

**HISTORIC SITES REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES
TELECONFERENCE IN 2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JULY 26, 2013**

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Terry Majewski called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS/

1. HSRC Committee Members present

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

2. HSRC Committee Members Absent

- a. Patricia Olson

3. Members Update

- a. Kathryn Leonard replaces Kathleen Henderson whose term had expired
- b. Doug Kupel and Don Ryden were re-appointed to the committee
- c. Leonard gave a brief introduction of herself

4. SHPO Staff Members present

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

C. NEW BUSINESS

2. JOESLER MPDF UPDATE (taken out of order to accommodate Garrison's meeting)

Jeffery gave an update of the Joesler MPDF

- Used the Draft Outline of proposed revisions
- The new document has not been completed.
- The 2008 inventory was used as a baseline to develop property types and sub-types to form the MPDF
- Working on the following
 - Character Defining Features
 - Statements of Significance
 - Registration Requirements
- A unfinished document was compiled using all the correspondence, notes from HSRC meetings, discussions, recommendations from the SHPO office, and the Keeper's office regarding the Joesler properties
- The document you have is an attempt to reorganize the document to focus only on Joesler as Criterion "C" and only residential property types

- The document focuses on his career, following the new MPDF protocols developed by Bill Collins
 - Starting to develop sub-types, space-types, stylistic genres
 - Developing the primary and secondary character defining features within each sub-type
 - Now starting to work on registration requirements
- Work has been unavoidably delayed

Comments:

- The outline covers the information that has been presented
- The nominations in the queue are related to sub-property type 2 in the MPDF. Sub-type 2 should be the focus of the current MPDF. In that manor we can use the MPDF to get most of the backlogged Joesler nominations moving forward to the keeper by assessing them under the new MPDF
- Frankeberger is working on a list of non-stylistic traits of Joesler that would be used in this sub-category of Joesler nominations
- There is an ongoing debate on whether the Joesler's are an evolution of style or is a continuation of typology
- Why were the references to Murphy removed, since property type 2 was built at a point in their careers that they worked closely together?
- Murphy should be mentioned, but Joesler is the focus of the MPDF. He is responsible for site planning and views from the residence. All are a part of his design aesthetic

Timeline:

- Once the sub-type 2 MPDF is completed would it be possible to do email consultations and move the project along
- We will look at the meeting notes and make decisions as to timeline and voting on the MPDF

Questions:

- Is the Keeper amenable to a partial MPDF
- The narrower the focus of the MPDF the better for the Keeper
- What would it be named
- Would it be submitted as "Joesler Eclecticism in the Catalina Foothills" or something similar
- Clinco's 2 nominations from Joesler's earlier period should be submitted as individual nominations
- The last period would be added as an amendment to the nominations that are a part of the MPDF
- Brooks will meet with the preparers of Joesler nominations to go over the MPDF in order to get clarification of dates and consistency within the document
- SHPO will draft a letter to the preparer's that they may share with their clients
- Unapproved minutes will be forwarded to the preparers after they have been transcribed

1. NEW NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

a. Maynard Dixon & Edith Hamlin House, Tucson, Pima County

Strang gave an overview of the Maynard Dixon & Edith Hamlin House

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Maynard Dixon & Edith Hamlin House on the Arizona Register of Historic Places under Criterion "**A**" at the Local level of significance, and recommend that the nomination be forwarded to the Keeper of the National Register for placement on National Register of Historic Places.

Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**.

Discussion:

- Why not nominate it under Criterion "B" – most of the proposal is about Maynard Dixon and his wife
- **Strang** – There is another property in Utah listed on the National Register under Criterion "B". If more than one property associated with a person is put forward for nomination under Criterion "B" then comparisons should be made and

evaluated. The Keeper suggested Criterion “A” be used for this nomination for an event – the Last Painting completed by Maynard Dixon.

- There are properties in multiple states listed under Criterion “B” for association with the same person
- Demion reworked the nomination converting it to Criterion “A”
- The Dixon property in Utah was listed in the 1990s, but this property seems to be the more significant of the 2 properties
- Nomination needs to be proofread, too many typographical errors and misspellings
- The integrity portion needs to be redone. Needs to be honest about the work done on the property and specify the time it was completed
- There was a 2-bedroom addition mentioned in one place in the nomination and later the addition was referred to as a master bedroom addition. Which is it
- In the discussion about the setting – it states that the setting hasn’t changed, but it has changed due to the additions. The following were added: an added pool, and the north porch enclosed. There are no dates for the porch enclosure.
- In the narrative a non contributing carport structure is mentioned but it is not in the resource column
- **Clinco** – The issues regarding the bedroom and kitchen additions can be cleared up. The north porch was enclosed prior to Dixon’s death, probably shortly after the house was constructed.
- More and better photos would be helpful, especially of the additions
- **Clinco** – A floor plan indicating the additions clearly would be easier to do since there is dense vegetation hiding most of the house including the additions
- The areal photo is helpful
- Integrity needs to be clarified and strengthened.
- Being the place that Dixon painted his last painting is not enough for a nomination. There needs to be more context
- The summary of Dixon’s career is not enough to make the nomination valid
- This property needs to be nominated under Criterion “B” as a renowned artist living in Tucson. It would take very little reworking to get the nomination back to a “B” nomination
- The “A” nomination cites the importance of this property as being the place he painted his last artwork. That premise needs to be strengthened
- Would this nomination be rejected outright by the Keeper if it is changed back to an “A” nomination
- The nomination in Utah was listed at the local level of significance. Why not make this nomination Criterion “B” as local to Tucson
- It still could be “A” for all the paintings completed in this house. Highlighting how he was influenced by his life in Tucson. His studio faced vistas of Tucson
- Too much work to tie everything to Criterion “A”, but Criterion “B” is a natural
- Compare the property in Utah and the one in Tucson
- SHPO will need research Preservation Bulletins in order to back up the legitimacy of more than one nomination for an individual in more than one location
- **Frankeberger** - Integrity means, “the ability to convey whatever the significance is” and the significance is the influence on this property by Dixon. What did he do to the property that made it an expression of him? By the same token his work expresses him. Then the addition of a bedroom, kitchen or a carport is architecturally consistent with the building is not relevant because we are not talking about “C”. We are talking about “B”. If he built a carport that was architecturally wrong, it still expresses Dixon. The integrity thing needs to be focused on does this in fact have the signature of Dixon or does it not.
- Amend the motion with no need to have it return the nomination to the committee
- Withdraw the motion and restate it in order to send it to the Keeper under “B”

Motion: **Ryden** the Criterion for the nomination as either Criterion “A” or “B” at the **State** or **Local** Level of Significance which would be determined based on further coordination with the Keeper and that appropriate modification should be made to the **Maynard Dixon & Edith Hamlin House** nomination following the discussion. Motion Seconded: **Jacquemart**

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried

b. Virginia Heights/E 5th Street Residential Historic District, Tucson, Pima County

Strang gave an overview of the Virginia Heights/E 5th Street Residential Historic District

Motion: **Ryden** moved that the State Historic Preservation Officer place the Virginia Heights/E 5th Street Residential 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: **Lacy**.

Discussion:

- This nomination appears to be out of place and doesn't stand on its own
- It should be an amendment to the El Encanto Estates. It was developed in coordination with El Encanto Estates.
- Many of these houses were used as models for homes constructed in El Encanto Estates. It is not a complete district
- Subjective language needs to be omitted
- There is a property located at 3135 East 5th that is attributed to Joesler. Other than a statement by the owner there is no documentation to support the claim
- Why were these properties not included with the El Encanto Estates
- El Encanto was nominated for its Street Landscape and not its architecture. These houses were not a part of that layout. After a time enough of the houses became eligible, the nomination was amended and now they are listed under Criterion "C", but district was not expanded beyond the original plat
- This group of houses could be considered as Community Development for the original district. Citing they were used as model homes for El Encanto Estates
- The original El Encanto Estates boundary ended at 5th Street that left these houses out of the district. They fell out of the perceptual boundary of the earlier proposed district
- Research needs to be done to clarify whether or not the Virginia Heights homes were indeed Model homes for the existing district as marketing for the historic district
- It could be considered a separate district, but more research need to be done to document their use as model homes
- Revise the nomination to verify the connection between El Encanto Estates and Virginia Estates
- Context may need to be changed – marketing for El Encanto Estates - advertising
- SHPO recommended that the nomination be separate from El Encanto Estates, because the original El Encanto was nominated for Street Landscape and these houses do not fit into the district
- If these are model homes are they unique for the time, 1921

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Opposed

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 22, 2013
Moved by **Lacy** and Seconded by **Ryden**

Majewski: Called for the vote
7 Ayes, Motion Carried

E. STAFF REPORTS

1. SHPO REPORT

- a. No National Register Report
- b. SHPO is in the process of hiring a replacement for Erick Laurila, Archaeological Compliance Officer she is Mary Ellen Walsh.
- c. No critical review and compliance projects at this time
- d. Collins gave an overview of the new electronic inventory system
- e. No grants at this time
- f. Collins gave an overview of the funding stream from the Federal Government
- g. Vondy gave an overview of the HP 2013 Conference and an update for the 2014 Conference
- h. In earlier portion of meeting notes
- i. There is draft of the State Plan and it will be on the November HSRC meeting for a vote

F. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

G. AGENDA ITEMS:

- Thompson Draw
- Joesler Properties

H. DATES FOR UPCOMMING 2013 HSRC MEETINGS

Next meeting on November 15 – 9:30 AM

ADJOURNED AT: 11:12 AM
