house is considered a contributor on this property and may be older than the house itself.
- ➡ The question returns to the Registration Requirements. How many changes can be made to the house before it is considered ineligible?
- ➡ The house and the barn cannot be seen from the road and lose the significance of their setting.
- ➡ **Murray:** Farmhouses were generally positioned at the front of the property, but this one was positioned in the middle of the property and is now located among mature vegetation that was planted close to the time of construction of the house and barn.
- ➡ Based on the problems with the nomination it is recommended it be returned to the preparer for revisions and then returned to the HSRC for review at a later date.
- ➡ Need to clarify the connection with the MPDF.
- ➡ Page 6, the narrative for the period of significance not clear.
- ➡ Mapping documentation should be improved.

- Some of the text is repetitive.
- Explanation for the sleeping porch.
- The setting is unusual and more documentation for Criterion "A".
- Barn should be a structure and not a building.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Nays, Motion Failed

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the **Hacienda Cocinero** be returned to the preparers and revised based on the comments presented today then resubmitted to SHPO and brought back to HSRC. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**.

Majewski: Called for the vote
6 Ayes, Motion Carried



2. JOESLER MPDF AND NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS UPDATE BY VIVIA STRANG

The revised Joesler MPDF was forwarded to the Keeper for comment. The MPDF was returned with comments. The nominations waiting to be reviewed were not because the Joesler MPDF was flawed. Included in your packet you will find Keepers comments, the minutes from the September and October meetings for reference, and SHPO staff comments. The Keeper will review all the Joeslers that are currently on the National Register again. Criterion "A" (community planning and development) is being removed from all those nominations. Some nominations will not fall under the MPDF, but may be listed individually. Lisa Deline and Paul Lusignan will be coming to Phoenix for the Preservation Conference in June. Their 2-day track involves National Register Nominations process. There have been changes it is important for HSRC members, consultants and other partners to attend these sessions. They will give attendees a look behind the scenes regarding what the Keeper's office is looking for in nominations. In addition to those sessions there will be a session with the Keeper's office, SHPO, and HSRC regarding working together for historic preservation. There will also be a session on how to evaluate historic districts and what the Keeper's office is looking for in those nominations.

Brooks moved that in accordance with the Keeper's office that the returned Joesler MPDF be revised in respect to the architecture and focus only on residential architecture in order to create a solid cohesive document, that will aid in the process of moving the Joesler nominations forward. **Balsom** seconded the motion.

Brooks I need to sit down with the co preparers of the MPDF consider all the comments that have been given and apply those comments to the document. This document has been reviewed several times and it still doesn't meet the Keeper's Standards. The Residential Requirements need to be examined in depth.

Garrison: State procurement laws may allow some of the moneys to be paid to the preparers for this new step in the process. Remuneration of funds must be under \$10,000. I will investigate this possibility.

Brooks I will donate my time outright or as a match.

Majewski: What is the time frame for this review?

- The review should be completed prior to the next HSRC meeting in order to review the pending nominations at the July 26, 2013.

Linda Mayro, Pima County Historic Preservation Officer: Would the Keeper's office continue to use the original context study in evaluating the current Joesler nominations or will they use the revised context study?

Strang: I don't have all the details from the Keeper at this time, but if they can stand on their own then they will be listed.

Garrison: We should try to meet with the representatives for the Keeper while they are here for the conference to insure that we are all in agreement of at least knowledgeable about what the Keeper will require of this MPDF and the remaining Joesler Nominations.

- How does the idea of "Protecting the Land" play into the MPDF? The goal of conservation of the land and the goal of integrity are joined in the current document.

Garrison: Is there a possibility of having a conservation district at the city or county level that deals with other issues than history?

Mayro: It would be more difficult to put into place local restrictions such zoning at the city or county level. If integrity of setting is the direction we try then with a lot is split, the property comes off the register. Thus there is no incentive for the owner to keep the residence intact and that property could be lost.

Eric Vondy, Program Coordinator: As the person responsible for the SPT program there are very few requests to split lots of historic properties in the program, so I don't see that as a major problem at this time.

Linda Weed, Owner of the Woollen House: Thanked everyone for all their hard work.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6 Ayes, Motion Carried



D. OLD BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM

Lacy moved to accept the minutes from November 16, 2012 HSRC meeting. **Brooks** seconded the motion.

Majewski: Called for the vote

6 Ayes, Motion Carried

E. STAFF REPORT

1. SHPO REPORT

- a. National Register Update
 1. Vivia gave an update on the properties that have been added to the National Register since the last meeting.
 2. On February 22, 2013 the Keeper determined the Mountain View Black Officers Club to be eligible for the National Register. We don't know what happens next with this nomination. It is in the hands of the Army.
- b. SHPO is getting a new intern that is interested in working with the National Register. We have decided to let her work on the Route 66 nominations.
- c. Review and Compliance Issues
 1. James Garrison gave an overview of the Rosemont Copper Mine on Coronado National Forest land. Other entities involved are the Tribes and the Arizona State Land Department.
 2. The Havasupai and the environmentalists have sued the Forest Service and Kaibab National Forest for re-opening a uranium mine.
- d. Legislative Issues.
 1. Sequestration – SHPO doesn't have a budget for the remainder of the year, but if it is the same as last years budget, then we lose approximately \$50,000 for this year. If that happens it shouldn't result in job loss.
 2. The Governor's proposed budget includes the Main Street Program, which indicates her interest in State Parks/ SHPO.
 3. As State Parks stabilizes they want to be able to hire above the imposed cap on new hires.
 4. State Parks is in the process of hiring an Archaeologist.
- e. State Plan
 1. Staff reviews and drafts are being worked on.
 2. The new draft of the State Plan should be ready for the next HSRC meeting.
- f. The Archaeology Expo was a success. Bureau of Land Management estimates an attendance of 1,000 to 1,100 that is roughly 4 times the usual attendance.
- g. Eric gave an overview on the Preservation Conference Scheduled for June 12th to June 14th, 2013.
- h. There are several HSRC members who are coming to the ends of their terms. At the next meeting there will a need to bring new members on board or reappoint the existing members. If the persons up for renewal want to continue in the position there is an application form to be filled out.
- i. Please remember that the Governor's Awards submissions are due and the application is on line at the AZ Preservation web site.

j. Events

1. The Canoa Ranch Dedication with the unveiling of the National Register Plaque.
2. The Pinal County City Cemetery.
3. The closing event for the IAHC Legacy Project.

F. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

G. **AGENDA ITEMS:** None

H. **DATES FOR UPCOMMING 2013 HSRC MEETINGS**

- a. Next meeting on July 26, 2013 – 9:30 AM

Adjourned at: 12: 46 PM

