

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
ARIZONA STATE PARKS, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
JULY 25, 2014**

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. Terry Majewski
- b. John Jacquemart
- c. Kathryn Leonard
- d. Don Ryden
- e. Doug Kupel
- f. Patricia Olson

2. HSRC Committee Members Absent

- a. Jan Balsom
- b. Brooks Jeffery
- c. John Lacy

3. SHPO Staff Members Present

- a. Jim Garrison
- b. Alyssa Gerszewski
- c. Bill Collins
- d. Vivia Strang

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

- a. Coffelt-Lamoreaux Homes, Phoenix, Maricopa, Arizona

Strang provided overview of Coffelt-Lamoreaux Homes.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **Coffelt-Lamoreaux Homes** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” 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: **Jacquemart**.

SHPO Staff Comments:

TO: Roger Reed
Federal Tax Program
Washington D.C.

Roger,

I assumed there were design guidelines or standards that the local housing authority would need to comply with, in their project, in order to qualify for federal funding. There is no mention of federal standards in the Coffelt-Lamoreaux nomination. The Documentation Form for the *Public Housing in the United States*, MPS prepared by NPS dated December 1, 2004, includes, on pages 118 -119, standardized unit and site plans which clearly were adopted to local conditions by the architects, Lescher and Mahoney, for Coffelt-

Lamoreaux, essentially repeating their earlier design for the first three public housing projects in Phoenix prior to WWII. The MPS states there is a remarkable similarity in the public housing designs throughout the country; and in the section relating to Registration Requirements, Figures 1-19 are referenced, which include the standardized plans. It also states that public housing projects built after 1949 may also use this context.

The features and characteristics of the standardized plans, as they are reflected in Coffelt-Lamoreaux, signify the contextual association with the federal housing program. Those features and characteristics are integral to the property's historic integrity. When the final plans for the Rehabilitation are submitted for review, the issue will be whether or not as a result of the proposed alterations and additions, the property continues to convey that historical significance.

As the nomination lacks specificity in identifying the characteristics and features that qualify the property for listing, it does not offer sufficient guidance for appropriate treatment, i.e., what particularly must be preserved as distinguished from what may be changed.

I doubt the nomination needs to be revised in order to be accepted; but in review of the Part 2, Description of the Rehabilitation, the MPS will provide a valuable resource.

Robert R Frankeberger AIA
Architect, State Historic Preservation Office
(602) 542-6943

City of Phoenix Comments:

At their monthly meeting on June 16, 2014 the Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission unanimously recommended that the above-referenced registration form be forwarded to the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee for approval subject to the following comments/corrections:

1. Section 5: Classification -- change property ownership to "public-local"
2. Section 5: Classification -- change category of property to "district"
3. Section 5: Classification -- revise the number of resources within the property to include all contributing and non-contributing elements within the district, including the carports, playground, circulation plan, landscape (the landscape plan should be evaluated as a site that is probably a non-contributing resource to the district due to loss of integrity).
4. Section 7: Architectural Classification -- change to "Modern Movement - Ranch Style"
5. Section 8: Statement of Significance -- Although the property is also eligible under Criterion C for the design of the public housing complex and its architecture, Criterion A is stronger and it is generally best to go with the stronger argument. "Social History" as an area of significance typically must be supported with oral histories, which are not included in this nomination and the period of significance would need to cover more than one year if social history is the area of significance. The areas of significance should be more fully developed in the narrative using "Community Planning and Development" as the main area of significance with discussion about politics/government, social history, more details the overall design of this complex, how it compares to the other public housing projects built in Phoenix (particularly those built in the early 1950s that were also designed by Lescher & Mahoney), and more information about the local and national contexts for public housing complex design, and ranch style architecture. A lot of this information is found in the "Public Housing in Phoenix: 1940-1970 Historic Context and Documentation" report, which was prepared in December 2012 and is on file in the Phoenix Historic Preservation Office (SHPO should also have a copy on disc).

Discussion:

Ryden: There's an issue with list figures and photos numbers. The photos don't cross-reference. What are the characteristics and features of the homes? Provide current site plan showing contributors and non-contributors.

Rob Mawson, Preparer: All buildings are contributors. All were surveyed and are in uniform condition. Units that were modified in 1980s including window changes, and other ADA alterations. Interior spaces aren't as important as exterior spaces. Given the historic value of the district, exterior setting remains largely intact.

Majewski: City of Phoenix comments # 3: Revise of number of resources to include all contributing and non-contributing elements. How will Heritage Consulting Group revise this?

Mawson: We will insert paragraph or two about the contributing and non-contributing elements.

Leonard: Requests more detail on landscaping. Wants to see more well articulated statement on landscape, because it's not a contributor.

Ryden: Lack of inventory forms and site plans is problematic. Would like to see buildings identified on site map and inventory forms. This is key for future preservation purposes.

Mawson: There is an Excel spreadsheet that records this information and identifies each individual building. We are more than willing to provide quarter view and cross reference to the specific properties.

Majewski: Include Excel spreadsheet to list all properties.

Leonard: Tax credit application for an entire district is unusual. What is background information? Will this be sold to a developer? What are the future plans?

Gloria Munoz: I am the executive director for Housing Authority of Maricopa County and my name is on the application. Housing Authority owned it since 1952. We plan to use low income tax credits and historic preservation tax credits and other soft financing to perform interior updates and completely re-do this project. It will go into low income tax credit partnership. Maricopa County will retain 51 percent ownership, and have property returned after 15 year compliance period.

Leonard: Because this property is owned by county, asks for SHPO staff perspective. How will lack of inventory forms, which would document the condition of each building, impact the future management and treatment of this property?

Garrison: Inventory forms are necessary because it's owned by one entity. Under state policy, inventory forms are required for other historic districts because there are many different owners.

Garrison: Addresses Frankeberger's comments. Treatment and eligibility are compressed into one project. Integrity must be addressed before part 2.

Ryden: Supports Frankeberger's suggestion to include full description of character defining features in the nomination.

Leonard: Should we treat Criterion A and C nominations equally in terms of identifying character defining features?

Collins: States can add to minimum standards for the National Register. There have been issues for years with identifying character defining features. We require that character defining features be included in Criterion A, B, and C nominations. Nominations are management documents.

Leonard: Recommends we have the articulation of character defining features in NRNs as educational topic at next AZ Historic Preservation Conference in 2015.

Majewski: This issue has become more complicated. Educational session with real examples would be helpful.

Jacquemart: Shade, landscaping, and pedestrian-oriented nature of property are character defining features. Property has state level of significance.

Ryden: Jacquemart referring to spatial organization with materials and character. Need to include this information in the nomination for proposed future alterations.

Mawson: There are no construction plans. The property will have the same orientation. No plans to increase number of bedrooms, but bathrooms and additional ADA parking may be added. No carport or structures added. The property will retain the same spacing and landscaping.

Olson: Landscaping lost integrity. Will you attempt to restore it in the future?

Mawson: Some sidewalks will be replaced, as well as changes in landscape species. They have compatible plan for landscaping. Fundamental scheme will remain. Roads will remain in same place.

Kupel: Wants to evaluate property in current condition rather than focus on future potential alterations.

Leonard: Only single year for period of significance listed. Questions level of research supporting argument for “Social History” as area of significance for Criterion A. “Politics and Government” or “Community Planning and Development” more appropriate than “Social History” for nomination. Recommends removal of “Social History” or completion of additional research and revision of that context.

Kupel: Finds discussion of “Social History” is sufficient. This is mismarked on the form.

Leonard: Period of significance must be revised. Insert sentence in nomination to state why a single end date is not appropriate. The period of significance reflects an embodiment of a policy, not a trend.

Kupel: Property does not need to be elevated to state level of significance.

Majewski: Staff alone to continue working with preparer. Include site plan and summary table or spreadsheet on the inventory. All character defining features should be discussed.

Majewski: Called for the vote.

Motion Carried

b. Maricopa County Courthouse, Phoenix, Maricopa, Arizona

Strang provided overview of update to 1989 nomination.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer forward the amended nomination for the **Maricopa County Courthouse** to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion **“A” & “C”** at the **national level** of significance. Motioned seconded: **Leonard**.

City of Phoenix Comments:

The HP Commission voted unanimously on 6/16/2014 to recommend approval of the amendment subject to the staff comments and edits embedded in the attached PDF version of the form. (Editorial)

HSRC –John Lacy Comments:

I commend Bill’s preparation of the nomination for the Maricopa County Court Building. I found nothing substantive that requires correction and only suggest that the Supreme Court cases throughout the nomination be cited in footnotes to the official reports of these decisions. In the case of the Miranda case itself, the Arizona Supreme Court case can be cited as (footnote 36) State v. Miranda, 98 Ariz. 18, 401 P.2d 721 (Ariz. 1965), and the U.S. Supreme Court as (footnote 3) Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602 (1966). I’ll be happy to work with Bill in completing the cites for the remaining cases.

Discussion:

Collins, Preparer: Section 7 might need to be updated per Vince Murray’s comments. The integrity on the city side of the building may be better than that on the county side.

Vince Murray: Toured the county side of the building extensively.

Collins: Wants to be sure about level of integrity on both sides of building.

Leonard and Olson: Year of significance?

Collins: This was complicated. The Miranda decision is less than 50 years old, while the case and the events that occurred in the courthouse are over 50 years old. Decided to end period of significance in 1966.

Kupel: Would like to see original 1989 nomination cited within the amendment.

Majewski: Called for the vote.

Motion Carried

2. RE-SUBMITTAL OF NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

a. El Encanto Estates Annex Residential Historic District (Formerly Virginia Heights/E. 5th Street Residential Historic District), Tucson, Pima, Arizona

Strang provided overview of El Encanto Estates.

Motion: **Kupel** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the **El Encanto Estates Annex Residential District** on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion “**A**” & “**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: **Olson**.

SHPO Staff Comments: None

Discussion:

Leonard: Why were these dates chosen for period of significance? Is 1928-1931 appropriate?

Ralph Comey, Preparer: That’s the period of construction.

Kupel: This is not a neighborhood. Originally there were 7 lots and houses, not 5 as stated in nomination. It’s not clear exactly how it’s significant. Utilitarian facilities (office and water tower) that are mentioned in the nomination no longer exist, so cannot nominate this for utilitarian nature. Be clearer about whether it’s part of El Encanto or Virginia Heights subdivision.

Leonard: Statement of significance is confusing on page 6.

Comey: This is a weird district. It was detached from development of El Encanto and sold separately. Doesn’t look like a utilitarian district or neighborhood. Title changed to El Encanto to address previous HSRC comments.

Leonard: Be clear about whether this was part of the enterprise.

All: Use of annex is appropriate title to describe district.

Majewski: Remove “modifications were within SHPO guidelines” and add “completed according to the Secretary of Interior Standards” within discussion of integrity. SHPO staff will work with preparer.

Leonard: Statement on page 4 is contradictory. Landscaping is not a contributor. Be clear about that throughout nomination.

Majewski: Yardscaping and landscaping needs to be tweaked.

Strang: Do not divide up 7 aspects of integrity. There should be 1 or 2 paragraphs addressing the integrity.

Majewski: Called for the vote.

Motion Carried

3. UPDATE ON JOESLER MPDF

Collins: *HSRC has most recent revised version of MPDF. This was last discussed at the March 2014 HSRC meeting. There was disagreement about how the context should be written. The reviewer at the Keeper’s office in Washington rejected several of the nominations. The fundamental research question: “What is the architectural character of Tucson and did Joesler and Murphey make a meaningful contribution to that?” shaped the revision of this context. If HSRC likes this approach, will continue with parts 1, 2, and 3 of the associated context. Janet Parkhurst volunteered to prepare part 4.*

Discussion:

Leonard: This document is very thorough.

Collins: Wanted to create general contexts, so other preparers could write about Tucson architects and apply the material to other nominations. May speak to Lisa Deline in Washington about making part 1 of the MPDF a stand-alone document. Current focus is to get Joesler properties listed. Does this revised context enlighten us about the significance of Joesler and Murphey and will it convince an audience outside Tucson?

Leonard: This contributes to the scholarship and solves the problem.

All: HSRC feels comfortable with this context.

Collins: SHPO was never comfortable with previous contexts. Joesler's work needed to be integrated into a larger context. Needed to dig far enough to make a strong enough argument to convince everyone along the review process. Waiting for feedback from Brooks Jeffery.

Ryden: What is Joesler style?

Olson: He was eclectic. He used those historical precedents and put them together in eclectic ways.

Collins: Joesler is the instrument, while the Murphey's are the driving force.

Leonard: The Tucson elite are key. Much like Santa Barbara and Santa Fe, the boosters are trying to build an identity in Tucson and they do that through architecture. The Murphey's tap into that. Janet's challenge is to take the idea of boosterism and these European antecedents and figure out how Murphey and Joesler made those trends distinct to Tucson.

Collins: Explains the pyramid metaphor format of the context.

Kupel: Thinks it's very good. There's a problem with the headings. Some are Roman Numerals and some are numbers.

Collins: Outline follows Chicago Manual of Style. Will change identification on the cover.

Collins: As these contexts become more academic, it will mean more work for the consultants. SHPO can provide the contexts and this might be a model for the future. We need to do more of this.

Strang: Thompson Draw was listed on July 24th, 2014 by the Keeper of the National Register.

Janet Parkhurst: Overjoyed to have someone with doctorate writing about Tucson architecture. This is our only chance to have our nominations get the eye of the Keeper of the National Register. Wants title changed to "Residential Architecture of Josias Joesler in Tucson, Arizona 1927-1956" or "The Residential Architecture of Josias Joesler and and Josias Joesler and John and Helen Murphey in Tucson, Arizona, 1927-1956." We don't believe all of Joesler's work has a connection to the Murphey's. Later on in their working relationship, Joesler and Murphey didn't get along. There is some speculation that Murphey exploited Joesler. Joesler has meaning to most of us that goes beyond Murphey. If we could just focus a little more on Joesler's importance to Tucson, and balance it with Murphey's contributions in the MPDF. Now that the Murphey's have been brought back into the context, do the individual nominations need Criterion C moving forward?

Collins: Janet, Bob Frankeberger, Brooks Jeffery, and other architects will work that out.

Garrison: Start with issues with Criterion C eligibility and then see if there's an A.

Linda Weed: Thanks to Collins for his efforts. There are more Tucson additions. For example, discussion of ranch schools. Tucson has Hacienda del Sol school for girls, and there might be a connection. Supports Janet's title suggestions. Likes this as a template for other architects. Might be that the residential development of John and Helen Murphey lends itself to that as context. Forward looking concept of natural vegetation and houses that were appropriate for the site can be interpreted in several different ways, and you have different architects doing that. I would like to go further on that for other architects in the future. We also interviewed Mel Norval, who is 96 years old, and vice president of Murphey Development. We wanted to explore the working relationship of Murphey and Joesler. His feeling was that Murphey was the developer and promoter, the guy with the vision and the money, and Joesler was the architect. The Murphey's weren't involved in architecture itself. Murphey gave instructions and Joesler translated that vision into architecture. We might think about an art patron and an artist.

Majewski: We will look forward to next Joesler update and wait to hear Tucson's contributions and Brooks' comments. Five minute restroom break. 11:47 AM reconvene.

D. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF 1938 WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT ARIZONA STATE FAIRGROUNDS.

Garrison and Murray: Provide overview and update on situation.

Garrison: Does anyone take issue with this building's eligibility? I believe based on the 1986 inventory form we have that it's eligible. Wanted to brief HSRC on this recent issue.

Murray: It's eligible, but at what level? Could it have national significance?

Leonard: You've told the agency that it's National Register eligible. Don't need HSRC to determine eligibility. I want to agendaize this for next meeting and discuss listing on Arizona Register of Historic Places, the Arizona Preservation Act, and care of the state's resources.

Kupel: We should wait for agenda item H to properly agendize this issue.

E. OLD BUSINESS

1. APPROVAL MINUTES FROM MARCH 21, 2014 HSRC MEETING

Majewski: Seven individuals were present but there are inconsistencies with numbers of people throughout the meeting. For example, for election of Chair and Vice Chair. SHPO staff to check Robert's Rules of Order.

Kupel: Roger's name is misspelled under Thompson Draw.

Moved to accept **Kupel**, seconded by **Olson**.
Motion Carried

F. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORTS

- a. National Register Update – A few nominations at the Keeper's office. They should be listed soon. Strang attended dedication ceremony for 1956 Grand Canyon crash site.
- b. SHPO Staffing and Program News – Welcome new Administrative Secretary Alyssa Gerszewski.
- c. Review and Compliance – Mining issues and pipeline projects discussed.
- d. Survey and Inventory – None at this time.
- e. Grants – None at this time.
- f. Legislative Issues – None at this time.
- g. HP 2014 Conference – Positive responses from HSRC.
- h. HSRC Membership – Jan Balsom and John Jacquemart reappointed.

G. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

H. AGENDA ITEMS:

Kupel: WPA building should be agendized to consider its placement on the Arizona Register of Historic Places. We should examine other properties on the State Fairgrounds to see if they are eligible, and check for other adobe infill buildings more specifically within the state of Arizona.

Majewski: Requests an update on the Black Officer's Club at Fort Huachuca.

I. DATE FOR UPCOMING HSRC MEETING: November 14, 2014

ADJOURNED: 12:32 PM