Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

AGENDA

Date: THURSDAY, August 9, 2012
Location: Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street, Tempe (parking in City Hall Garage)

6:00 PM Call to Order, sign in, introductions, (please mute cell phones)

1. Call to Audience: Persons wishing to address the commission on any matter may do so at the discretion of the Chair, however, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Other topics may be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

2. Approval of HPC Minutes
   1) 07/12/2012 Tempe HPC Monthly meeting
   2) 07/14/2012 Tempe HPC Retreat

3. Discuss & Consider Historic Neighborhood Reports
   Neighborhood Representatives updates on recent projects in or near historic neighborhoods

4. Discuss & Consider Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation Activities
   Foundation President Lisa Roach update on Tempe HPF projects

5. Discuss & Consider Commission Strategic Planning Retreat
   Review Retreat Action Items:
   a. Review commission/council liaison assignments (see list as posted in Retreat Minutes),
   b. Edit/prioritize list of topics for presentations (see list as posted in Retreat Minutes),
   c. Report of HE designation in context of Prop 207

6. Discuss & Consider Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines
   Brad) Presentation of final document conditionally approved by HPC 07/12/2012 and review of neighborhood meeting held on August 8, 2012.

7. Discuss & Consider General Plan 2040 Update
   Brad/Nathan) Update survey & inventory of Cultural Resource Areas
   Brad/Alyssa) Update survey & inventory of Multi-family Development
   Anne/Billy) Discuss and consider revising 2000 HP Plan for inclusion in GP-2040

8. Discuss and Consider Graduate Student Intern Program Projects
   Korri/Alyssa) Moeur Park WPA Structures National Register Nomination
   Charlie/Nathan) Kirkland-McKinney Ditch National Register Nomination
   Ira/Billy) Tempe Double Butte Cemetery National Register Nomination
   Anne/Alyssa) Tempe Municipal Building National Register Nomination
   Andrea/Joe) Historic Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program update

9. Liaison Speaking Points for Council Member Updates
   Tentative schedule (October?)
   Gift of Historic Photos from THM Collection
   Implementation of Council Historic Preservation Awards
   Review of Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines process and tax program participation

10. Presentation – Cultural Resource Area
    What is the Cultural Resource Area denotation and what are its effects?

11. Discuss and Consider Chair / Staff Updates:
    Tempe HPO Social Media Project n=2436 http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPO
    Tempe HPF Social Media Project n=1226 http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPF

12. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
    ▪ Member Announcements
    ▪ Staff Announcements
    Next HPC Meeting Date: Thursday 09/13/2012 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E 7th Street

Adjourn

To date in 2012 commission members report donating 401 volunteer hours to the City of Tempe

The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Within 48 hours notice, special assistance can be provided for sight and/or hearing impaired persons at public meetings. Please call (480) 350-8007 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request accommodation.
City of Tempe, Arizona

Notice of Public Meeting of a Public Body

Sections 7.6.3, 7.7.4, 7.10.1

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission and to the general public that the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission will hold a meeting open to the public on Thursday, August 9, 2012, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., at Hatton Hall, located on the Governor B. B. Moeur Campus at 34 East 7th Street, Tempe, Arizona.

A copy of the agenda for the meeting will be available at Tempe City Hall, 31 East 5th Street, Garden Level East, Community Development Department, Historic Preservation Office at least twenty-four hours in advance of the meeting.

Dated this 2 day of August, 2012

Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

By [Signature]
RULES OF PROCEDURE

AS ADOPTED BY THE

TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

April 8, 2010

WHEREAS, the Commission recognizes the underlying principal of these rules to be decision-making by majority, and
WHEREAS, application of these rules provide every member of the voting body of this Commission with equal rights, and
WHEREAS, these rules afford Commissioners protection of the minority rights to be heard, to protest, to convince their peers, and to fully understand the issues discussed or voted, and
WHEREAS, the use of the rules offers a simple and direct procedure for conducting Commission business;
NOW THEREFORE, the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission does adopt for use and implement the rules of order as procedure for conducting the Commission’s business as set forth herein and as follows:

MOTIONS, shall follow correct order … considering only one question at a time, as such:

- A Commission member addresses the Chair,
- The Chair acknowledges that member,
- Another member seconds the motion,
- The Chair repeats the motion,
- The Chair calls for discussion of the motion,
- The Chair puts the motion to a vote,
- The Chair announces the results of the vote.

IMPARTIALITY, shall provide for and protect the rights of individual members, of minority opinions, of majority opinion, and of any member absent from a meeting, as such:

- Members may communicate to the Commission when recognized by the Chair,
- The Chair maintains highest priority to direct the course of the meeting,
- The maker of a motion will take precedence over others,
- New speakers will take precedence over those who already spoke to a motion,
- The Chair should typically request speakers for an opposing view.

ORDER OF BUSINESS, shall proceed in consideration of interested public, invited guests, staff, and any having business with the commission, as such:

- A consent agenda may be presented by the Chair at the beginning of a meeting.
- Call to order and approval of minutes shall be the Commission’s first business,
- Members of the public and guests of the Commission shall next be invited to speak,
- Public Hearing presentations or discussion shall be the Commission’s next business,
- Public Meeting presentations or discussion shall be the Commission’s next business,
- Presentations by City Staff shall be the Commission’s next business,
- Presentations by Consultants shall be the Commission’s next business,
- Presentations by Standing Committees of this Commission shall occur next,
- Presentations by Special Committees of this Commission shall occur next,
- General discussion and Commissioner’s Business shall then occur.

* A consent agenda may be presented by the Chair at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda, be placed later on the agenda, or continued to another meeting at the discretion of the assembly.
WELCOME

TO THE MONTHLY MEETING OF THE

TEMPE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

The Tempe Historic Preservation Commission meets at 6:00 p.m. on the second Thursday of each month at Hatton Hall, 34 East 7th Street. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office prepares an agenda with supporting material for Historic Preservation Commission meetings. State law requires that commission agendas be publicly posted at least 24 hours prior to a meeting; however, Historic Preservation Commission agendas are usually available the Monday before the Thursday meeting. You can find Historic Preservation Commission agendas in the following locations: the City Clerk’s Office on the 2nd floor of City Hall, the Tempe Historic Preservation Office on the 2nd floor of the Orchid House, the bulletin board on the Garden Level outside of the City Council Chambers, and on the internet at http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres.

Historic Preservation Commission monthly meetings are always open to the public and are greatly enriched by community participation. The Commission welcomes the community perspective and schedules a “Call to the Audience” at the beginning of the meeting for the convenience of attendees who would like to have input but can not stay for the entire meeting. The Commission was created to advise Tempe City Council on matters concerning historic preservation and therefore providing citizens with opportunities to communicate comments and concerns is fundamental to the mission of the organization.

There are many ways to reach the Historic Preservation Commission during public meetings and at other times as well. Members of the public may come forward and talk with the Commission during the “Call to the Audience” at the beginning of each monthly meeting, however, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Of course you can always request that an item be placed on the agenda for discussion at an upcoming Commission meeting.

If you know in advance that you want to address the Commission on a specific issue you can have the issue placed on the agenda for discussion and consideration as a Scheduled Public Appearance. Please contact the Historic Preservation Office no later than the Friday morning before the Thursday meeting.

Citizens can also contact the Historic Preservation Office to communicate with Commission members. The Tempe Preservation website is the Commission’s primary public outreach facility. From the site at http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/ you will find up to date information on Tempe Preservation including: announcements of meetings and events, agendas and minutes, and additional contact information. Please feel free to contact the Tempe Historic Preservation Office at 480.350.8870 or by email sent to joe_nucci@tempe.gov, or find us on Facebook at http://www.facebook.com/TempeHPO.
MEETING MINUTES

Date: THURSDAY, July 12, 2012

Location: Hatton Hall 34 East Seventh Street

Commissioners Present: Ira Bennett Brenda Shears
Andrea Gregory Scott Solliday
Charlie Lee Korri Turner

Staff Present: Alyssa Gerszewski Joe Nucci
Nathan Hallam Jared Smith
Billy Kiser Mark Vinson
Alyssa Matter

Public Present: Vic Linoff

Call to Order: 6:05 P.M., Andrea Gregory, Chair

Welcome New Member Scott Solliday

1. Call to Audience NO REPLY

2. Approval of HPC Minutes 06/07/2012 Tempe HPC meeting

MOTION [SHEARS]: MOVE TO APPROVE TEMPE HPC MEETING MINUTES FROM 06/07/2012 AS AMENDED, SECOND [LEE], APPROVED, 6-0

3. Discuss & Consider Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation Activities

• HPF has suspended meetings during summertime
• Mill fundraiser is next upcoming event
• Eisendrath docent program still in planning stages

4. Discuss & Consider Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines

• Update by Alyssa Matter: Design Guidelines document complete barring grammatical changes and minor photo revisions
• Q: The document has two distinct voices; is this intentional?
  A: The design guidelines represent a collaborative working effort with neighbors, and, coupled with the complexity of three different property types, this accounts for minor changes in voice/tone.
• Discussion on differences between previous Roosevelt Addition Design Guidelines and present Borden Homes Design Guidelines
• Less neighborhood participation with Borden Homes, partially as a result of Gracie’s development, which undermined community input in the process.
• Eric Vondy from SHPO will be present at neighborhood meeting in August to explain tax benefits.
• CONSENSUS THAT FINAL DRAFT OF DESIGN GUIDELINES IS APPROVED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND THAT IS BE PRESENTED TO BORDEN HOMES RESIDENTS 08/08/2012 ON CONDITION THAT MINOR GRAMMATICAL CHANGES ARE MADE BY THAT DATE.
5. **Discuss & Consider Cultural Resource Area Update**  
   - **Hallam Update:** Interns working on plat maps, improvement district maps, and GIS mapping of pre-1978 historic subdivisions and multi-family housing units.
   - GIS chosen for organization of information due to the spatial nature of the project
   - PDFs of plat maps and improvement district maps will be linked to GIS for each cultural resource area
   - Final HPO deliverable for GP2040 will include this GIS production
   - Hallam concentrating on GIS for subdivisions; Gerszewski working on GIS for multi-family housing units; other interns contributing to both projects as needed
   - GIS project is being hosted on a site/server external to that of the City of Tempe
   - Q: Will HPO conduct on-site assessments of proposed cultural resource areas to analyze integrity?  
     - A: Yes, on-site assessments will be conducted once all potential areas/districts have been identified
   - Due to the large quantity of subdivisions and multi-family housing units (100+) HPO must choose a small number of exemplary candidates based on level of integrity
   - Discussion of additional archival resources for expansion of research
   - Nucci and Vinson: discussion on City of Tempe meeting (07/12/12) pertaining to General Plan 2040 update
   - City seeks to increase land-use densities in conjunction with transportation overlay districts
   - Object to create or encourage development of urban corridors of greater occupational density
   - As the proposed Gracie’s Village development approval process highlighted, the above concept may conflict in some instances with the objectives of historic preservation and the establishment of cultural resource areas, which seek to preserve an existing sense of place. GP2040 update should be viewed as an opportunity and a venue for HPC to present and advance the cause of preservation and land use planning
   - City has modified the schedule for GP2040 update; new scheduling requires the update to be presented/approved in November 2013

6. **Discuss & Consider Commission Strategic Planning Retreat**  
   - Discussion of agenda items
   - City Council’s recent summit and resultant 11 strategic priorities will be added to agenda for discussion at retreat
   - Council/Mayor outreach to be among priorities for discussion
   - Meeting Minutes will serve as the retreat’s final product for future consideration

7. **Discuss & Consider Historic Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program**  
   - Gerszewski: Continuing work on NRN for Moeur Park WPA Structures
   - Gerszewski: Continuing work on Cultural Resource Area Update using GIS for multi-family housing units
   - Hallam: GP2040 update and GIS mapping has taken precedence
   - Hallam: Met with Commissioner-Member Charlie Lee and his wife to discuss Kirkland-McKinney Ditch and its importance to local and cultural history and the adjacent Sotelo Addition neighborhood
   - Kiser: NRN for Governor B.B. Moeur House has been approved and the property is officially listed on the National Register
   - Kiser: Has completed draft of NRN for Double Butte Cemetery and will include that in the August meeting packet for HPC review. A draft will be submitted to SHPO for scheduling on the November HSRC meeting agenda
• Kiser: Assisting Hallam and Gerszewski with Cultural Resource Area updates
• Kiser: Update of HPO's new webpage has been completed
• Matter: Completed Borden Homes Design Guidelines
• Matter: Continuing collaboration with Mark Vinson on various projects
• Nucci: HPO submittal to GRIC included accounting of intern activities, in compliance with requirements for grant funding
• Nucci: Similar submittal sent to SHPO for general accounting purposes. Future funding for intern program likely forthcoming

8. Discuss & Consider Chair / Staff Updates
• Vinson: Update on Eisendrath House. Rio Salado Foundation has secured funding to complete the new building and to finish exterior restoration of the historic structure. This will prevent any damage from exposure, etc. until additional funding can be procured for project completion. Security systems have also been installed

9. Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items
• Next HPC Meeting Date: Thursday 08/09/2012 6:00 p.m. at Hatton Hall, 34 E. 7th Street
• Historic Preservation Retreat: 07/12/2012 at Tempe Learning Center, 8:00 AM
• AZ Historic Sites Review Commission, 07/27/2012, 9:00 am Arizona State Parks, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix

Adjourned: 7:25 PM

______________________________
Andrea Gregory, Chair
- minutes scheduled for HPC approval on 08/09/2012
FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS OR ACRONYMS

CDD – City of Tempe Community Development Department: The Community Development Department plans the long range future of Tempe land for transportation corridors, business districts and residential areas as well as administering permits and oversight of current construction. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office is an agency of the Department.

CLG – Certified Local Government: In 1980, Congress established a framework for local preservation programs through an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act empowering Arizona cities and counties to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). Once certified, these entities are eligible for specialized assistance and funds for developing their own local preservation programs and entitled to comment on NR and other SHPO activities within their boundaries. The City of Tempe became a CLG in 1995.

DDA – Development & Disposition Agreement: a redevelopment contract between the City and one or more developers or redevelopers specifying terms and conditions for construction or reconstruction.


GRIC – Gila River Indian Community: is an alliance of two tribes, the Akimel O’odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa). Established by Executive Order in 1859, the Community covers more than 600 square miles and is the largest indigenous community in the Phoenix metropolitan area. GRIC helps make the Tempe Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program possible through a generous grant of State-Shared Revenue funds.

HSRC – (Arizona) Historic Sites Review Committee: Arizona's official Arizona and National Register of Historic Places review board. The HSRC meets three times during the year to review National Register nominations and advise the State Historic Preservation Officer on nominations to the State and National Registers.

IRS – Issue Review Session: informal Mayor and Council public meeting where members of the public may come forward and talk with City Council during the “Call to the Audience” prior to regular Council meetings.

NPS – National Park Service: the City of Tempe is a Certified Local Government through an inter-governmental agreement with the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.

NRN – National Register Nomination: An application to list a property on the National Register of Historic Places is reviewed by the SHPO and then by the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee (Sites) before formal application is made to the Keeper of the National Register in Washington DC.

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office: a division of Arizona State Parks, responsible for the identification, evaluation, and protection of Arizona’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources; established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

SRP-MIC – Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: created by Executive Order on June 14, 1879 by President Rutherford B. Hayes, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) is located in Maricopa County, aside the boundaries of Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and metropolitan Phoenix.

Tempe HPC – Tempe Historic Preservation Commission: Created by Ordinance 95.35, adopted November 9, 1995. Members serve three year terms with the exception of the initial appointments; charged with administering the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance and Plan, as well as advising Mayor / Council on all matters related to historic preservation.

Tempe HPF – Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation: A private nonprofit corporation established in 2005, Mission Statement 02.02.06 “The Foundation advocates preserving Tempe’s at-risk historic properties and supporting worthy preservation projects through education, community participation, and fundraising.”

Tempe HPO – Tempe Historic Preservation Office: Responsible for the identification and conservation of Tempe’s prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Office uses Federal, state, and city funding for the historic preservation program and assists owners of historic properties with grant applications, property maintenance, and preservation activities; provides staff support to the Tempe HPC.

THM – Tempe History Museum: Located at 809 E. Southern Avenue in Tempe, the Museum is a center where the community comes together to celebrate Tempe's past and ponder the future. Permanent and changing exhibits, educational programs, and research projects generally focus on some aspect of Tempe's history within the context of state and national events.

TOD – Tempe Transportation Overlay District: placed to encourage appropriate land development and redevelopment consistent with and complementary to the community’s focused investment in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure in certain geographic areas of the City; typically in association with the light rail.

ZDC – Zoning & Development Code: Adopted by Mayor and Council on January 20, 2005, effective February 22, 2005, the Code implements Tempe General Plan 2030 by encouraging creative development of the built environment in order to build a community that promotes the livability and uniqueness of Tempe; establishes zoning districts and development standards.
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission Retreat

MEETING MINUTES

Date: SATURDAY, July 14, 2012

Location: TLC Classroom (lower level Tempe Public Library)
3500 S. Rural Rd.

Commissioners Present: Ira Bennett Andrea Gregory
Anne Bilsbarrow Charlie Lee
Brad Graham Korri Turner
Andrea Gregory, Chair

Staff Present: Alyssa Gerzewski Alyssa Matter
Nathan Hallam Joe Nucci
William Kiser Mark Vinson

Public Present: Vic Linoff

Call to Order: 8:05 A.M., Andrea Gregory, Chair

1. Commission member “sponsorship” of projects or activities on the agenda
   - Looking for a point person on the commission for each project – they would then speak about each project at the HPC meetings.
   - This is already informally in place – looking to formally implement.
   - Possibly add a list of upcoming projects in the monthly packet.
   - The in progress projects are:
     o 2040 Plan
     o Double Butte Cemetery NRN
     o Tempe Municipal Building NRN
     o Moeur Park NRN
     o Kirkland McKinney Ditch
   - The in progress projects and the assigned commission member:
     o 2040 Plan – Anne Bilsbarrow and Brad Graham
     o Double Butte Cemetery NRN – Ira Bennett
     o Tempe Municipal Building NRN – Anne Bilsbarrow
     o Moeur Park NRN – Korri Turner
     o Kirkland McKinney Ditch – Charlie Lee
   - The Historic Preservation Commission Plan
     o Develop and preserve Downtown Mill Avenue District and the Petroglyphs on Tempe Butte
     o Revisit the conversation with Patti Olson about the student awareness towards petroglyphs on Tempe Butte
     o Republish the written letter as an opinion piece in the ASU State Press to help raise awareness of petroglyphs on Tempe Butte
     o Possibly print flyers to hand out during Freshman Orientation
     o Brenda Shears will be asked to take lead on student awareness

2. Council Member Shadows
   - The commission hopes that the outcome of shadowing council members will make council members more aware of preservation projects and concerns
• Commission would like to discover existing relationships between commissioners and council members
• Commission would like to have a written list of talking points to have uniformity when talking with council members
• Commission wants to develop these relationships with council members early and before issues arise, this should be a proactive relationship
• It might be nice to give the council members a gift from the commission, a print of an historic building
• When speaking to council members it could be beneficial to focus on the economics of historic preservation
• Useful references about historic preservation and economics are:
  o Placeeconomics.com http://www.placeeconomics.com/
  o Economics of Historic Preservation by Donovan Rypkema
• Council Members will be shadowed by:
  o Mark Mitchell – Andrea Gregory
  o Onnie Shekerjian – Brad Graham
  o Robin Arredondo-Savage – Kori Turner
  o Shana Ellis – Brenda Sheras (verify)
  o Kolby Granville – Anne Bilsbarrow
  o Joel Navarro – Scott Sollday (verify)
  o Corey Woods – Ira Bennett
• Develop talking points at the next meeting
• Suggested to get on the DRC agenda with a similar Into to HP message
• Suggested to bring back the Preservation Awards
  o This would be a type of congratulations for the efforts made in preservation
• Suggested to appear before council in a study session to give an update on the work
• Suggested that Andrea take Mayor Mark Mitchell on a ride along of Tempe

3. Ordinance Review
• What do we mean by protection of properties?
  o “But have no right to protect” statement is awkward
  o “Protection” is misleading
• Why does the commission never see issues in a cultural resource area
• Officially put all cultural resource areas as HE historic eligible properties
  o Find all individual properties
  o Would need to notify every property owner
• Look at cultural resource areas or properties and see which are most at risk and then start with those to be listing as possibly historically eligible
• (Mark Vinson or Joe Nucci) speak with the city attorney about the technicalities of a historic eligible designation, Staff to follow up on Arizona Proposition 207 with Tempe City Attorney regarding Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance discussion
• The 2030 plan specifies density must be maintained but not the lot coverage – could this specification be added to the 2040 plan?
• Staff is to follow up on Prop 207, and to start identifying which properties are at risk
• Gregory: Question about list of archeologically sensitive sites - Nucci and Vinson state that the list exists

4. General Presentations at meetings about architectural types/styles and context overviews
• Want to brief commission with short presentations of styles and overviews of different historically sensitive topics
• Could go on at the end of the agenda so it can be dropped or moved if need be
• This is meant to be an educational opportunity for the commission as well as the public – would be added to the public website for easy access
- How would these presentations be packaged for use by the general public? Possibly a set of handouts or a web based presentation
- Joe’s and Mark’s ASU class presentations can be tied into these the starting point
- Presentations would run between 15 – 20 minutes at the HPC meetings
- If presenting to the council, handout would be a better way to convey the messages
- Maybe there is a possibility of using the Tempe Library/Museum for general public education
- Staff is to put together a list of presentations that are almost ready, this list is to be included within the next HPC meeting packet
- Some current possibilities are:
  - Talking points to the council members
  - Tempe Preservation Today
  - Tests for significance
  - Ethnographic histories of Tempe
  - Architectural styles of buildings in Tempe
  - Land use and zoning considerations/restrictions
  - State property tax program
  - Preserving eligibility and integrity for structures not yet nominated/historic
  - CRA—what does it mean?

5. Maps and/or database (HPIFs) of historic properties on local register.
- Hallam: Shares information regarding the creation of a GIS for historic properties listed locally and nationally. GIS map could be publically accessible through Tempe Historic Preservation website
- Linoff & Gregory: Tucson model to serve as a guide for creation of GIS map?

6. East Valley Coalition
- Gregory: Discussion about joining East Valley Coalition of Historic Preservation Commissions
- Gregory: Possibly send two representatives from each commission to ensure efficiency?
- Nucci: Encourages Commissioners to attend Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation meetings
- Gregory: Bennett and Bilsbarrow selected to attend next East Valley Coalition meeting

7. Commission Wish List
- Discussion about revisiting National Register Nomination for Hayden Flour Mill
- Gregory: Proposes separate meeting to move this process forward
- Bennett: Expresses interest in educating both Tempe Historic Preservation Commission and the community on preservation
- Bennett: Interested in knowing more about historic context of residential neighborhood
- Bennett: Suggests social activities for Tempe Historic Preservation Commission
- Bilsbarrow: Advocates suggestion for social event

8. Review of Tempe Historic Preservation Plan
- Gregory & Nucci: Plan to be discussed during General Plan 2040 update at August HPC meeting
- Bilsbarrow: Los Angeles district plans to serve as guide?
- Vinson: Albuquerque to serve as possible guide as well?
- Nucci: Requests that HPC review current plan

Adjourn 12:02 pm

Andrea Gregory, Chair
-minutes scheduled for HPC approval on 08/09/2012
FREQUENTLY USED ABBREVIATIONS OR ACRONYMS

- CDD – City of Tempe Community Development Department: Established February 15, 2005, by City Manager Will Manley. The CDD consists of six divisions: Economic Development, Housing Services, Redevelopment, Neighborhood Enhancement, Rio Salado/Town Lake, and Special Projects, as well as the Community Design Studio / City Architect. The Tempe Historic Preservation Office is an agency of the Special Projects Division.
- CLG – Certified Local Government: In 1980, Congress established a framework for local preservation programs through an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act empowering Arizona cities and counties to become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). Once certified, these entities are eligible for specialized assistance and funds for developing their own local preservation programs and entitled to comment on NR and other SHPO activities within their boundaries. The City of Tempe became a CLG in 1995.
- DDA – Development & Disposition Agreement: a redevelopment contract between the City and one or more developers or redevelopers specifying terms and conditions for construction or reconstruction.
- DSD – City of Tempe Development Services Department: dealing with Building Safety, Land Use, Planning and Zoning
- GRIC – Gila River Indian Community: is an alliance of two tribes, the Akimel O’odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa). Established by Executive Order in 1859, the Community covers more than 600 square miles and is the largest indigenous community in the Phoenix metropolitan area. GRIC helps make the Tempe Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program possible through a generous grant of State-Shared Revenue funds.
- HPF – (see Tempe HPF) Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation
- HSRC – (Arizona) Historic Sites Review Committee: Arizona's official Arizona and National Register of Historic Places review board. The HSRC meets three times during the year to review National Register nominations and advise the State Historic Preservation Officer on nominations to the State and National Registers.
- IEBC – International Existing Building Code: adopted by Tempe City Council by Ordinance No. 2005.89 on December 1, 2005, as part of the code body promulgated by the International Code Council, provides means for preservation of existing Tempe building inventory through reasonable and feasible code processes.
- IRS – Issue Review Session: informal Mayor and Council public meeting where members of the public may come forward and talk with City Council during the “Call to the Audience” prior to regular Council meetings.
- NPS – National Park Service: the City of Tempe is a Certified Local Government through an inter-governmental agreement with the United States Department of the Interior National Park Service and the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office.
- NRN – National Register Nomination: An application to list a property on the National Register of Historic Places is reviewed by the SHPO and then by the Arizona Historic Sites Review Committee (Sites) before formal application is made to the Keeper of the National Register in Washington DC.
- PAD – Planned Area Development: site plan overlay to define development standards for a specific project.
- SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office: a division of Arizona State Parks, responsible for the identification, evaluation, and protection of Arizona's prehistoric and historic cultural resources; established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.
- SRP-MIC – Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: created by Executive Order on June 14, 1879 by President Rutherford B. Hayes, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) is located in Maricopa County, aside the boundaries of Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and metropolitan Phoenix.
- Tempe HPC – Tempe Historic Preservation Commission: Created by Ordinance 95.35, adopted November 9, 1995. Members serve three year terms with the exception of the initial appointments; charged with administering the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance and Plan, as well as advising Mayor / Council on all matters related to historic preservation
- Tempe HPO – Tempe Historic Preservation Office: Responsible for the identification and conservation of Tempe's prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Office uses Federal, state, and city funding for the historic preservation program and assists owners of historic properties with grant applications, property maintenance, and preservation activities; provides staff support to the Tempe HPC.
- THM – Tempe Historical Museum: Located at 809 E. Southern Avenue in Tempe, the Tempe Historical Museum is a center where the community comes together to celebrate Tempe's past and ponder the future. Permanent and changing exhibits, educational programs, and research projects generally focus on some aspect of Tempe's history within the context of state and national events.
- TOD – Tempe Transportation Overlay District: placed to encourage appropriate land development and redevelopment consistent with and complementary to the community's focused investment in transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure in certain geographic areas of the City; typically in association with the light rail.
- ZDC – Zoning & Development Code: Adopted by Mayor and Council on January 20, 2005, effective February 22, 2005, the ZDC implements Tempe General Plan 2030 by encouraging creative development of the built environment in order to build a community that promotes the livability and uniqueness of Tempe; establishes zoning districts and development standards.
July 10, 2012

Dear Friends and Neighbors,

On June 28th the Tempe City Council voted unanimously to approve the fifth out of character, opposed development in the Maple Ash Neighborhood since 1986. At that time they also gave the developer/speculators the go-ahead to combine three properties into a single property, effectively up-zoning the property by allowing more units to be built. The City Council let stand the approval by the Development Review Commission to allow a use permit for tandem parking. They added stipulations on visitor parking for the project. The developers are not being held to best-practice development, which would have provided enough parking on site without variances. Sad that the Council was not as sympathetic to long-standing neighbors in opposition to this project.

For many years the City Council and the Development Review Commission have approved projects in Maple Ash that are not in the interest of residents or are well outside the zoning regulations and neighborhood plans. The inordinate influence of developers and speculators to call the shots on what gets built is as obvious to long-time residents as it is perplexing.

The Development Review Commission approved an over-sized, unwanted by immediate neighbors project at 959 S. Ash recently. This was not a surprise. I expected more from the City Council, however, on appeal of the project and opposition to granting a combination of three lots.

There were legitimate grounds to deny the project. Street parking for that block is bad now and will become worse once this apartment block fronted by three charming houses is complete. This will happen even with stipulations to decrease the impacts of parking on neighbors. The Council could have denied the requested parking use permit that the developers needed to proceed. Just because the developers had modified their project a bit, doesn’t make the project fit.

The Maple Ash Neighborhood deserves better. The small neighborhood runs the length of the two streets between the railroad tracks and Mill Avenue from University through 13th Street to Hudson Lane. Maple Ash totals 50 acres and has approximately 190 properties within it. ASU looms to the east and Downtown Tempe towers to the north. Maple Ash is the oldest neighborhood left standing relatively intact in the city of Tempe.

A large group of residents and owners, most living in the neighborhood, have worked hard to preserve the neighborhood for the past 26 years. We don't have so much as a neighborhood plan to show for our efforts. We have completed over a dozen planning processes. We have stood before the City Council on numerous occasions to make our case.

We have lost zoning rights in our multi-family R3R zoning category. Our property was rezoned in 2005 to allow 30 feet maximum height, an increase from 15 feet allowable. Without that zoning change, the ugly, too-large Spanish style units at 1120-22 South Ash would not exist.

At that time the maximum lot coverage in the multi-family R3 zoning category changed to 50 percent from 40 percent. Under the 40 percent maximum lot coverage regulation, the project at 959 S. Ash would not be as dense as it now will be.

The development team, including a zoning attorney and a publicist, disingenuously presented a
depiction of the project that allowed the massive back structure to melt into an imagined lushness and obscurity. They did not show a straight-on depiction of what this project would look like from the sidewalk. Very little of the height and none of the massing is visible in this dishonestly skewed, artistic perspective. City Councilmembers looked at the tasteful rendering of three charming front houses and said, "Oh! It's beautiful."

I am angry that the developers manipulated everyone present with their disingenuous artwork.

I am angry with council persons for not denying what was easily deniable - the use permit for tandem parking.

This is the fifth project that the neighborhood has protested over the past two plus decades. Each one has delivered unhappy surprises. Large scale developments are destroying what is left of the small-scale, multifamily residential character in Maple Ash.

To repeat: Maple Ash is the oldest relatively intact neighborhood left in the city. Owners of 60 properties signed petitions against the project and against the combination of lots over a two-week period, most of them owners-in-residence. More than 60 residents and community friends signed as well. If the good people on the City Council cared about this neighborhood at all, or took a balanced approach to development in the neighborhood given wide-spread opposition to out-of-character development, they would have stood up on June 28, 2012 and said, "enough!" to the developers and speculators.

Many of us are weary of big money from outside coming into our neighborhood to steer its course and design. They have been allowed to do this for 26 years while residents have had zero to minimal say on a plan for orderly development.

I realize that not all of you receiving this email were in opposition to the project. Thanks go to all that have a legitimate interest in the fate of Maple Ash, many simply because you walk or drive or bike through. I do not consider greed and speculation legitimate qualifications to override residential desires. One can understand a project not delivering and getting through city process the first time and even the second time, but certainly not the third, fourth and fifth times. Shame on me, as they say. So where is the backing of the council people who are so supportive of Tempe neighborhoods?

I am grateful to those of you who have supported this effort and the attempts of our neighborhood association, surrounding neighborhoods and other friends to conserve Maple Ash. Thank you.

Karyn Gitlis, Chair
Maple Ash Neighborhood Association
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moeur Park WPA Structures National Register Nomination</td>
<td>Alyssa Gerszewski</td>
<td>Korri Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland-McKinney Ditch National Register Nomination</td>
<td>Nathan Hallam</td>
<td>Charlie Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe Double Butte Cemetery National Register Nomination</td>
<td>Billy Kiser</td>
<td>Ira Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe Municipal Building National Register Nomination</td>
<td>Alyssa Matter</td>
<td>Anne Bilsbarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Graduate Student Intern Program</td>
<td>Joe Nucci</td>
<td>Andrea Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Plan Rewrite</td>
<td>Billy Kiser</td>
<td>Anne Bilsbarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP2040 - Cultural Resource Area Survey &amp; Inventory</td>
<td>Nathan Hallam</td>
<td>Brad Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP2040 - Multi-Family Housing Survey &amp; Inventory</td>
<td>Alyssa Gerszewski</td>
<td>Brad Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempe (Hayden) Butte Petroglyphs Protection</td>
<td>Billy Kiser</td>
<td>Brenda Shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Maps and Inventory Forms for Listed Properties</td>
<td>Nathan Hallam</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Flour Mill &amp; Silos Designation and Listing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Eligible Properties Denotation and Listing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Scott Solliday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear Neighbors:

Good News! Borden Homes is now listed as a National Register of Historic Places Historic District and a committee composed of neighbors and city volunteers, with the help of Tempe Preservation volunteers and staff has drawn up this set of guidelines to establish the criteria for determining which homes are “contributing properties” (i.e. what makes your house eligible for the status “Historic Home”). The process used and the factors considered are all discussed in detail in the attached document, the Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines. If you have any interest in Tempe history, please read it; it will give you a sense of the importance of your home in the development of the Phoenix area post WWII. Many of us think Southwestern History consists of Native American and early Spanish History in the Valley, and do not realize that our homes also make a contribution to the story.

In reading these guidelines please understand that we worked on setting reasonable requirements; basically, could the original owner of the property recognize it today? Also, note that there is no “stick” but only “carrot” to encourage homeowners to bring their homes into the category of “contributing property.” If your home contributes you can apply for a substantial reduction in property taxes for fifteen to thirty years along with the enhancement of the home value that accompanies the historic classification. No one will make you do or not do anything to your property outside of existing City Zoning, Development, and Building Safety Codes. With that in mind, please relax and read!

For the Committee,

George K Wittenberg,
Borden Homes Homeowner
INTRODUCTION

1 BORDEN HOMES HISTORIC CHARACTER
   1.1 Neighborhood Description
   1.2 Character-Defining Features of the District

   Architectural Styles
   1.3 Early/Transitional Ranch style
   1.4 Simple Ranch style
   1.5 Later Ranch style

2 PRESERVATION REVIEW PROCESS
   Policy Basis for Design Guidelines
   2.1 Historic Preservation Review Process

3 EXTERIOR BUILDING FEATURES
   3.1 Preserve – Repair – Replace
   3.2 Foundations
   3.3 Exterior Walls
   3.4 Roofs
   3.5 Windows
   3.6 Porches
   3.7 Awnings, Shades and Shutters
   3.8 Entrance Doors and Screen Doors

4 ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS
   4.1 Borden Homes Design Guidelines Evaluation Process
   4.2 HPC Standards for Evaluating Additions and Alterations in the Borden Homes Historic District
   4.3 SHPO Standards for Evaluation
   4.4 Compatible Design of New Additions
   4.5 Significant Historic-Era Additions
   4.6 Non-Contributing Building Alterations
   4.7 Detached Buildings
   4.8 Energy Conservation
   4.9 Health, Safety and Accessibility
5 IN-FILL BUILDINGS
5.1 New In-Fill Buildings
5.2 Streetscape Pattern
5.3 Building Height
5.4 Building Form
5.5 Building Materials
5.6 Building Features

6 SITE FEATURES AND SETTING
6.1 Entrance Courtyards
6.2 Sidewalks and Walkways
6.3 Driveways, Streets and Parking
6.4 Fences
6.5 Landscape and Irrigation
6.6 Lighting
6.7 Accessory Structures and Features
6.8 Equipment and Utilities Placement

APPENDICES
A. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
C. Tempe Historic-Era Plant Materials (Trees)
   Tempe Historic-Era Plant Materials (Shrubs and Groundcover)
   Tempe Historic-Era Plant Materials (Vines and Annuals)
D. Glossary of Terms
E. References
With the end of World War II, Arizona in general, and Tempe in particular, experienced unprecedented population growth and economic expansion. From 1945 to 1960, Tempe opened more than one hundred new subdivisions for development and frequent annexations saw the city’s boundaries expand eight-fold. Residential development trends that began in the post-war period are reflected in thousands of Tempe houses and structures that were built during this time. Many of these post-war Tempe neighborhoods continue to contribute to the unique character of our community today.

Borden Homes Historic District is one of the earliest post-war neighborhoods in Tempe. The district is historically significant as a well-preserved post-World War II neighborhood that is representative of new approaches to subdivision development and residential design and construction in Tempe in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Borden Homes was the first subdivision of tract homes established east of Tempe after the war. Built in anticipation of the emerging population boom; successful development of Borden Homes soon caused the city to expand and incorporate the subdivision within the city limits through annexation.

Borden Homes Historic District has been designated historic and listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register as well as the National Register of Historic Places. The Tempe Register is the official list of historically, culturally, and visually significant buildings, structures, landmarks, districts, and archaeological sites in Tempe that have undergone the process of historic designation provided by city code and ordinances.

The intent of historic designation is to provide protection for significant properties and archaeological sites which represent important aspects of Tempe’s heritage, to enhance the character of the community by taking such properties and sites into account during development, and to assist owners in the preservation and restoration of their properties.
Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines assist in managing change in the district. The guidelines seek to identify a range of solutions that allows a property to be adapted to a modern use maintaining its historic integrity and its status as a contributing property to the historic district. The guidelines provide an understanding of the historic significance of the neighborhood and by calling attention to the character-defining features of buildings and properties. This understanding can inform decision-making with regard to maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and new construction, by identifying alternatives that conserve and enhance the historic character of the district.

Property owners can use the guidelines for planning exterior alterations or additions to properties in the district and for design of new or relocated buildings in the district.

Tempe Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and City Staff will use the guidelines to approve requests for alterations to properties in the district and to evaluate the appropriateness of the City’s own projects in and adjacent to the district.
Borden Homes Historic District demonstrates the evolution of rapidly changing homebuilding methods in the post-WWII era in Tempe. The majority of houses in the Borden Homes Historic District were constructed in three discrete phases within a ten-year period beginning in 1947. During this time, construction materials and methods developed by wartime industries found new applications in raising the productivity and controlling costs amidst a post-war residential construction boom. Attendant upon the rapid expansion of residential construction was the advent of new building safety regulations in the form of standardized building codes being implemented across the country. Tempe was following a national trend when, on June 12, 1952, Council adopted the 1949 Edition of the Uniform Building Code, as the first Tempe building regulation to provide minimum standards for safeguarding life, health, property, and public welfare.

The earliest houses in the Borden Homes Historic District are predominantly small brick masonry houses that are similar in size and design yet with enough variation in plan, masonry style, roof types, and porch types, as to make each house appear to be unique. Homes built later exhibit a change in construction with the introduction of concrete block as the primary building material and the more elongated plan characteristic of the true Ranch style. The last of the original homes demonstrate the continuing evolution of the Ranch style in the post-war era with standard features including slab foundations, steel casement windows, and asphalt shingle roofs. Further evolution could continue to happen by providing carports under the main roof as part of the designed expandability of these homes, which allowed them keep pace with growing families. It is hard to capture the significance of the Borden Homes subdivision simply by physical description. Instead, it is in the larger community setting that the district develops significance as a representation of fulfillment of deeply held values about home in American society. Protection of the collection of properties as a whole is essential to maintaining district character. These humble houses develop significance through the integrity of their setting.

Information is based on the nomination that listed the district in the National Register of Historic Places as prepared by historian Scott Solliday (2011), and on data used to designate and list the district in the Tempe Historic Property Register.
I.1 NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Borden Homes Historic District is a 17-acre residential subdivision located one mile east of Arizona State University and downtown Tempe. The approximately 70 single-family zoned lots in the L-shaped district are arranged along three streets. Comprising the 1000 and 1100 blocks of South Una Avenue, 1000 and 1100 blocks of South Butte Avenue, and the 1600 and 1700 blocks of West 12th Street, the district is zoned R1-6 and is identified as a Cultural Resource Area in Tempe General Plan 2030.

The chronological development of the subdivision from south to north to east spanned the decade after World War II, a time when building materials, methods, and regulations were changing rapidly. Today the streetscape of the Borden Homes Historic District retains a secluded, quiet atmosphere and a strong sense of place. Many properties have uninterrupted, open front yards. Original sidewalks, curbs, and gutters from 1959 remain intact, although many dirt or gravel driveways have since been replaced with concrete. The Tempe City Council designated the neighborhood as an historic district on June 2, 2005 and it was listed on the National Register of Historic Places on November 18, 2011.

Overall the neighborhood presents a generally uniform streetscape of small, one-story houses on large lots with flood-irrigated landscapes. Mature shade trees, large shrubs, and lush lawns resulting from years of flood irrigation, along with the visible elements of irrigation, are significant character-defining features of the historic district.

Roughly two-thirds of the houses in the district were built within the first three years of development, including the twenty-five houses built in the Early Transitional Ranch style. By the end of the period of significance (1959) over ninety percent of the houses (n=65/69) had been built, with the majority having been constructed in the Simple Ranch style. The initial and brief period of Early Transitional Ranch style building exemplifies the rapid evolution of residential design and construction methods in Tempe during the post-war period.
Several houses in the Borden Homes Historic District have sensitive additions that do not adversely affect the character of the individual property or the overall streetscape. However, several newer houses in the neighborhood do not contribute to the distinctive character of the district. Constructed in 1966, 1967, 1971, and 2009, these four properties do not date to the period of significance (1947-1959) and are of unrelated architectural character.

The **design guidelines process** begins with identification of the form and detailing of those materials and features that are important to maintaining the historic character or integrity of a district’s property. A character-defining feature is critical to conveying the historical significance of a property. These are the features of the property that should be retained in order to preserve that character and convey historic significance.

Most homes in Borden Homes display two different types of masonry patterns. This home is an example of the use of two different patterns to break up the exterior front of the home.
The Borden Homes design guidelines provides guidance on identifying character-defining features, and guidance on retaining and preserving the character of an historic property. The ability to recognize what is important to retain can provide an architectural theme or indicate a thematic context for rehabilitation and reuse. This informed decision-making may lead to sensitive or conspicuously appropriate design solutions. The following will assist in identifying the form and detailing of character-defining features for both the District overall, as well as each of the three primary house types within the Borden Homes Historic District.

Diagram - Early/Transitional Ranch Homes in the Neighborhood (Matter 2012)
1.2 CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF BORDEN HOMES HISTORIC DISTRICT

- Small, one-story houses on large lots
- Consistent spacing between houses
- Flood-irrigated yards and lush, mature landscaping
- Lush irrigated front lawns continuous from lot to lot
- 35-foot front yard dramatically punctuated by mature shade tree(s)
- Asphalt-paved streets
- Continuous concrete sidewalks with rolled curbs along both sides of street
- Straight walkways to the front entries of each house
- Consistent lot width, depth and shapes (rectangular or square corner lots)

The Early/ Transitional Ranch Style House

The Borden Homes Historic District - Tempe AZ

Main Roof Forms
Gable Sheathing

Character Defining Features

Foundation & Floor Slab
Porch Floors

Original Entrance Doors

Exterior Masonry Patterns

Barge Boards

Window Patterns

Eave Moldings

Diagram - Ranch Style House Kit Of Parts (Matter 2012)
1.3 EARLY/TRANSITIONAL RANCH STYLE

The first homes built in the Borden Homes Historic District are representative of a turning point in Tempe homebuilding, largely reflecting a broad national trend in residential architecture in the years following World War II. These are small brick houses with a simple design that could be built quickly and sold for between $5,800 and $6,600. These are outstanding examples of the Early/Transitional Ranch style, a distinct style identified throughout the Phoenix Metropolitan Area.

The Early/Transitional Ranch style house has a massing and plan similar to earlier Period Revival styles, but ornamentation is largely nonexistent. Features such as concrete slab foundations, steel casement windows, and asphalt shingle roofs associated with the emerging Ranch style are already present, but these houses lack the elongated facades and horizontal emphasis characteristic of subsequent Ranch style houses.

In Tempe, the Early/Transitional Ranch style marked the initial departure from the vernacular four- or five-room house constructed in the National Folk style. These homes are indicative of a new paradigm of residential construction in the post-WWII period that began to differentiate a unique style in the American Southwest, one that remained at variance from other regional expressions.

Roughly two-thirds of the houses in the Borden Homes Historic District were built between 1947 and 1949, including all twenty-five of the Early/Transitional Ranch style examples built in the 1100 blocks of South Una and South Butte Avenues. While each of these houses is similar in size and design, various combinations of floor plan, roof type, porch, and masonry style were used to give each home a unique appearance with much more variation than was seen in later phases.
CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES OF THE EARLY/TRANSITIONAL RANCH

- Built without carports (a few houses had detached garages at the rear)
- Small houses on large lots, originally about 900-sf houses on 7,850-sf lots (12%)
- One-story L-shaped or rectilinear floor plans
- Low-pitched hip, gable, or intersecting hip-and-gable roof forms
- The roof is clad predominantly with asphalt or asbestos shingles
- No true front porch but broad overhanging eave supported by posts - a few houses have a small front-facing gable porch at the entry
- Brick masonry patterns vary but the Flemish bond row-lock pattern is common
1.4 SIMPLE RANCH STYLE

Houses built in the 1000 blocks of South Una and South Butte Avenues in 1949 and 1950 exhibit a significant change in construction with the introduction of concrete masonry (block) and with more elongated floor plans and horizontal emphasis. Taken together, these houses represent an important incremental shift in the evolution of the Ranch form—which, for sake of differentiation from earlier and later motifs, will refered to as the Simple Ranch style. Concurrent with changes in design and materials, sweeping changes in building codes for residential masonry construction were taking place throughout the Valley.

The engineering implications of masonry reinforcement impacted many aspects of residential development and caused both the gradual transition to, and the overwhelming success of, what would ultimately become recognized as the Ranch style house. By 1949, when construction had moved up to the 1000 blocks of South Una and South Butte Avenues, all houses were of concrete construction and long, low facades with strong horizontal emphasis indicating that the Ranch style was emerging.

These houses clearly reflect the Ranch style that was emerging across mid-century America. Homes were of common bond concrete block with a narrow plan and a broad facade spanning more of the lot’s width. Houses in the 1000 block of Butte Avenue built from 1949 to 1950 are of much simpler design than those on Una Avenue. Almost all have a rectilinear plan and a hip-of-side gable roof. Many have a distinctive new style of porch with a broad front-gabled porch roof supported by masonry columns.
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF THE SIMPLE RANCH STYLE

- Built without garages
- Built with concrete masonry (block), painted
- One story, less than 1,200-sf area
- More elongated floor plans
- Overall low horizontal emphasis
- Concrete slab on grade floor
- Low-pitch gable or hip roof
- Small, covered front porch or stoop
- Roofs sheathed predominantly with asphalt shingles
- Rectangular window openings
- Steel casement windows
- Variation in use and type of exterior materials, such as clay brick, glass block accent windows, and wood siding at gable ends

Diagram - Ranch Homes in the Neighborhood  (Matter 2012)
- Variation in ornamental details (fascia board trim, shutters, porch posts)
- Stylistic treatment of materials and details is used evenly on all sides
- Front facade may be enhanced with minor ornamentation

1.5 LATER RANCH STYLE

Houses built on 12th Street after 1950 show the further evolution of the Ranch style and are distinguished most quickly by the carport now being incorporated under the main roof of the house. The houses are still small, typically less than 1,200-sf as originally built. The predominant type has an L-shaped plan and intersecting gable roof with an extended eave porch over the junction of the two wings. Another common model has an L-shaped plan with a recessed porch under a side-gable roof. Almost all houses built in the 1600 blocks of East 12th Street have a carport incorporated under the main roof of the house.

The integral carport feature is typical of the ultimate form of the Ranch style house of the American Southwest. Several of these houses have enclosed the carport to add additional living space. This Later Ranch style provided built-in expandability to the post-war Ranch style and introduced the concept of the starter-house, one that could be economically adapted to keep pace with the needs of growing families during the baby-boom era. This inherent expandability has been taken advantage of by property owners frequently. The State Historic Preservation Office provides special guidance on how the carport, an integral component of the Ranch style house type, has successfully been modified over time.
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF THE LATER RANCH STYLE

- Built-out carports under the main roof of the house
- Built with concrete masonry (block), painted
- Overall low horizontal emphasis
- One story, less than 1,200 sf area
- L-shaped plan and intersecting gable roof, with...
- Extended eave porch over the junction of the two wings, or...
- Recessed porch under a side gable roof
- Concrete slab on grade floor
- Roofs sheathed predominantly with asphalt shingles
- Rectangular window openings
- Steel casement windows
- Stylistic treatment of materials and details is used evenly on all sides
- Front facade may be enhanced with minor ornamentation

These are the materials and features that are important to be retained in the process of rehabilitation work, the following Design Guidelines will examine opportunities for protecting and maintaining them.
Guidelines provide a basis for managing change that affects the appearance of individual buildings or the general character of the district. Guidelines do not dictate design solutions; instead, they identify a range of responses to specific design issues affecting historic resources.

This document provides guidance for sensitively changing single-family historic residential properties by complying with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. By so doing, a homeowner will have a better chance of qualifying for the historic property tax reclassification program and for other historic preservation grants and incentives.

Guidelines in this document provide direction for specific changes and follow basic principles specified by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Design and construction proposals that can be demonstrated to comply with the Secretary’s Standards will be accepted as meeting the intent of these guidelines (see Appendix B). Standards and Guidelines emphasize retention and repair of historic materials and provide latitude for replacement. Guidelines focus on preservation of the character-defining features of a property; those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character. A property may exhibit less than three minor changes to the character defining features and still be considered a contributing property.
2.1 HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW PROCESS

Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines are authorized by Tempe City Code Chapter 14A - Historic Preservation in keeping with community policies regarding review of alterations and additions to properties, new buildings, and site work, located in the Borden Homes Historic District.

City of Tempe General Plan 2030 lists as a major community objective the preservation of historic resources. It also notes that it is desirable to maintain the existing residential density of locally designated neighborhoods.

When a building permit or approval is required to alter, remodel, build or otherwise develop or landscape property located in the Borden Homes Historic District, City Code stipulates that permits or approvals shall be deferred until approval has been obtained from the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission. When the work is obviously minor in nature, the Tempe Historic Preservation Office can provide administrative-level approval. Commission or administrative-level approval or denial will be based on how well proposed changes meet the intent or objectives stated in these guidelines. Issuance of historic preservation approval indicates conformity with the provisions and intent of these guidelines only and does not imply approval by other City or regulatory agencies.
3 EXTERIOR BUILDING FEATURES

Exterior building features help define the character of historic properties. A building’s architectural details add visual interest, distinguish building styles and types, and often reflect craftsmanship characteristic of a particular period in time. Features such as windows, doors, porch posts, and roof eaves display materials, finishes, and designs that are associated with specific architectural styles and historic periods.

According to the National Park Service, a character-defining feature is a prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a historic property that contributes significantly to its physical character. Character-defining features are property features such as materials, spaces, and finishes that help convey the property’s historic significance. The ongoing ability of a property to convey its historic significance is called historic integrity. The historic integrity of a property survives only when critical character-defining features remain intact. When making changes to historic properties it is often necessary to determine which features are most important to preserve in order avoid or minimize harm or to determine whether proposed rehabilitation, preservation, maintenance and other activities are consistent with the preservation objective.

Character-defining features are different for each architectural style. Identification and evaluation of these features does not address intangible qualities, such as feeling or association with significant persons or events, but works from the understanding that historic significance is often embodied in the tangible aspects of a property that include its setting, form, and essential physical features.

In the three developmental stages of the Ranch style home on display in the Borden Homes Historic District, simplicity of design and construction is arguably the most consistent stylistic theme. Simplicity was perhaps the greatest advantage of the Ranch style in the early post-war period as it enabled fast and efficient housing production to meet the growing demand for affordable housing.
Early/Transitional Ranch, Simple Ranch, and Later Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District are devoid of elaborate detailing. Their most significant character-defining features are the porch, windows, doors, and the rooflines. Based on their historical importance and stylistic prominence, preservation of these basic features is important for appropriately managing change in the district. These character-defining features provide a sense of authenticity, scale, and aesthetic quality to the facade of the Ranch style house and should receive sensitive treatment during exterior rehabilitation and restoration work.

3.1 PRESERVE - REPAIR - REPLACE

Preserve Features - The best way to preserve historic building materials is through timely maintenance. Preserving original architectural features is critical to maintaining the integrity of any historic building.

Repair Features - When historic building materials are deteriorated, repairing rather than replacing materials is preferred. Frequently, damaged materials can be patched or consolidated using special bonding agents.

Replace Features - When materials or features are beyond repair, replacement is necessary. However, it is important to minimize the extent of replacement because the original materials contribute to the authenticity of the property as a historic resource. New material should be compatible with the original appearance, but be distinguishable from original construction. However, even when replacement materials exactly match originals, the integrity of a historic building is to some extent compromised by replacement. This is because the original material contains a record of the labor and craftsmanship of an earlier time. Integrity cannot be reproduced or recreated. The physical record of history is lost when materials are replaced; thus, conservation of original materials and features is strongly recommended.
3.2 FOUNDATIONS

Early/Transitional Ranch, Simple Ranch, and Later Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District all utilize the more cost-effective concrete slab-on-grade technique in favor of the raised wooden floors and crawl spaces characteristic of pre-war times.

For continued eligibility slab foundations should be maintained in good condition by keeping moisture away. Make sure the soil or pavement next to the slab-on-grade foundation slopes away to keep water from soaking down along the slab and surrounding soil. Provide rain gutters, downspouts, and concrete splash blocks to direct water away from the foundation.

For continued eligibility cracks in the foundation should be repaired with compatible patching material. If cracking is caused by differential settlement, which may, in turn, cause cracking of interior and exterior walls, professional consultation by a historical architect or structural engineer is recommended. Stabilize settling foundations using low-impact techniques. It is sometimes advisable to stop further settlement of a foundation rather than to raise it back into place. Replace or rebuild a new foundation only as a last resort.

3.3 EXTERIOR WALLS

Early/Transitional Ranch style houses constructed in 1947 differ subtly from the Simple and Later Ranch style houses from 1948 specifically in masonry shape and materials. Masonry is a character-defining architectural detail and should be preserved. Mortar joints that have become deteriorated should be re-pointed to prevent structural damage. Some of the Early/Transitional Ranch style houses in the district exhibit the rare but signature style in their distinctive brick masonry walls. Beginning with a base of brick wainscot to a height of three feet, a raised brick belt course is surmounted by upper walls laid up in the Flemish bond rowlock masonry pattern. This produced walls with special visual interest and is very rare in post-war Tempe subdivisions.
Simple and Later Ranch style houses built in the Borden Homes Historic District in 1948 and later, like virtually all new tract houses built in Tempe after 1947, were of concrete block construction. Painted concrete block is the primary material used on the exteriors of the Simple and Later Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District. Stucco was used once in the original material palette of the subdivision, its use should be discouraged in remodel projects because it is not a characteristic of the historic Ranch style house.

### 3.4 ROOFS

The Ranch style drew its inspiration from various sources, including early Prairie style houses designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. The simple and sparsely adorned house form reflected romantic imagery of the past and new social trends toward informality and casual home life embodied in post-war suburbia. The cohesive visual character of the Borden Homes Historic District results, in part, from consistent use of low-pitched cross-gable and hip roofs, typically with asphalt shingles. These low roof forms are a character-defining feature of the Ranch style house.

Early/Transitional Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District employ the low-pitched asphalt shingle roof in a variety of forms, including: intersecting gable, intersecting gable-and-hip, full hip, and side gable.

Simple Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District employ the low-pitched asphalt shingle roof over a rectilinear plan, with a hip or side-gable roof emblematic of the developing style.

Later Ranch style houses in the Borden Homes Historic District employ the low-pitched asphalt shingle roof to illustrate the further evolution of the form, with predominantly L-shaped plans and intersecting gable roofs extending at their intersecting junction to form an eave porch at the front entry. Another model has an L-shaped plan with a receded porch under a side-gable roof. Many of the Later Ranch style houses have a carport under the main roof of the house.
For continued eligibility a homeowner should preserve the original form, materials, eaves, details, and other character-defining features of an historic roof. Preserve the original overhang depth of the eaves. Minimize the visual impact of new skylights and other rooftop devices by installing them behind the ridgeline of the roof and away from view from the street. If new mechanical equipment, such as air conditioning or solar devices, are installed on the roof, place them to be inconspicuous from the street and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

3.5 WINDOWS

Windows are an important character-defining feature of the historic Ranch style house. Along with the front door, windows give scale to the building and provide visual interest to the composition of the facades. Distinct window designs help define the historic Ranch style. The depth of their position set into the thickness of the wall casts shadows that also contribute to the character of the facade. Proportions, orientation, divisions, and materials of a historic window are among its essential elements of design. Arrangement and number of panes, or “lights,” is also an important compositional element of windows. Virtually all-original windows in the Borden Homes Historic District were the steel casement type. Casement windows have an operable sash that swings open, typically to the outside. Nearly square or rectangular, these windows were usually divided into horizontal rectangular lights. The original steel casement windows have provided excellent service for decades and with proper maintenance can continue to function well into the future.

Some historic windows have been replaced with new windows that do not reflect the historic character of the house. In many instances, historic character can be emulated by adding muntins to reflect the proportions of the historic windows.
Replacing windows for greater energy efficiency may have unintended consequences. The window area is a relatively small portion of the total exterior surface of a house. Repairing and resetting historic windows, combined with adding insulation in the attic, can provide more effective energy performance without compromising the historic integrity of the house. In addition, removing and discarding serviceable building components such as windows and doors wastes their embodied energy and adds to landfills unnecessarily. Where historic windows still exist, they should be repaired rather than replaced. The original windows significantly contribute to the historic character of the Ranch style house. Even when replaced with an exact duplicate window, a portion of the historic character is lost. Distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship should be treated with sensitivity.

3.6 PORCHES

Early/Transitional Ranch style homes in the Borden Homes Historic District were constructed with no true porch, but instead with broad overhanging eaves at the juncture of the intersecting wings, often supported by porch posts.

Simple Ranch style homes in the Borden Homes Historic District were constructed in a number of design variations created through the treatment of the gable end or by using different configurations for the extended eave porch. Some overhanging eaves extended along more than half of the primary facade, providing a distinct covered entry supported by two or three posts. Others have small porches only at the entry, supported by brackets.

Later Ranch style houses relied more on the porch to provide shade, a sheltered entry, and visual interest to the entry facade. Sometimes running the entire length of the front of the house, porches integrated into the covered carport were a prominent feature of this house type.
Original porch features may require preservation because of deterioration or inappropriate alterations. Some may have had minor changes, while others may have been altered to the point of losing their original character. Original wood posts may have been replaced with uncharacteristic materials or covered with stucco. Porches may have been in-filled to create an entry or to increase living space. These treatments may compromise the proportions and integrity of the house. Extensive replacement of historic qualities or enclosure of the porch should be avoided. Although replacement of an entire porch is discouraged, such extreme measures may, in rare occasions, become necessary. Preferably, the design of the replacement porch should be a reconstruction of the original. Short of that approach, reconstruction should be based on examples of another house of the same period and style.

Maintain the porch and its character-defining features. If an historic porch must be enlarged or a carport is added, the new porch posts should be in scale and proportion to those used historically. Avoid changing the character of the historic porch by adding details and features such as porch railings or trellises.

3.7 AWNINGS, SHADES, AND SHUTTERS

Energy studies show that significant cost savings can be achieved by shading window openings. In addition to strategically placed landscaping, a number of architectural elements were commonly used to shade window openings on houses during the post-war period and can effectively block sunlight from striking the window without obscuring historic glazing patterns or details.
Awnings appear to have been installed on several houses in the Borden Homes Historic District, demonstrating the popularity of these devices during the historic period. Awnings continue to provide important and effective energy conservation and should be preserved. Maintain existing awnings in good repair. Modern materials such as acrylic fibers have significantly extended life expectancies compared to traditional canvas fabrics and can reduce long-term maintenance needs. Select fabric consistent in appearance with period colors and textures. If it is necessary to reduce sun exposure on windows, awnings can be an effective means of reducing heat gain. New installations should follow recommendations for reversibility and minimize damage to existing historic fabric.

Shade screen products were historically available in wide varieties to protect windows. Typically, these screens were designed as removable panels that were mounted at the onset of warm weather and taken down seasonally. The number of shade screen panels used to cover any given window was typically less than the number of panes in the sash, resulting in these exterior mounted screens completely changing observable window proportions and obscuring historic glazing patterns. Modern screens should not change the observable glazing patterns.

One of very few embellishments found on Ranch style houses in the district are the nonfunctional wood shutters on the windows in primary facades. These original shutters remain important character-defining features of an architectural style that used only minimal ornamentation.
3.8 ENTRANCE DOORS AND SCREEN DOORS

An entry that is appropriate to the style and period of significance helps to maintain the historic character of the district. Entry doors provide scale and visual interest to the primary facade. Entry doors on Ranch style houses have traditionally encompassed a wide range of design variations indicative of their historic antecedents. From the familiar frame-and-panel type, through the nine-lights-over cross-bucks, to the modern flush or slab construction, the Ranch house has drawn on a variety of door styles.

Historically, front entrance doors would almost always have a screen door for ventilation. This was typically a single-panel, insect-screened opening reinforced at hardware height by some unobtrusive decorative grille installed on the inside of the door.

Many houses in the district have had historic front entrance doors replaced for acoustic concerns. For the most part, new doors of compatible character have been installed in the original masonry openings. Other houses have had security doors installed that are not characteristic of the Ranch style and that visually obscure the historic front doors; these should be avoided.

Preserve decorative features of historic entrances and doors. Repair is a better approach than replacement if a door possesses significance through visual prominence on the facade or due to its stylistic characteristics.
On Thursday, January 14, 2010, the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission adopted standards for evaluating additions proposed for historic properties or for determining the effect of existing additions on historic integrity. These standards are based on the work of Linda McClelland in 2008, and are included on the following page of these guidelines.

4.1 BORDEN HOMES DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION PROCESS

On Wednesday, March 14, 2012, members of the Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines Work Group met to assess the existing conditions within the district and determine what the criteria should be to balance the diversity of the housing stock with the desire to maintain eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the Tempe Historic Property Register. The consensus of this grass-roots policy making is recorded in the minutes of that meeting and specific guidance is codified as items 1 through 7 herein.

1) A property will not be a contributing property if a detached two-story addition is built that can be seen from the street.

2) A room addition is acceptable if it is located in the backyard and is a single story-structure.

3) A carport addition, or front-of-house addition, cannot encroach into the historic front yard setback.

4) A property may exhibit two minor changes to the character-defining features and still be considered a contributing property.
5) If a property owner encloses their carport, they will be encouraged to use compatible materials that are distinct enough to preserve historic integrity to still be considered a contributing property.

6) A front porch enclosure is not allowed; property owners are to be discouraged from screening in the front porch.

7) The front facade of a property needs to be kept uniform through the use of the same steel casement windows and compatible materials that are unique to this community.

---

**Borden Homes Historic District Design Guidelines**

**Appropriate Additions**

- Sitting Room Addition
- Carport Addition
- Detached Garage Addition
- Multiple Additions

*Diagram - Appropriate Additions and Alterations (Matter 2012 quoting Ryden 2010)*
4.2 HPC STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS IN THE BORDEN HOMES HISTORIC DISTRICT

1. An addition should fall within the period of significance, and, in some cases, its date of construction may be used as the closing date of an extended period of significance.

2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should be sympathetic to the original design (i.e., stylistically appropriate, sensitively rendered, compatible in size and scale, with similar or compatible materials).

3. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should consider the cumulative effect of the change along with other changes that have been made or proposed (window replacement, siding, etc.).

4. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction that is not sympathetic in design must not substantially damage the historic property.

5. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not mimic the historic design to the extent that it becomes indistinguishable from the original building and thereby conveys a false sense of history.

6. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not overwhelm or dominate the historic character of the property as a whole or alter the property’s character-defining features, including significant open space.

7. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not be out-of-scale; rooftop additions and additions that obscure principal elevations are particularly problematic unless they are stepped back and appear small in scale.
8. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not hide a building’s principal facade from the public right-of-way and other significant viewpoints, or change the perceived orientation or number of entrances.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not impair significant or character-defining features of the historic resource.

10. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not impact the front-yard setback to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

These standards for evaluating additions proposed for historic properties or for determining the effect of existing additions on historic integrity are adopted by the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission. These standards are based on the work of Linda McClelland, 2008 “Evaluating the Significance of Additions and Accretions: A National Register White Paper”.

4.3 ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

SHPO has recently published guidance for evaluating building additions and alterations (AZ SHPO 2011). The SHPO protocol has been included for reference as Appendix A of these guidelines. SHPO evaluation protocol requires the significance of the addition to be assessed regardless of compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. Under SHPO evaluation protocol, the typical carport addition in Borden Homes Historic District could be determined not to be historically significant. However, the typical carport addition would still meet the Secretary’s Standards and, therefore the property could still be considered to contribute generally to the historic character of the district. Again under the SHPO evaluation protocol, in instances where a carport addition is determined to be significant and does not meet the Standards, most would be considered minor alterations and the property could still be considered contributing.
For purposes of evaluating a property as contributing to a Tempe Historic Property Register Historic District, it must be a property within a designated historic district that contributes generally to the distinctive character of the district. SHPO policy cited above is based on interpretation of National Park Service guidance and does not define the limits of local eligibility.

4.4 COMPATIBLE DESIGN OF ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS

Appropriate additions and alterations will relate to the scale of nearby historic buildings and to the general size, shape, and proportions of nearby historic buildings, and will not utilize primary building materials dissimilar, at least in appearance, to historic materials.

Appropriate additions and alterations will be in proportion to the overall size of the lot and will not appear to be too big for the lot when compared with nearby historic buildings. Maintain the established scale of the neighborhood’s houses and lots.

Appropriate additions and alterations will maintain setbacks and alignments of the buildings with the surrounding context and will not maximize front yard development standards. Setback from the street at a distance similar to that of nearby historic buildings and provide landscaped areas compatible with the historic setting. Maintain alignments of horizontal features on new roof ridges, eaves, porches, windows, and doors, with those of adjacent buildings to help ensure compatibility with the overall patterns of streetscape facades.
Appropriate additions and alterations will respect the design character of nearby historic properties and will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize these properties. Balance appropriate differentiation and compatibility with the character of the nearby historic properties. Do not make new work look older than it is. Differentiate style, design, and details subtly from the historic buildings through contemporary interpretation of the historic architecture.

4.5 SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC-ERA ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS

Most of the additions and alterations visible from the street in the Borden Homes Historic District occurred during the period of significance, 1947-1959, the most common change being the addition of a carport on the sides of houses on Una and Butte Avenues. The typical carport addition was a simple, flat roofed or very low-pitched shed roof structure supported by wood posts or iron poles that did not adversely affect the architectural or historic integrity of the houses. Many of the additions and alterations constructed within the period of significance have acquired historic significance in their own right and should be retained and preserved. A property may exhibit less than three minor changes to the character-defining features and still be considered a contributing property.
4.6 NON-CONTRIBUTING BUILDING ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS

Design of alterations and additions to noncontributing buildings should address the characteristics of both the non-contributing building and the contributing neighboring buildings. For historic-era buildings that have lost integrity, a rehabilitation project may be the ideal way to reverse incompatible alterations, allowing them to regain their original character and perhaps become eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Some of the additions and alterations visible from the street in the Borden Homes Historic District occurred outside of the period of significance or are substantially incompatible with the general historic character of the district. In a few cases, where an addition or alteration can be determined not to be significant, not to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and having a major effect on the integrity of the building, the property should be considered ineligible. This is an infrequent occurrence in the Borden Homes Historic District.

4.7 DETACHED BUILDINGS

The post-World War II “starter” houses of the Borden Homes Historic District were small buildings on spacious lots. They were intended to be improved and enlarged as families grew and new needs developed. During the early decades of the neighborhood, some homeowners constructed detached garages in the backyard in alignment with the wider side yard setback left clear for a driveway. The building of a detached one- or two-car garage was in keeping with the patterns of residential development of the early twentieth century when small Bungalow Era garages replaced Victorian Era stables. Borden Homes Historic District straddles that point in American history when the automobile began to influence the architectural character of residential facades. During the period of significance, the homes in the District could have added a new carport attached to the side of the house or a detached garage added in the backyard. These additions usually matched the house.
It was not uncommon for homeowners to construct their own tool sheds and workshops in the backyard in a manner that complemented the style of the house but did not necessarily copy the house. Prefabricated steel tool sheds were not commonly available locally until the late 1960s. Because of the modest means of the early homeowners in this neighborhood, guesthouses or mother-in-law cottages were not commonly found.

New detached buildings should be compatible in design with the historic character of the house and site and should preserve the historic relationship between the house and the landscape.

4.8 ENERGY CONSERVATION

Historic preservation maximizes the use of existing materials and infrastructure, reduces waste, and preserves the character of neighborhoods and the community. The energy embodied in an historic building can exceed 40 percent of the embedded maintenance and operations energy over the useful life of the building. Historic preservation is the ultimate sustainability strategy.

Because these houses were constructed prior to the introduction of affordable air conditioning systems, they tend to have been designed with greater consideration for passive energy efficiency techniques. Even the latest evaporative coolers available in post-World War II Arizona were far more energy efficient (although less comfortable in humid seasons) than later air conditioners. The flood-irrigated environment of the Borden Homes Historic District also contributes to energy efficiency.
The irrigation system of the neighborhood and of each house should be maintained for the sake of energy conservation as well as historic character.

1) The community would like to encourage the use of solar panels as long as they are installed on the roof slope that is facing away from the street.

2) It is important to discourage the replacement of the original steel casement windows and doors on the front facade of the house, and instead to repair the windows or doors back to their original state.

3) Preserve the historic masonry wall. Do not cover with foam insulation, stucco, or other treatment to increase energy performance.

4.9 HEALTH, SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY

The Early/Transitional Ranch and Simple Ranch style houses in Borden Homes Historic District have very little ornamentation and few character-defining features. Thus, the loss of original steel casement windows, while marginally successful in improving the residents’ comfort, would have a significant adverse effect on the architectural integrity of the house. Patterns created by the vertical casement sashes and the horizontal mutins were important, not only to each house, but also to the continuity of horizontal lines that carried through the facades collectively as an element of streetscape design. The horizontal line is one of the important characteristics of the Ranch style created by uniform elevations of roof ridges, eaves, window openings, windowpanes, and masonry bonding patterns. The key visual pattern to be retained is the twelve-inch vertical dimension of the original windowpanes. Even casual observation of this historic window type will reveal several windowpane widths but the heights are all twelve inches. Homeowners may restore the original horizontal character of twelve-inch-high panes by modifying existing replacement windows or by installing new window assemblies with the appropriate mullion patterns and glass proportions.
It is often necessary to make modifications to an historic property so that it can comply with current accessibility code requirements or, in the case of a private home, simply to make use of the building more convenient. Although federal, state or local laws do not require the accessibility of existing private residences, standards exist that can be used as a guide for homeowners who desire to improve accessibility to their own dwelling and property. The work must be carefully planned and undertaken so that it does not result in a loss of character-defining spaces, features, and finishes. The goal is to provide the highest level of access with the lowest level of impact. Provide barrier-free access in such a manner that character-defining spaces, features, and finishes are preserved.

If a bedroom is located in the front of the house, a window on the side of that bedroom may be installed for fire egress, which would then preserve the original steel casement window that is located on the front facade of the property.
Several houses in the Borden Homes Historic District have been constructed after the neighborhood’s period of significance as in-fill structures. Most recently, the house at 1638 East 12th Street, built in 2009, was constructed on a vacant lot that had become a neighborhood nuisance. Although this property is not eligible as a contributor to the historic district because of its age, this modern-style house is a reflection of its own time while its rectilinear plan and low-pitched front gable roof simultaneously consider and defer to the character of the historic district.

5.1 NEW IN-FILL BUILDINGS

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and these Guidelines acknowledge that in-fill buildings should be reflections of their own time, but they must also defer to the character of their host historic district. New in-fill buildings constructed in the Borden Homes Historic District must be visually compatible with contributing buildings and should be differentiated from the historic buildings. A new building should not be mistaken for a historic building. Its design must take into consideration the scale, size, massing, silhouette, and materials, patterns of openings and structure, color, and texture of the earlier buildings. New construction must also be placed appropriately on its property to maintain setbacks, spacing and setting of historic structures. New landscaping should blend with the general character of the streetscape. For example, a gravel yard with desert landscaping would not be appropriate in the context of the character-defining lush, mature vegetation and lawns of this irrigated subdivision.
5.2 STREETSCAPE PATTERN

Should an historic house be lost to disaster or demolition, an existing building may be moved into the district if it maintains a sense of architectural unity with existing buildings in the district. Likewise, a new building of contemporary design may be constructed in compliance with these same standards of appropriateness, especially in terms of massing, size, scale and placement. New buildings and additions should be placed within the historic-era setbacks. A building should fit within the range of yard dimensions seen in the block and maintain the existing spacing of side yards. The front of the house should be oriented to the street and the front door should be clearly identifiable. A side yard driveway in keeping with the traditional layout of the streetscape should be provided.

5.3 BUILDING HEIGHT

The height of a building should be similar to that of houses found traditionally on the block and in the neighborhood. New buildings should be the same one-story height as found traditionally in the subdivision or provide wall heights of one story (8 or 9 feet) at facades visible from the street.

5.4 BUILDING FORM

Simple building plans in the form of a rectangle or L-shape should complement the traditional layouts of the Early/Transitional Ranch and Simple Ranch style houses. Low-pitched gable and hipped roofs are appropriate for primary roof forms. Dormers and cupolas are not appropriate for complementing the simple roof massing of the Early/Transitional Ranch and Simple Ranch style houses.
5.5 BUILDING MATERIALS

Building materials that contribute to the traditional sense of scale and that reinforce the sense of visual continuity in the neighborhood are appropriate. The most appropriate wall material in the Ranch style is painted masonry. Use block or brick that is similar in texture, size and proportions to those used historically. Natural-finished used bricks and false bricks or stone should be avoided. Wood siding, as found in the gables of the historic houses, may also be used. Stucco was not characteristically used in this neighborhood, and thus should be avoided. New materials that are similar to traditional materials may be used as accent materials. Roof materials should be composite shingles and should convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally on Early/ Transitional Ranch and Simple Ranch style houses. Wood shakes appropriate for the later up-scaled California Ranch style houses are not appropriate here.

5.6 BUILDING FEATURES

Building features for in-fill houses and accessory buildings should complement the historic character of the contributing houses of the district. The porches should be compatible with the size, scale, materials and colors of the neighborhood’s prevalent historic architectural style. Eaves of the roof overhangs should be modeled after the visual characteristics of the molding trim type and exposed rafter tail type found in the neighborhood. Decorative profiles at the ends of bargeboards or rafter tails should differ in design from the historic examples in order to differentiate old from new.
In recent years, community awareness of water conservation issues has dramatically affected the character of many historic districts. Well-watered lawns, shrubs, and shade trees characterized traditional older Tempe neighborhoods. Today, many homeowners are converting to low-water (xeriscape) landscaping and abandoning lawns for gravel. The loss of traditional green lawns in Ranch house neighborhoods adversely affects the character of the streetscape as well as the setting of the individual house. Lush lawns and mature trees are character-defining features of the district and contribute to energy conservation in their own ways. These guidelines focus on preserving this aspect of neighborhood character through continuation of Tempe’s Residential Flood Irrigation Program and the traditional landscapes that program supports. Updating this traditional landscape form considers non-invasive species and allergy or air-quality concerns as factors limiting the recommendations from the historically correct plant lists provided (Appendix C). The best of both, or an enlightened blending of the new with the old, make these guidelines unique to Borden Homes Historic District.

6.1 ENTRANCE COURTYARDS

Early homes in the Borden Homes Historic District minimize the front porch and front entrance as an area for social interaction. Early/Transitional and Simple Ranch style homes here have no true front porch, but instead, a broad overhanging eave may extend along half or more of the entry facade supported by porch posts. A few houses have a small front-gabled porch roof extending from the main roof. Later Ranch style houses typically have an L-shaped plan and intersecting gable roofs with an extended eave porch over the junction of the two wings. Another model has an L-shaped plan with a recessed porch under a side-gable roof. In keeping with a broad post-WWII trend, the backyard became a retreat for the family and guests, and the traditional broad, raised, front porch verandahs overlooking the street disappeared as did the focus on neighborly interaction with passers-by it engendered.

A maintained, lush landscape is important in preserving the neighborhood character.

This entry porch maintains the original features of the Ranch Home. The Y-support column is a distinct feature unique to this house type.
Today, homeowners trying to create a friendly front porch setting for their Ranch style house must work within the minimalist character of the original entrance porch or stoop. By creating entrance courtyards with paving surrounded by a low fence or planter, the historic facades of Ranch style houses may be respected while creating a neighbor-friendly, semi-public space for the family. Create a small-scaled expansion of the existing porch floor or stoop in a manner that retains the materials, features and character of the original porch. Define the semi-public zone of the entrance courtyard with a low fence, hedge, or raised planter at a height no greater than the sill of the front windows or belt course of the brick wall. Avoid overemphasizing the entrance to the courtyard by using large piers or light fixtures. Instead, provide shade for the new courtyard by introducing an appropriate tree rather than constructing a new or larger porch roof. Avoid extension of an existing porch forward toward the street or adding a trellis or pergola to the primary facade of the Ranch style house.

6.2 SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS

The streets in the Borden Homes Historic District were not paved until 1959 when continuous rolled curbs and sidewalks were also installed. These elements are considered to be character-defining features of the historic district because the technology is representative of the period of significance and they are elements that work generally to unify the various phases of development within the neighborhood into one comprehensible district. The original concrete sidewalks and rolled concrete curbs in Borden Homes Historic District reflect the post-World War II development of the subdivision. This design allows placement of driveways anywhere along the frontage of each lot. Parkways buffering the street from the sidewalk do not exist as they had in earlier pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods. Instead, the front entrance door and porch of the district’s house was reached directly by a straight and narrow, concrete walkway.
Because these features of the right of way possess historic significance, it is recommended to preserve significant sidewalk and walkway features retaining their original materials, finishes and colors. Encourage the City to repair damaged portions of the concrete curbs and public sidewalk by replacing them with the matching color, texture and scoring patterns. Preserve historic contractors’ marks stamped into the concrete of sidewalks. Do not remove them. Where concrete sidewalks are too damaged to repair, encourage the City to replace damaged portions of the concrete curbs and public sidewalk using a matching color, texture and scoring patterns. Design for new walkways should take into consideration the materials, design, patterns, scale, size and color of historic examples. New walkways should complement historic features without copying them directly and should not be more ornate than the original sidewalks in finish or detailing.

6.3 DRIVEWAYS, STREETS AND PARKING

Driveways in the Borden Homes Historic District are concrete slab, and most houses have a straight, narrow concrete walk leading to the front entry. The most common alteration visible from the street during the period of significance, 1947-1959, was the addition of a carport on the side of the house. Preserve significant driveway and parking features retaining their original materials, finishes, colors, and extents.

6.4 FENCES

It is likely that perimeter fences and hedges were seldom seen in the Borden Homes Historic District during the period of significance, 1947-1959. Wooden picket fences and chain link fences seen today were probably introduced later. Backyards, when enclosed at all, were probably secured by wooden plank or cedar stake fences popular in the early post-war period. These fences were primarily intended to prevent pets and children from wandering.
In recent decades, when security and privacy became a concern, stronger and higher fences of chain link or concrete block enclosed the backyards. Today, fences in the Borden Homes Historic District are generally five or six-feet high, built of wood or block, and remain limited to enclosing the backyard. Most properties do not have a fence in the front yard; however, landscape often defines front yard boundaries. Lot-line plantings often add emphasis to perimeter irrigation berms and help reinforce the rhythm and scale of the overall streetscape.

Where no perimeter fence or hedge exists, keeping the front yard open is encouraged. Where a new decorative fence is desired, it should be similar in design, material, and color with those seen in Ranch style neighborhoods. Front yard fences of low scale, open railings, and rustic materials (e.g., cedar rails) are appropriate. New fences must not obscure the primary facade of a building. The railing addition to the front porch is not typical of the Early/Traditional Ranch style houses of the Borden Homes Historic District, but is in keeping with the broader Ranch style vocabulary of design. Decorative railings, like non-operable window shutters, are symbolic features often used in later Ranch style designs.

When installing a six-foot-high fence or wall at a side yard, keep the front corners of the house visible from the street. If possible, connect the side yard fence to the house behind the side window of the front room.

To meet the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office solid wall or fence policy any solid wall or fence should to the greatest extent possible (see Appendix A):

a. Have a maximum height of four feet (48 inches) and be placed at the front property line in order to maintain the historic relationship of the building to the front yard and the relationship of the building to the public street.
b. Have openings or breaks that allow the building and the character defining features to be viewed from the street. If the openings and breaks exceed 25% of the width of the lot then the wall may exceed the four-foot height restriction.

c. Be designed to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and defer to the historic building.

6.5 LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION

The residential flood irrigation system that serves the Borden Homes Historic District and the landscaped environment that it supports are important components of the neighborhood design, and were features so desirable in 1950s Tempe that the irrigation works were constructed before street paving or any other improvements. Many properties have grass lawns and a variety of non-native trees and foliage. A lush green landscape was a very desirable feature of post-war subdivisions throughout central Arizona, and flood irrigation provided consistent watering to support it. In the Borden Homes Historic District the setting is green and open, with expanses of turf lawns that were generally not broken by fences, except for an occasional low decorative wall or picket fence. In some cases, vegetation today is so dense that it partially obscures the view of the house. Large, mature, deciduous and semi-tropical trees shade houses and streets, and the vegetation and irrigation water noticeably lower the ambient temperature in the neighborhood during the hot summer months. Tree and shrub varieties present include eucalyptus, Aleppo pine, mulberry, African sumac, orange, bougainvillea, oleander, boxwood, juniper, Mexican fan palm, mesquite, fig, and olive.
The first impression of the historic character of the district landscape is a continuous plane of lush grass punctuated by mature shade trees. This impressive landscape has been made possible by the historic flood irrigation system. Deep watering provided by flood irrigation promotes species and growth rates that modern sprinklers and drippers simply cannot sustain. Irrigation standpipes should be maintained as character defining features of the streetscape. The components of this infrastructure (e.g., standpipes, alfalfa valves, culverts, berms) are the tangible elements that convey the significant technical design aspects of the irrigation system. The mature landscape materials are the direct result of the system. Berms, basins, and raised building pads were designed to protect the foundations and slab floors of the houses from water damage. Maintaining flood irrigation is imperative to preserving the character of the landscape in the Borden Homes Historic District.

Maintaining the clearances between irrigation water and foundations is crucial to preserving each house. Property owners should preserve the component features of the flood irrigation system on their residential lots and preserve historic landscape features whenever possible. Front yard lawns and mature landscaping should be retained to preserve the character of the flood-irrigated historic subdivision. New landscape designs should use materials that are compatible with the historic property and neighborhood. Retain as much of the original design as possible, including landscape materials and irrigation infrastructure. A typical landscape plan for this subdivision would consist of a Bermuda grass lawn and a large shade tree in the front yard. Smaller plantings would have been placed to screen objectionable views or to frame the house.

Today many historic neighborhoods are in a transition from traditional well-watered lawns to low-water desert landscapes. These changes are dramatically affecting the character of the streetscapes. When considering redesign, special attention should be paid to the choice and location of a shade tree. The tree should be placed so that it shades the house as much as possible. A complete list of historically appropriate trees, shrubs and annuals is available in Appendix C.
Varieties that are most significant in the Borden Homes Historic District include:
Morus alba – Mulberry
Pinus Halepensis – Aleppo Pine

Several varieties are recommended more than others including:
Morus alba ‘Kigan’ – Fruitless Mulberry
Fraxinus velutina – Arizona Ash
Pinus Halepensis – Aleppo Pine
Platanus wrightii - Cottonwood

Several historic varieties are strongly discouraged because they are considered highly allergenic or invasive species. See Appendix C for a full list.

6.6 LIGHTING

Streetlights in the Borden Homes Historic District are spaced about 400 feet apart, with three on Una Avenue, three on Butte Avenue, and two on 12th Street. Original lighting fixtures of the house or site should be preserved, when feasible. New exterior lights should be simple in character and low in intensity. Light sources should be shielded to prevent excessive glare. Minimize the visual impacts of site and architectural lighting. Prevent shining light into adjacent properties by using shielded and focused light sources that direct light onto the ground. Select lighting fixtures that maintain the “dark sky” by avoiding directing light upward.
6.7 ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND FEATURES

Accessory structures and features in the Borden Homes Historic District almost entirely exist out of view from the right-of-way. Locate a new permanent accessory structure toward the rear of a lot whenever possible, respecting the building setback requirements of the zoning ordinance. Construct a permanent accessory structure that is not only subordinate in size and design to the primary structure, but also similar in character. Maintain the traditional range of building materials on accessory structures and the simple detailing historically found on accessory structures. Keep accessory buildings low in scale, small, and hidden from view from the street.

6.8 EQUIPMENT AND UTILITIES PLACEMENT

The residential flood irrigation system in the Borden Homes Historic District was built in 1953, and is an important character-defining feature of the district. It is a complex network of underground concrete pipes and manifolds with concrete risers that bring water to the surface of each lot. There are three large above-ground features of this structure that are visible in the neighborhood: a concrete outlet box, which regulates the flow of water in to the system, and two vertical standpipes that fill with water to pressurize the system and force water to rise to the surface.
These features have been recently altered by a neighborhood public art project that installed ceramic mosaic tiles depicting neighborhood images on much of the visible surfaces above ground. The form and function of these system components is still apparent and they remain character-defining features of the historic district. Irrigation features on individual properties include alfalfa valves to regulate water flow on the property and perimeter earthen berms to contain residential flood irrigation water on the lot without flooding, runoff or erosion. These features should be maintained.

New placement of equipment and utilities in the Borden Homes Historic District should minimize the visual impacts of utilities and service equipment. Avoid placing mechanical equipment (e.g., air conditioner, attic turbine ventilators) on a roof where it is visible from the public right-of-way. Solar devices should not block views or be placed where they are visible from the public right-of-way. Place a satellite dish out of view from the public right-of-way.
APPENDIX A

THE ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE REVISED POLICY STATEMENT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY OF BUILDINGS TO THE ARIZONA REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (ADOPTED MARCH 25, 2011)

As a guide to consultants, the SHPO staff and the Historic Sites Review Committee the following standards for integrity and eligibility will be applied to buildings being nominated to the Arizona or National Registers of Historic Places under criterion C: Design/Construction. These policies are primarily designed to address the eligibility of buildings as contributors to historic or architectural districts. The eligibility of an individual building will often require the presence of a higher level of integrity. To be eligible a building must convey its significance by maintaining its integrity. Changes that respect the integrity of a historic building do not alter its significance.

THE ORIGINAL BUILDING

1. Evaluation of exterior integrity will continue to be the primary focus of survey work with most attention given to the primary facade.

2. In general, the primary facade must have a majority (51%) of its features intact, and at least 75% of all exterior walls must be present.

3. In general, either the historic wall materials and details must be intact and visible, or the historic massing and openings (doors and windows) must be intact and visible. If both are missing or are hidden behind non-historic materials the building will not be eligible for lack of integrity. In the future, if the non-historic materials are sufficiently removed to prove the existence of intact historic materials, details or openings, the property can then be reevaluated for eligibility.

4. Only the uncovering and exposure of historic materials, not the restoration of missing features, can affect the evaluation of historic integrity. Although the accurate replacement of missing features shall be encouraged, their replacement will play no role in the evaluation of historic integrity.

5. At the request of an owner, the SHPO, or a member of the HSRC, the SHPO staff or qualified consultant can undertake a comprehensive evaluation of a potential historic property. This expanded evaluation may include the exterior, interior and setting of the property utilizing the federal tax act application “Part I” evaluation format.
6. Interior features including the building’s structural system which are found to be rare or of high artistic merit will indicate that the building is potentially eligible even if the exterior integrity is marginal, but in any evaluation at least 75% of the original exterior walls must be intact. In only very rare cases can a building be eligible for its significant interior features if its primary facade has been extensively altered or completely replaced. In general, the complete removal of the primary facade indicates an irreparable loss of integrity no matter how much documentation exists for reconstruction.

7. As part of a comprehensive evaluation the age and rarity of the resource will be addressed within an historical context and a comparison with other similar properties. In general, the older or rarer the property the less integrity will be required for eligibility. Indigenous buildings over 100 years old, vernacular or designed buildings constructed by hand utilizing square nails, or unique one of a kind buildings will be given the greatest leniency in relationship to level of integrity.

8. Although the National Register program allows buildings to be nominated under criterion D, it will be applied to buildings only in cases when there is an indication that the building is likely to yield important information on construction technology, stylistic evolution, or artistic design. If these factors are clearly visible then the building must be nominated under criterion C. If significant below ground archaeological resources are present on the building site then the property should be nominated under both criteria.

BUILDING ADDITIONS

1. For building additions within the property’s period of significance:
   a. The significance of the addition must be assessed regardless of compliance with the Secretary’s Standards.
   b. If determined significant the property should be considered eligible.
   c. If determined not to be significant but still meets the Secretary’s Standards the building should be considered eligible.
   d. If determined not to be significant and not to meet the Standards but considered minor the property should be considered eligible.
e. If determined not to be significant, not to meet the Standards and having a major effect on the integrity of the building, the property should be considered ineligible.

2. For building additions outside the property’s period of significance:
   a. If the addition meets the Secretary’s Standards the property should be considered eligible.
   b. If the addition does not meet the Standards but is considered minor the property should be considered eligible.
   c. If the addition does not meet the Standards and has a major effect on the integrity of the building, the property should be considered ineligible.

3. To meet the Secretary’s Standards an addition should to the greatest extent possible:
   a. Be located at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of the historic building. Front facade additions are limited to simply designed carports, porches or balconies.
   b. Be limited in its size and scale in relationship to the historic building or district.
   c. Be designed to be clearly differentiated or distinctive from the historic building but be compatible with it in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solid to voids, and color thus making clear what is historic and what is new.
   d. Be designed not to obscure the character defining features of the historic building.
   e. Be designed with setbacks or offsets from the roof and/or wall planes or have a neutral spacer such as glass between original fabric and the new addition and be as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.
   f. Be placed behind the front roof slope if designed taller than the original building.
   g. Defer all new work to the original building.
   h. Leave original exterior walls in place even if enclosed within the addition. And,
   i. Match original roof slopes and eave widths.

PORCH AND/OR CARPORT INFILL ADDITIONS
1. For porch or carport infill additions within the property’s period of significance:
a. The significance of the infill must be assessed regardless of compliance with the Secretary’s Standards.

b. If determined significant the property should be considered eligible.

c. If determined not to be significant but still meets the Secretary’s Standards the property should be considered eligible.

d. If determined not to be significant and not to meet the Standards the property should be considered ineligible.

2. For porch or carport infill additions outside the property’s period of significance:

a. If the infill meets the Secretary’s Standards the property should be considered eligible.

b. If the infill does not to meet the Standards the property should be considered ineligible.

3. To meet the Secretary’s Standards a porch or carport infill addition should to the greatest extent possible:

a. Not destroy character-defining features of the original building including any porch or carport features.

b. Not destroy the original bay expression of the original porch or carport.

c. Be in filled with panels of glass, glass block, stucco or horizontal wood siding that are distinctive but compatible with the original building and reinforce the bay expression of the original feature.

d. Not incorporate discrete openings but utilize grouped or ribbon openings that blend with the infill panels. New doors should not be on primary facades.

e. If in filled as a garage, incorporates a plane and simple garage door that matches the full width of the original carport.

f. Have any new walls offset inward from the original bay structure or have new walls that express the underlying structural bays as a surface treatment.

F. Defers to the original building, porch and/or carport.

h. Retains the original driveway location.

FRONT YARD SOLID WALLS OR FENCES
1. For front yard solid walls or fences within the property’s period of significance:
   a. The significance of the wall must be assessed.
   b. If the wall or fence is determined significant the property should be considered eligible.
   c. If the wall or fence is determined not to be significant and blocks the view of the historic building the property should be considered ineligible.
   d. If the wall or fence is determined not to be significant but meets these policies then the property should be considered eligible.

2. For front yard solid walls or fences outside the property’s period of significance:
   a. If the wall or fence meets these policies then the property should be considered eligible.
   b. If the wall or fence does not meet these policies then the property should be considered ineligible.

3. To meet this solid wall or fence policy any solid wall or fence should to the greatest extent possible:
   a. Have a maximum height of 4 feet (48 inches) and be placed at the front property line in order to maintain the historic relationship of the building to the front yard and the relationship of the building to the public street.
   b. Have openings or breaks that allow the building and the character defining features to be viewed from the street. If the openings and breaks exceed 25% of the width of the lot then the wall may exceed the 4-foot height restriction.
   c. Be designed to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and defer to the historic building.

LANDSCAPING

1. Historic property landscaping must be consistent with one of the following treatments for historic properties: preservation, restoration or rehabilitation.
   a. Landscaping preservation retains the character of the landscape per the date of the survey. Historic changes and alterations are respected but additional changes are discouraged.
b. Landscaping restoration returns the landscaping to an earlier specific time period. Restoration must be based on research from physical evidence, historic photographs and/or written documentation.

c. Landscaping rehabilitation retains significant features from the past while allowing non-historic replacement materials and added features that are distinctive but compatible with the historic landscaping.

2. For landscaping features over 50 years old at the time of survey:

   a. The significance of the landscaping must be assessed.
   b. If the landscaping is determined significant the property should be considered eligible.
   c. If the landscaping is determined not to be significant and blocks the view of the historic building the property should be considered ineligible.
   d. If the landscaping meets these policies then the property should be considered eligible.

3. For landscaping features less than 50 years old at the time of survey work:

   a. If the landscaping meets these policies then the property should be considered eligible.
   b. If the landscaping does not meet these policies then the property should be considered ineligible.

4. To meet this landscaping policy the landscaping should to the greatest extent possible:

   a. Meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the selected treatment.
   b. Retain the historic relationship between the building, landscape features and open space.
   c. Not introduce new landscape features that are out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the historic setting.
   d. Not introduce new landscape features or plant materials that are visually incompatible with the site or destroys site patterns or vistas including the view of the primary building.
   e. Have any new hardscape features defer to the historic building.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY
1. In cases of clear eligibility (consensus by the SHPO staff) the SHPO can determine eligibility without HSRC consultation. An eligibility statement signed by the appropriate staff and the SHPO must be on file with a State Inventory Form. Files containing properties that have been determined eligible will be clearly marked for identification.

2. Properties of marginal or questionable integrity by staff in need of a recommendation of eligibility will be brought to the HSRC for comment. The HSRC will receive a completed State Inventory Form and a staff report addressing the eligibility of the property. If the HSRC considers the property eligible, such statement, if agreed to by the SHPO, will be signed and filed with the State Inventory Form.

Adopted by the Historic Sites Review Committee (HSRC) March 25, 2011
Prepared by James Garrison, State Historic Preservation Officer
State Historic Preservation Office, Arizona State Parks
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction, will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

* Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.
APPENDIX C  TEMPE HISTORIC ERA PLANT MATERIALS LIST

Trees available from Valley garden centers ca. 1950s

- Acacia farnesiana  
- Callistemon viminalis  
- Carya illinoinensis  
- Citrus species  
- Eriobotrya japonica  
- Fraxinus velutina  
- Morus alba ‘Kingan’  
- Pinus halepensis  
- Punica granatum  
- Ulmus parvifolia  
- Vitex agnus

- Sweet Acacia  
- Weeping Bottlebrush  
- Pecan  
- Citrus (all but sour)  
- Loquat - Japanese  
- Arizona Ash -NATIVE  
- Mulberry - Kingan, Fruitless  
- Aleppo Pine  
- Pomegranate  
- Chinese Elm  
- Chaste Tree

Shrubs available from Valley garden centers ca. 1950s

- Bougainvillea spp.  
- Buxus japonica  
- Jasminium mesnyi  
- Juniperus deppeana  
- Lagerstroomia indica  
- Leucophyllum frutescens  
- Liguistrum japonicum  
- Liguistrum lucidum  
- Myrtus communis compacta  
- Nandina domestica  
- Nerium oleander  
- Pyracantha spp.  
- Rosa spp.  
- Rosemarinus officinalis prostrate  
- Thuja orientalis

- Bougainvillea  
- Boxwood  
- Primrose Jasmine  
- ‘Chinese’ Juniper  
- Crape myrtle  
- Texas Sage  
- Japanese Privet  
- Wax Leaf Privet  
- Dwarf Myrtle  
- Heavenly Bamboo  
- Oleander  
- Pyracantha  
- Roses  
- Rosemary  
- Arborvitae

Annuals available from Valley garden centers ca. 1950s

- Antirrhinum spp.  
- Bellis perennis  
- Calendula  
- Camellia spp.  
- Chrysanthemum spp.  
- Delphinium spp.

- Snapdragons  
- Daisies  
- Pot Mangold  
- Camellia  
- Chrysanthemum  
- Larkspur
Dianthus caryophyllus  Carnations
Gardenia spp.  Gardenia
Geranium spp.  Geranium
Hemerocallis spp.  Daylily
Iris spp.  Iris
Lobularia maritima  Sweet Assylum
Petunia spp.  Petunias
Tagetes spp.  Marigolds
Verbena spp.  Verbena
Viola spp.  Pansies
Viola spp.  Violets
Zinnia spp.  Zinnia

Vines available from Valley garden centers ca. 1950s

Antigonon leptopus  Queen’s Wreath
Campsis radicans  Trumpet Vine
Dipogon lignosus  Australian Pea Vine
Hedera helix  English Ivy
Lablab purpureus  Hyacinth Bean
Lagenaria spp.  Gourds
Lathyrus odoratus  Sweet Pea
Marah gilensis  Wild Cucumber
Tropaeolum spp.  Nasturtiums
Wisteria frutescens  Wisteria
APPENDIX D  GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Alteration:
Any aesthetic, architectural, mechanical or structural change to the exterior surface of any significant part of a designated property.

Archeologically sensitive:
A property that includes known or suspected archeological sites.

Archeological site:
A site that has yielded, or exhibits the promise of yielding, information important in the understanding of human prehistory or history. Such information may consist of evidence of past human life, habitation or activity, as well as material remains.

Arizona register of historic places:
The list of Arizona’s historic properties worthy of preservation which serves as an official record of Arizona’s historic districts, archeological sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in this state’s history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-511.04(9), the Arizona state parks board, state historic preservation office is authorized to keep and administer an Arizona register of historic places composed of properties that meet the criteria established by the board, see below, or which are listed on the national register of historic places. Entry on the register requires nomination by the state historic preservation officer (SHPO) and owner notification in accordance with rules that the board adopts. The criteria for evaluation of potential Arizona register properties generally encompass the quality of significance in Arizona history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. Such qualities may be present in districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association; and also:

(1) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history;

(2) Are associated with the lives of historically significant persons;

(3) Are the embodiment of a distinctive characteristic(s) of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and
A distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(4) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Building:
Any structure created to shelter any form of human activity, such as a house, church or hotel; may also refer to a related complex such as a courthouse and jail, or a house and barn.

Certified Local Government (CLG):
A federal program, the aim of which is to decentralize the national historic preservation program by assigning decision-making to the states and, ultimately, to local governments. Applications for certification are reviewed by the state historic preservation officer and must document, at a minimum, establishment of an historic preservation commission with specific membership and duties, adoption of an historic preservation ordinance and development of an historic preservation plan.

Commission:
The historic preservation commission of Tempe.

Compatibility:
A pleasing visual relationship between elements of a property, building, or structure, or among properties, buildings and structures, or with their surroundings. Aspects of compatibility may include, but are not limited to, proportion, rhythm, detail, texture, material, reflectance and architectural style.

Contributing property:
A classification applied to an individual property within a designated historic district, signifying that the property contributes generally to the distinctive character of the district; or an archeological site.

Demolition:
The act or process that destroys a designated property.

Designated property:
Any property that has been classified as a landmark, historic property or contributing property within an historic district.
Distinctive character:
   The distinguishing architectural and aesthetic characteristics of a landmark or historic property, or those generally found throughout an historic district, which fulfill the criteria for designation.

Historic district:
   A designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to all properties within an area with defined boundaries, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which express a distinctive character worthy of preservation. An historic district may also include or be composed of one or more archeological sites.

Historic eligible:
   A property that appears to meet the criteria for designation.

Historic preservation officer (HPO):
   A city staff member appointed by the community development manager to serve as secretary to the historic preservation commission, maintain the Tempe historic property register and otherwise perform such tasks and duties as assigned by this chapter.

Historic preservation plan:
   A document, formally adopted by the city council, containing goals and policies regarding historic preservation within the city.

Historic property:
   A designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to an individual property, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation, or an archaeological site.

Landmark:
   A designation, in the form of overlay zoning, applied to an individual property, as a result of formal adoption by the city council, which has achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years and which expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation and which otherwise fulfills or exceeds the criteria for designation as an historic property.
National register of historic places:

The national register of historic places as established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. § 461 et seq.) and expanded by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, (16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.) as amended. It is the nation’s official listing of prehistoric and historic properties worthy of preservation. It affords protection and recognition for districts, sites, buildings and structures significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. This significance can be at the local, state or national level. The national register serves both as a planning tool and as a means of identifying buildings, sites and districts that are of special significance to a community and worthy of preservation. The criteria for evaluation of potential national register properties generally encompass the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture. Such qualities may be present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association; and

(1) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

(2) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

(3) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(4) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Noncontributing property:

A classification applied to an individual property located within a designated historic district, signifying that the property does not contribute to the distinctive character of the district. Such properties are subject only to the provisions of this chapter regarding new construction, including general landscape character, and only when the amount of new construction equals or exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the land area or building ground floor area of the property at the time of its identification.
as noncontributing.

**Ordinary maintenance and repair:**
Regular or usual care, upkeep or replacement of any part, or putting back together that which is deteriorated or broken, of an existing property, building or structure to effect the maintenance of a safe, sanitary and stable condition.

**Owner:**
The legal ownership entity of an individual parcel or property, as recorded with Maricopa County. For purposes of this chapter, each such parcel or property shall be considered to have one owner.

**Parcel:**
Land identified as a separate lot for purposes of the subdivision and zoning regulations of the city and so recorded with Maricopa County.

**Preservation covenant:**
A deed restriction, filed with Maricopa County, which limits the owner’s use of a designated property in order to effect the preservation of the distinctive character of the property.

**Preservation easement:**
The non-possessory interest of a holder in real property, said property being a designated property, imposing limitations or obligations to preserve the distinctive character of that property, or a specified portion thereof.

**Property:**
Building(s), structures(s) or other improvements, or an archeological site, associated with a particular parcel or location.

**Secretary of the interior’s standards for the treatment of historic properties:**
Standards developed and adopted, as amended, by the secretary of the interior of the United States to guide work funded by, or otherwise conducted under the auspices of, the federal government on historic properties and archeological sites. Guidelines are given for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.
**Significant:**

Having aesthetic, architectural or historical qualities of critical importance to the consideration of a property, building or structure for classification as a designated property.

**Structure:**

Anything built, constructed or erected, or any piece of work artificially built-up or composed of parts joined together in some definite manner, the existence of which requires a permanent or semi-permanent location on or in the ground, including, but not limited to: bridges, dams, walls, fences, gazebos, garages, advertising signs, communications towers, sculpture, monuments, recreational facilities and water distribution systems.

**Tempe historic property register:**

A document listing all designated properties and districts in the city.
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United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).

1. Name of Property

historic name  Moer Park Works Progress Administration Structures
other names/site number

2. Location

street & number  715 North Mill Avenue  not for publication
city or town  Tempe
state  Arizona code  AZ  county  Maricopa  code  013  zip code  85281

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

national    statewide    local

Signature of certifying official/Title Date

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of commenting official Date

Title State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

entered in the National Register determined eligible for the National Register
determined not eligible for the National Register removed from the National Register
other (explain) ________________

Signature of the Keeper Date of Action

5. Classification
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration
Maricopa, Arizona

Name of Property                   County and State

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply.)

- private
- public - Local
- public - State
- public - Federal

Category of Property
(Check only one box.)

- building(s)
- district
- site
- structure
- object

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 structure</td>
<td>6 object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter “N/A” if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Recreation and Culture: Outdoor Recreation
Landscape: Park

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Recreation and Culture: Outdoor Recreation
Landscape: Park

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Rustic Architecture

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: Concrete
walls: Stone: Fieldstone?; Stone: Sandstone
roof: Metal: Tin?
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration    Maricopa, Arizona

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

Summary Paragraph
The Works Progress Administration Structures are located in Moeur Park are located at 715 North Mill Avenue in Tempe, Arizona. Moeur Park is positioned North and South of Curry Road and as a result the structures are placed near the intersection of North Mill Avenue and Curry Road. The WPA Structures include raised planters, stairs, planter borders, stone benches, stone tables, ramadas, an automobile bridge, retaining walls, and irrigation boxes and are great examples of Rustic Architecture. The park contains a grass lawn along with trees, shrubs, and bushes scattered throughout the property. The WPA Structures display high levels of historical integrity with their location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association making them eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Narrative Description
Location and Setting
The Moeur Park Works Progress Administration Structures are located in north Tempe on the north side of the Salt River. The surrounding natural Sonoran Desert environment is noticeable in close proximity of Papago Park to the northwest and the Hayden Butte to the south. Moeur Park is also positioned near several other recreational areas including the Tempe Beach Park and Tempe Town Lake to the south.

Moeur Park is located in Township 1N, Range 4E of Section 10 in Tempe, Arizona. The WPA Structures are located within the north and south portions of the park. Both the north and south portions of Moeur Park are part of larger parcels of land owned by the City of Tempe.

Moeur Park, Northern and Southern portions
The smaller portion of Moeur Park is located south of Curry Road. The WPA Structures in the southern portion of the park include two stone benches, a retaining wall stretching the length of the property, and two stone ramadas. The larger portion of Moeur Park is located north of Curry Road. Two stone staircases, two stone tables, one automobile bridge, one stone ramada, two stone benches, two planter borders, two raised planters, and an irrigation box are positioned in this portion of the park.

Fieldstone and sandstone were used to construct the walls, stairs, tables and benches. Concrete provides the foundation and support for these structures.

Possible description of each individual structure or group of structures?
Alterations and Additions
The gabled roofs on the three stone ramadas was originally covered with palm thatch and have since been replaced with tin. When viewing the southern portion of Moeur Park from Mill Avenue, a modern concrete staircase is visible on the incline. Three modern ramadas are positioned on the top of the incline near a modern parking area. The view of the northern portion of Moeur Park from Mill Avenue contains a small bus stop, a modern bench, and the addition of concrete pathways.

Parts of retaining wall removed?
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration

Structures

Maricopa, Arizona

Name of Property

County and State

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

(Mark “x” in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Areas of Significance

(Enter categories from instructions.)

Architecture

Entertainment/Recreation

Landscape Architecture?

Social History?

Period of Significance

1930-1943?

Significant Dates

1930

1936

Significant Person

(Check complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

Architect/Builder

Criteria Considerations

(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

B removed from its original location.

C a birthplace or grave.

D a cemetery.

E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

F a commemoratory property.

G less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

Period of Significance (justification)

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration

Structures

Maricopa, Arizona

Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance and applicable criteria.)

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)

9. Major Bibliographical References
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration
Structures

Maricopa, Arizona

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):
___ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
___ previously listed in the National Register
___ previously determined eligible by the National Register
___ designated a National Historic Landmark
___ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
___ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #
___ recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #

Primary location of additional data:
___ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State agency
___ Federal agency
___ Local government
___ University
___ Other
Name of repository: ________________________________

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned):

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property __________________________
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

1 Zone Easting Northing
2 Zone Easting Northing
3 Zone Easting Northing
4 Zone Easting Northing

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration Maricopa, Arizona

Structures

Name of Property

County and State

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Alyssa Gerszewski

organization City of Tempe
date

street & number 31 East 5th Street telephone

city or town Tempe state AZ zip code 85281
e-mail Alyssa_Gerszewski@tempe.gov

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- Maps: A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
  - A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- Continuation Sheets

- Additional items: (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs:

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property:

City or Vicinity:

County: State:

Photographer:

Date Photographed:

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of ___.
Moeur Park Works Progress Administration                      Maricopa, Arizona
Structures
Name of Property

Property Owner: (Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name ________________________________
street & number ______________________ telephone ________________
city or town __________________________ state ________ zip code ________

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).

1. Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>historic name</th>
<th>Kirkland-McKinney Ditch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other names/site number</td>
<td>Hayden Ditch; Hayden Canal; Hayden Branch of the Tempe Canal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>street &amp; number</th>
<th>East 8th Street between South Gary Drive and South Una Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state code</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county code</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
<td>85281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,

I hereby certify that this _X_ nomination _X_ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property _X_ meets _X_ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

- national
- statewide
- _X_ local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of certifying official/Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property _X_ meets _X_ does not meet the National Register criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of commenting official</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

- _X_ entered in the National Register
- _X_ determined eligible for the National Register
- _X_ determined not eligible for the National Register
- _X_ removed from the National Register
- _X_ other (explain:)

| Signature of the Keeper | Date of Action |
5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply.)</td>
<td>(Check only one box.)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ private</td>
<td>□ building(s)</td>
<td>□ Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ public - Local</td>
<td>□ district</td>
<td>buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ public - State</td>
<td>□ site</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X public - Federal</td>
<td>X structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION:</td>
<td>INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterworks</td>
<td>Waterworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other: dirt-lined canal</td>
<td>foundation: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other: earth, concrete, shotcrete, cobblestone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Kirkland-McKinney Ditch refers to the daylighted, dirt-lined segment of an historic lateral canal in Tempe, Arizona. Constructed in 1869-1874, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch originally delivered water a distance of six miles from the “trunk ditch” of the Tempe Canal to Hayden Flour Mill on the west slope of Tempe Butte. Today only the subject segment, which extends approximately 500 feet along the south side of East 8th Street between Gary Drive and Una Avenue, retains aspects of integrity that allow it to suitably convey canals and ditches from the “agricultural period” of Tempe history, 1869-1950. The setting is urban; the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch fronts the Tempe Manor apartment complex and a single-family residence, with commercial and light-industrial properties nearby, including the historic Borden Milk Co. Creamery and Ice Factory (NR #84000171). Along its boundary with Tempe Manor, Kirkland-McKinney Ditch is bordered by a five-foot tall masonry wall with wrought iron fencing. At its east end, west of Una Avenue, water flows through a concrete endwall into a dirt-lined channel shaded by a landscape of giant reed, cottonwood, and palo verde. To the west, approximately 120 feet downstream, the water meets a concrete check and turnout gate with timber fence and cobblestone/shotcrete-lined channel, followed by a 350-foot dirt-lined channel that terminates at a concrete headwall and trashrack at Gary Drive.

In terms of its original construction, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch differed little from other early canal-building efforts in the Salt River Valley. Its builders, a team of Tempe-area pioneers who labored in exchange for shares in the ditch and corresponding water rights, used shovels and picks in addition to rudimentary (pre-Fresno) scrapers to dig through sandy loam and adobe topsoils south and east of Tempe Butte. Like other irrigators in the Salt River Valley, William H. Kirkland and James B. McKinney relied heavily on the skills of Spanish-speaking newcomers from southern Arizona and Sonora, who won praise as “natural engineer[s]” who “can construct an acequia (canal) with unerring exactness...” From its head on the Tempe Canal “trunk ditch” in Section 9 (T1N, R5E), the Kirkland McKinney Ditch ran southwest through a three-mile saddle of low-lying land to the northeast quarter of Section 24 (T1N, R4E), where it veered west before turning northwest to Hayden Flour Mill on the west slope of Tempe Butte in Section 15 (T1N, R4E).

Like other water delivery facilities in Tempe, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch’s dirt-lined channel permitted seepage of water into the soil, creating riparian zones where cottonwood trees and other plant life flourished. “Where the canals or ditches have been established a few years,” noted journalist Sylvester Baxter in 1888, “long lines of trees mark their course and give beauty to the landscape. The trees are mostly cottonwoods, which, under the stimulus of plenty of water, attain a height of fifty feet or so in a comparatively short time.” Aspects of this landscape, including a large cottonwood tree, remain evident at the east end of the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch near its intersection with Una Avenue.

In April 1892 the Arizona Republican reported that “Charles T. Hayden has about fifty Mexicans at work cleaning and deepening the Hayden ditch.” Despite these structural changes, however, late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century maintenance efforts such as this did little to compromise the historical integrity of the six-mile-long facility; by 1940 the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch retained essential aspects of its original construction and landscape—even as the entire system of the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company joined the Salt River Water Users’ Association in 1923 with ownership passing to the federal government.

Yet more pronounced changes loomed. In December 1944, SRP installed a concrete check and turnout gate with timber fence and cobblestone/shotcrete endwall on the subject segment between Gary Drive and Una Avenue; this gate...
regulated the amount of water that entered a smaller lateral ditch extending south along the quarter-section line of Section 23, a quarter-mile west of what is now McClintock Drive.\(^5\) This modification corresponded with the beginning of a dramatic period of growth in Tempe, as much of the area’s farmland transitioned to commercial and residential development. Responding to customer demands for lower costs through greater system efficiency, SRP obtained federal loans under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949. These low-interest loans provided for the improvement of water-delivery facilities in SRP’s service area. “Rehabilitation and betterment” involved lining canals with concrete to prevent seepage, piping laterals and ditches to prevent evaporation, and removing adjacent trees and plant life.\(^6\)

During the 1950s SRP entirely dismantled the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch upstream from its intersection with College Avenue north of Arizona State University’s main campus, severing the facility’s link with Hayden Flour Mill.\(^7\) East of Rural Road, however, much of the facility remained intact. That began to change in the winter of 1983-84 as SRP formulated plans to pipe the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch in response to development pressures in the Sotelo Addition along East 8th Street between Rural Road and McClintock Drive. Work proceeded through the next six years as the project endured construction delays and alterations, including a shortening of the pipeline near Una Avenue due to a dispute between the City of Tempe and a property owner. This dispute may explain, in part, the decision not to pipe the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch between Una Avenue and Gary Drive; the 1944 check and turnout gate may have also spared this segment.

SRP contractors finished the pipeline west of Gary Drive in February 1984; under this roadway they installed a concrete culvert and headwall with trashrack. In August 1987 they finished the pipeline east of Una Avenue; under this roadway they installed a concrete culvert and endwall.\(^8\) Besides these modifications, however, the 500-foot segment of the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch between Una Avenue and Gary Drive remained daylighted, dirt-lined, and essentially unchanged with the exception of the 1944 check and turnout gate. In 1989 an observer characterized the segment as “a broad and shallow unlined ditch…not very different from that originally dug by the pioneer shareholders in 1871.”\(^9\)

Twenty-three years later the segment retains a high degree of historical integrity to the 1869-1950 “agricultural period” of Tempe history; large cottonwood and palo verde trees at the segment’s east end, too, convey the landscape that lined most Tempe canals and ditches before 1950.

\(^5\) “Sec. 23 T. 1 R. 4 Card #2,” Documents Collection, Salt River Project (Research Services).
\(^8\) Plan and profile drawing nos. A-64-216 and A-64-236, Documents Collection, Salt River Project (Research Services).
\(^9\) Anderson, “Tempe Canal,” 44.
Kirkland-McKinney Ditch Maricopa, Arizona
Name of Property County and State

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark “x” in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Community Planning and Development

Period of Significance
1869-1950

Significant Dates
1870

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Architect/Builder
William H. Kirkland, James B. McKinney, et. al.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

B removed from its original location.

C a birthplace or grave.

D a cemetery.

E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

F a commemorative property.

G less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

Period of Significance (justification)

The period of significance corresponds with the earliest year of canal-building in the Tempe area through 1950, the end of the Tempe-area’s “agricultural period,” in which many canals and ditches sustained modifications and loss of historic integrity.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A
The Kirkland-McKinney Ditch is eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion ‘A’ for its association with early canal-building in the Tempe area and the area’s subsequent “agricultural period” lasting through 1950. By diverting water from the Salt River to nearby desert landscapes, canals and ditches unlocked the agricultural potential of the Tempe area and helped to determine the location and form of its settlements. Tempe, like much of the Salt River Valley, is today extensively urbanized, but from the late-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries its system of canals and lateral ditches sustained not residential growth, but a vast irrigated-agricultural landscape that yielded an array of grains, fruits, vegetables, and dairy products. “To Arizona,” wrote a territorial booster in 1890, “irrigation is what the life-blood is to man, or the piston-rod is to the steam engine.” The town of Tempe was no exception, as its largest employer, Hayden Flour Mill, processed grain harvests from nearby irrigated farms; the mill itself relied on the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch as a source of motive power until its electrification in 1924. Upstream from Hayden Flour Mill, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch also watered the fields and gardens of farming families who settled in sections 23 and 24.

In November 1870, perhaps less than a year after the Kirkland-McKinney team began their work, a Tucson-based freighter named Charles Trumbull Hayden and four others established the Hayden Milling and Farm Ditch Company on the south side of the Salt River downstream from the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch. The company filed claims for over 180,000 annual acre-feet of water and for land in the vicinity of Tempe Butte, where the river channel narrowed opposite the Papago Buttes. A freighter in the business of teaming goods between Tucson and Prescott, Hayden appreciated Tempe Butte as a reliable Salt River crossing; by the fall of 1870 he had already identified the site as an important transportation corridor and had probably formulated plans for a ferry service, flour mill, and general store that became the basis of Tempe’s business district.

Also in the fall of 1870, a month after the Hayden Milling and Farm Ditch Company organized, Jack Swilling and five associates including B. W. Hardy formed the Hardy Irrigation Canal Company for “milling, farming, and other purposes” upstream from Hayden. The company claimed over 360,000 annual acre-feet of water with a head for a canal near what is now Mesa Drive in Mesa. In January 1871 these three enterprises—the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch, the Hayden Milling and Farm Ditch Company, and the Hardy Irrigation Canal Company—consolidated as the Tempe Irrigating Canal Company (TICC). It remains unclear just how far west workers had extended the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch toward Kirkland’s farm, but this facility was quickly integrated into the larger TICC canal system. In April 1871 the TICC offered Hayden seventeen shares, or over 700 annual acre-feet of water, in exchange for suspension of his earlier water claim; the deal also committed Hayden to the construction of a flour mill. Once Hayden bought in, laborers relocated the head of the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch to a lateral off the TICC’s main Tempe Canal and extended the facility around the

10 Before 1950, residents of the Salt River Valley obtained drinking water from groundwater wells exclusively; surface water irrigated agricultural and residential landscapes.
11 John A. Black, Arizona: The Land of Sunshine and Silver, Health and Prosperity; the Place For Ideal Homes (Tucson: John A. Black, 1890), 58.
12 Anderson, “Tempe Canal,” 3; Pry, Oasis in the Valley, 7.
southern slope of Tempe Butte to the mill site, where it accelerated through a twenty-four-foot drop and turned the
turbine that set the mill in motion.15 “There is an abundance of water power to be obtained,” reported a Los Angeles
News dispatch from Arizona, “and the location that he (Hayden) has taken the precaution to secure is, of the most
desirable character.”16 In the summer of 1874 the mill became operational and the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch became
known colloquially as Hayden Ditch (others called it “Hayden Canal” or “Hayden Branch of the Tempe Canal,” while
others preferred its original name, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch). Initially the water that flowed through the mill’s tailrace
returned to the Salt River, but in the mid-1870s farmers west of Tempe removed the head of the San Francisco Canal to
the tailrace; thereafter the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch supplied water that irrigated fields west of Tempe owned by Michael
Wormser.17

Besides powering Hayden’s flour mill, the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch also irrigated the farms and gardens of homesteads
located in sections 23 and 24. Primarily the landholders in these sections, like other Tempe-area farmers, produced
commercial grains milled at Hayden Flour Mill and marketed throughout the southwest. Their names include Manuel
Gonzalez, Tiburcio Sotelo, Juan Soza, Jesus Miranda, and Winchester Miller.18 Miller, who for a time served as president
and zanjero, or water master, of the TICC, also served as deputy sheriff and administered county services in the Tempe
area.19 In 1873 he married Tiburcio Sotelo’s daughter, Maria, and helped her widowed mother, Manuela Sotelo, attain a
patent on her quarter-section homestead in Section 23 between what is now Rural Road and Dorsey Lane. In 1890
Manuela Sotelo subdivided a narrow, half-mile-long portion of her homestead along the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch where
several friends and family members had already purchased lots and raised families of their own. This neighborhood,
officially called the Sotelo Addition but also known as Barrio del May’s and La Cremeria, emerged as an independent
barrio where residents relied on the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch to water backyard subsistence gardens. The Elias-
Rodriguez House (NR #84000684) was one such property. “The backyard fronting on the canal,” writes an historian of
the house, “was a veritable garden, filled with fruit trees—figs, apricots, pomegranates, plums, citrus, quince—along with
grapes and all varieties of flowers … children used to swim in the canal and swung from a rope attached to the large
trees that grew along its banks.”20 Like much of Tempe’s farming landscape, however, the homes of the Sotelo Addition
lost their irrigated-agricultural character in the decades following World War II, when development pressures prompted
officials to pipe much of the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch along East 8th Street.

Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)

N/A

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

“An Historic Building Analysis of the Elias/Rodriguez House, Tempe, Arizona.” Phoenix: Don W. Ryden, AIA/Architects,

Arizona Citizen

Arizona Republican

---

Trumbull Hayden and His Family,” in Hayden Flour Mill, 1:44; Scott Solliday, “Exploration and Settlement of Arizona and the Salt River Valley” in
Hayden Flour Mill, 1:56-59.

16 Reprinted as “Grist Mill for Tucson” in Arizona Citizen, 6 April 1872. The Los Angeles News had mistakenly identified Tucson as the location of
Hayden’s mill, prompting the Arizona Citizen to reprint the story with a correction.

Region, Department of the Interior, 1987, 10.

18 Scott Solliday, “History of the Sotelo Addition to Tempe” in Thomas E. Wright, et. al., La Plaza y La Cremeria (Tempe: Archaeological Research
Services, Inc., 2004), 249.


Addition to Tempe” in Wright, et. al., La Plaza y La Cremeria, 251-253.
Kirkland-McKinney Ditch _____________________________ Maricopa, Arizona

Name of Property County and State


Black, John A. Arizona: The Land of Sunshine and Silver, Health and Prosperity; the Place For Ideal Homes. Tucson: John A. Black, 1890.


Previous documentation on file (NPS):
___ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
___ previously listed in the National Register
___ previously determined eligible by the National Register
___ designated a National Historic Landmark
___ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # __________________
___ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # __________________
___ recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey # __________________

Primary location of additional data:
___ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State agency
___ Federal agency
___ Local government
___ Local government
___ University
___ Other

Name of repository: __________________________

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): __________________________

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property Less than one acre.
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

1 12S 414972 3698151 3
Zone Easting Northing Zone Easting Northing
Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The subject property is bounded by East 8th Street to the north, Una Avenue to the east, the north property boundary of the Tempe Manor apartment complex to the south, and Gary Drive to the west.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The boundary selection corresponds with the 500-foot daylighted, dirt-lined segment of the Kirkland-McKinney Ditch.

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
  
  A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Continuation Sheets**

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs:
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property: Kirkland-McKinney Ditch
City or Vicinity: Tempe
County: Maricopa State: Arizona
Photographer: Nathan Hallam
Kirkland-McKinney Ditch
Name of Property

Maricopa, Arizona
County and State

Date Photographed: December 11, 2011

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of ___.
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name U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Phoenix Area Office)

street & number 6150 West Thunderbird Road
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city or town Glendale
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zip code 85306
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National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).

1. Name of Property

historic name  Tempe Double Butte Cemetery (Pioneer Section)
other names/site number

2. Location

street & number  2505 W. Broadway Rd.  not for publication
city or town  Tempe  vicinity
state  Arizona  code AZ  county  Maricopa  code 013  zip code  85281

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

In my opinion, the property  x  meets  _  does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:

  __ national  __ statewide  x local

Signature of certifying official/Title

Date

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

In my opinion, the property  ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria.

Signature of commenting official

Date

Title

State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

  ____ entered in the National Register
  ____ determined eligible for the National Register
  ____ determined not eligible for the National Register
  ____ removed from the National Register
  ____ other (explain):

Signature of the Keeper

Date of Action

5. Classification
Tempe Double Butte Cemetery    Maricopa, Arizona
Name of Property                   County and State

Ownership of Property (Check as many boxes as apply.)

[ ] private
[ ] public - Local
[ ] public - State
[ ] public - Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box.)

[ ] building(s)
[ ] district
[ ] site
[ ] structure
[ ] object

Number of Resources within Property (Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions.)

Funerary / Cemetery

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions.)

Funerary / Cemetery

7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions.)

N/A

Materials (Enter categories from instructions.)

foundation: N/A
walls: N/A
roof: N/A
other: Stone (Granite/Marble Monuments)
Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

Summary Paragraph

Double Butte Cemetery is located on the westernmost fringe of the City of Tempe and sits just east of that municipality’s boundary with neighboring Phoenix. It is located immediately south of Broadway Road, from which thoroughfare public access is gained. Interstate-10 flanks the eastern periphery of the property; there is a considerable distance of undeveloped land and vegetation separating the interstate from the burial grounds, providing a veritable buffer zone that eliminates excessive noise and unsightly features of mass-transportation that might otherwise detract from the serenity commonly associated with cemeteries. To the south, the main entrance to the Marriott hotel and resort at Double Buttes marks the cemetery’s boundary but is separated by fencing and mature vegetation. The cemetery is prominently situated at the western base of two large rock outcroppings known locally as the Double Buttes and Bell Butte. These geographic features have played a prominent role in the cemetery’s history since its founding in the late 1880s and have provided the omnipresent visual backdrop from whence the cemetery’s name is derived. As an active graveyard, the grounds continue to expand outward as necessity dictates and therefore this nomination pertains only to the oldest, or “Pioneer,” section of the property, in which those persons of transcendent historical importance are buried and in which approximately three-quarters of burials predate 1962. Owned and operated by the City of Tempe, Double Butte Cemetery is comprised of 41.4 acres, although 13.7 of that remain undeveloped at this time and, as will be seen, only a portion of the remaining 27.7 acres is being nominated to the national register. The majority of the cemetery exudes its original desert, bare-dirt appearance and contains only minimal plantings, although the newest sections (those not being nominated because of their modernity) are grass-covered and lined with large trees. Numerous narrow paths—some paved, some not—wind their way throughout the cemetery and allow vehicular access to each respective section; significantly, these access trails have not been straightened or otherwise altered from their original configuration; that is to say, they remain positioned in the same manner as they were during the historic period of significance, and other than the addition of asphalt pavement no other alterations have been made. (See photos 1-4 for geographic setting and context).

Narrative Description

DESCRIPTION OF PHYSICAL FEATURES

Location – This property exists in its originally developed location at the western base of the Double Buttes. The first burial plots were set in an undeveloped, Sonoran desert environment and the cemetery has been maintained in a manner that has preserved this original desert appearance. Niels Petersen, a prominent Tempe entrepreneur and landowner, donated this site in the late 1890s for use as a cemetery. The original burials remain within the confines of Tempe Double Butte Cemetery, which has expanded outward many times over the years to accommodate community needs. This outward growth, however, has served only to enhance the integrity of setting and has had no detrimental impacts.

Setting - Double Butte Cemetery retains its full integrity of setting with regard to the historic period of significance (1888-1962). Visiting the site, one immediately gains a sense of the original layout and it is easy to envision the cemetery as it existed in its earliest days. Visitors can readily deduce the manner in which the cemetery strategically expanded at various intervals over a period of many decades, radiating outward in different directions to accommodate the continuing need for additional burial space. The two mountainous outcroppings—Bell Butte and Double Buttes, respectively—rise prominently to the east and southeast, providing a sense of visual orientation that has remained constant since the first interments occurred some 120 years ago.

Feeling - The sheer size and dominance of the buttes underscores the natural setting and deepens the sense of spiritual connection that visitors experience when traversing the cemetery grounds. Despite being situated in a sprawling urban and suburban area with more than 4 million residents, one feels as though they have stepped backwards in time and cannot help but become oblivious to the city around them. The Sonoran Desert atmosphere adds tremendously to this sense of feeling, as no alterations have been made to the historic portions of the cemetery; the indigenous vegetation that

\[1\] Fox, A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery, p. 3.
sporadically surrounds the individual graves and trails harkens back to the earliest years of the site’s use as a burial ground and exudes a high level of environmental feeling and integrity.

Association - As Tempe’s earliest cemetery, Double Butte prominently portrays the unique diversity of the community across time. Members of various ethnic groups can be found buried alongside one another, a lasting vestige to the remarkable range of cultural associations that defined people’s daily lives in Tempe through the ages. No other place in Tempe so vividly portrays this cultural diversity and developmental associations in such a powerful and original setting. The cemetery also bears close associations with broader historical themes, including economic development and politics (at the local, state, and national levels), which will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section of this nomination.

Materials - Tempe Double Butte Cemetery is unique in that it is the only cemetery in the Salt River Valley that includes both a Victorian-era pioneer graveyard alongside a Post WWII-era cemetery. The property contains graves and markers of pioneer families evidencing the early diversity of the community and providing a good representation of the historic Tempe community’s continuously developing self-image. The juxtaposition of both aforementioned sections demonstrates the evolution of a simple town graveyard into a modern community cemetery. From the natural desert in the pioneer section to the tree-lined irrigated lawn areas, both sections coexist with good integrity and together they help us interpret Tempe’s growth and development from a rural 19th century farming community to a modern 21st century urban center. This transcendence of design and development provides a significant array of gravemarkers and monuments that collectively represent the artistic values of several historical periods while simultaneously offering insights into the evolution of landscape architecture.

The gravemarkers in the sections being nominated (1888-1962) consist primarily of stone tablets and obelisks, with the more elaborate obelisks predating the 1920s and being representative of the Victorian-style preferences more common to that earlier time period. Among the newer burials, many of the markers lay flat on the surface of the ground and are composed of copper or brass, whereas older burials contain predominantly free-standing tablets of granite or marble.

A number of larger family plots dot the cemetery grounds, many of which date back to the early 1900s and some of which are still active in cases where the family remains in Tempe. These family plots are almost invariably distinguished by historic fencing of various sorts, in many cases wrought-iron (see photos 5-6). Furthermore, many family burial plots (particularly those that are not fenced) have small, approximately six-inch wide and four-inch tall concrete curbing denoting the rectangular boundaries (see photos 7-8). These concrete curbs are an important character-defining feature of the cemetery and no such infrastructure has been installed in the modern era; all concrete curbing shows certain unmistakable signs of old age, such as significant cracking; lightening in coloration; wear to the surface finish; shifting in position (making them unlevel); and minor damage of various sorts including chipping and weathering. Damaged portions of these concrete curbs have not been replaced with new materials and thus the historic integrity remains fully intact.

Condition - For many years, primary caretaking responsibilities at the cemetery fell to the individual families whose relatives were buried there. Oftentimes families would erect fencing around their burial plots and would, to the best of their abilities, care for the grounds in the immediate vicinity to prevent overgrowth and other unsightly features. As a result, in its earliest years Double Butte Cemetery appeared only sporadically cared-for because some families had access to caretaking resources while others did not. In early years the Tempe Cemetery Company did its utmost to ensure upkeep, but ultimately the more minute details were the responsibility of the families who owned burial plots. Of course, this early method of landscaping and grounds upkeep is no longer the case at Double Butte. The cemetery is now administered and maintained by the City of Tempe Parks and Recreation Department. This city department first acquired ownership of the property in 1958 from the Tempe Cemetery Association, which dissolved its interest in the property at that time.\(^2\) After a brief period of private operation from 1998 to early 2000, the City of Tempe resumed its former role and continues to operate the cemetery through a cooperative arrangement between the Community Services and Public Works Departments, with administrative oversight provided by the Double Butte Cemetery Advisory Commission.

Although gravestones and burial plots at Tempe Double Butte Cemetery generally remain in good condition, many of the older burial-markers show signs of age and some are in critical need of conservation. Additionally, some of the oldest markers have suffered either from vandalism or natural deterioration and are now cracked, chipped, or in a few egregious instances, lying prostrate upon the ground (see photos 9-10). There are also a number of graves at the cemetery that

\(^2\) Cheryl Fox, *A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery*, p. 9.
have never had identifying markers (130 according to burial database records). All burial plots are maintained with care, however, and the cemetery continues to portray its wide diversity of interments through the careful, diligent caretaking of the City of Tempe Parks and Recreation Department.

CONTRIBUTING/NON-CONTRIBUTING ELEMENTS

The gravel (desert-landscaped) sections of the cemetery (Sections A-G and 1-14) are considered contributing, as all of these portions contain predominantly pre-1962 burials with some post-1962 interments spread sporadically throughout. Sections 16 and 18 (located in the grass-covered area of the grounds) are also considered contributing, with roughly half of their interments predating 1962. The fact that desert-landscaped and lawn-covered portions of the cemetery both fall within the period of significance indicates an evolving burial trend in suburban Arizona, one which saw a mid-century shift at many cemeteries from natural Sonoran desert environs to a more lush vegetative environment featuring large trees and grass in lieu of desert flora. Significantly, however, preexisting portions of the cemetery were never altered to conform with this new trend and thus we see these two customary styles—one representing the historic method of burial and the other a more modern preference—located side-by-side at Double Butte Cemetery.

The more modern grass sections (Sections 17 and 19-23), which comprise the western portion of Double Butte Cemetery, contain no historic (pre-1962) burials and are therefore considered non-contributing. Additionally, the Memorial Gardens, Sunset Section, and Sunrise Sections (the latter two making up the southeastern fringe of the property and the former comprising a small component of the northern periphery), which contain approximately 250 burials, are also considered non-contributing due to modernity. It should also be noted that a total of 130 burials are listed as having an unknown date of death and date of interment, and thus those are not included in the enumeration that follows.

STATISTICAL BREAKDOWN OF THE CEMETERY

Contributing elements (Sections A-G and Sections 1-16 and 18): 7,631 total burials, of which 5,473 are considered contributing because they pre-date 1962. Thus, the eligible portion of Double Butte Cemetery contains 71.72% contributing burials. Of the 5,473 pre-1962 burials, 101 are listed as before 1900, meaning that 1.18% of contributing burials pre-date 1900.

Non-Contributing elements (Sections 17,19-23; Sunset; Sunrise; Memorial Gardens): 4,347 total burials, none of which pre-date 1962. These sections are not considered a part of this historic district and therefore are not being nominated for the National Register of Historic Places.

The cemetery contains only one built structure, a restroom facility, which is of modern construction and is considered non-contributing.

SUMMARY

Although there has been some damage and vandalism to a small number of the oldest gravestones, Tempe Double Butte Cemetery nevertheless retains a remarkably high level of integrity, as evidenced through the retention of desert-landscaping in the older sections, the continuing existence of historic burial plot fencing and concrete curbing, and the presence of a very high percentage (approximately 72%) of burials dating to the period of significance (1888-1962). The location, setting, burial juxtaposition, and retention of historic infrastructure all contribute to a remarkably high level of integrity at Double Butte Cemetery. The sections of the cemetery being nominated contain only one non-contributing structure which, considered in the grander scheme, is no detraction at all from the setting and feeling one experiences when visiting the site.

---

3 Double Butte Cemetery Burial Database.
4 All statistics are taken from burial record databases at the Double Butte Cemetery Administration Office and were provided courtesy of Cynthia Yanez.
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8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. (A)
- Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. (B)
- Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. (C)
- Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (D)

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

- Property is:
  - Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes. (A)
  - Removed from its original location. (B)
  - A birthplace or grave. (C)
  - A cemetery. (X)
  - A reconstructed building, object, or structure. (E)
  - A commemorative property. (F)
  - Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years. (G)

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- Community Planning/Development
- Politics/Government
- Exploration/Settlement

Period of Significance

- 1888-1962

Significant Dates

- 1888 (First verifiable burial in cemetery)

Significant Person

- N/A (Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Cultural Affiliation

- N/A

Architect/Builder

- N/A

Period of Significance (justification)

The first recorded burial at Tempe Double Butte Cemetery dates to 1888. The cut-off date of 1962 reflects the point at which burials are no longer 50 years old and thus are not eligible for listing on the National Register.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

The property is a cemetery being nominated under criteria ‘A’ and modified through criteria consideration ‘D’. Please see discussion of this in the narrative statement of significance below.
Double Butte Cemetery is being nominated for the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A, with the stipulations of criteria consideration D as supporting evidence of eligibility inasmuch as the cemetery transcends mere personal/familial significance and many of those buried there maintained a direct association with the development of both the Tempe community as well as the State of Arizona. Under criteria A, Double Butte Cemetery is eligible for its strong association with the early development of Tempe in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. The period of significance begins in 1888 with the first known burial and extends to 1962, the current 50-year mark. It is the only remaining pre-1900 burial ground in the City of Tempe and served as the community’s first officially-recognized cemetery beginning in 1888. As such, it contains the graves of early pioneers who contributed in various ways to the economic, political, social, and cultural development of the burgeoning town beginning in the 1880s, a mere decade after Tempe’s beginning in 1888. As such, it contains the graves of early pioneers who contributed in various ways to the economic, political, social, and cultural development of the burgeoning town beginning in the 1880s, a mere decade after Tempe’s beginning in 1888. So too does the cemetery contain the graves of persons who played prominent roles in the political development of the Territory (and later State) of Arizona, exceeding the many contributions of Tempe residents to the broader realm of Arizona history writ large.

Double Butte Cemetery is the town’s first cemetery; it is significant for being contemporaneous with the founding of Tempe, for evidencing the diversity of community pioneers, and as an exemplary representation of the self-image of the community during its first century in existence. The creation and continuity of Tempe’s first cemetery reflects a broad spectrum of the community’s history and culture. As a district eligible under Criteria A, Double Butte not only meets, but exceeds, the requirements for the continued presence of integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association. Significantly, the site goes far beyond mere individual and family associations; it reflects the establishment, development, and growth of Tempe through the presence of dozens of early pioneers’ gravesites. Furthermore, the cemetery is also reflective of the political ascension of Arizona inasmuch as several prominent public figures are interred on the property.

Tempe Double Butte Cemetery is significant at both the local and state levels, although its importance to Tempe history arguably exceeds its contribution to larger statewide contexts. Most of the approximately 11,000 persons buried at the cemetery are more closely associated with Tempe as a community than with Arizona as a state. As will be seen, however, the graves of many important figures in Double Butte Cemetery provide a strong case for statewide significance as well.

Increasingly, scholarship and public perception have come to demonstrate a growing appreciation for the important historical themes that graves, cemeteries, and burial places represent. Owing to a growing emphasis on the history of ordinary individuals, grass roots movements, and various cultural groups, the importance of burial places to the interpretation of community history is taking on new significance. Unfortunately, the maintenance and preservation of burial places is threatened by neglect and vandalism, even as the qualities that render these places important representatives of our history make them worthy of preservation. Historic designation and listing is an important step in preserving Double Butte, because such recognition can help to initiate and sustain community interest in the overall importance of this site in conveying the story of its past. Designation also lends increased credibility to localized efforts seeking to preserve this resource for its continuing contribution to the community’s identity.

The advent of the western base of the Double Buttes as a burial place can be traced to the continued expansion of Tempe in the late nineteenth century and the increasing need for a pre-determined cemetery far-removed from the town’s residential and commercial core. Prior to the establishment of Double Butte Cemetery, many persons were buried in a haphazard manner at locations near the settlement. Double Butte therefore became the first successful attempt to mitigate this shortcoming and, within ten years of its founding, had become the primary place of burial for deceased Tempe residents. Although the first verifiable burials date to the 1880s, Double Butte Cemetery was not officially established until September 13, 1897 during a meeting of the Tempe Cemetery Company, whose officers formed the first corporate entity to administer the property. The many interments that already existed at that location prompted the Tempe Cemetery Company to assume responsibility for the property. The earliest gravestones recorded in the burial

---

database date to 1888; there are six known graves from that year, making that the earliest verifiable date for the
cemetery’s founding.

Some of the significant people who are buried within the confines of Double Butte Cemetery include:

Charles Trumbull Hayden (Founder of Tempe)

Charles Trumbull Hayden, the founder of Tempe, was born in 1825 in Connecticut and ventured to Arizona in the mid-
1850s. After spending more than a decade in Tucson working as a merchant and freighter, he relocated to the southern
bank of the Salt River, where he established himself by constructing a house, general store, grist mill, and river-crossing.
He played a pivotal role in ensuring that the Territorial Normal School was located in Tempe in 1885, a move that
guaranteed the prosperity of the town and which has now made Tempe one of Arizona’s leading educational centers.
Hayden died in Tempe in 1900 and was among the first people buried at Double Butte Cemetery. (See photo 11).

Carl T. Hayden (Arizona senator, 1927-1969)

Born in Tempe in 1877, Carl Hayden was a prominent figure who spent the bulk of his life in politics at the national level.
A member of the Democratic Party, he served as Arizona’s first state representative in the House beginning in 1912 and,
after eight terms, went on to become a U.S. senator and served an additional seven terms in that role. His political career
in Washington spanned seven decades, from 1912 to 1969, making him the longest-serving Congressman up to that
time. He played a major role in western development, especially in regards to irrigation and water rights, public lands,
reclamation, and transportation. A widely-respected man prone to compromise and congeniality on the Senate floor,
Hayden garnered incredible respect among his colleagues. One person famously wrote that Hayden had “assisted so
many projects for so many senators that when old Carl wants something for his beloved Arizona, his fellow senators fall
all over themselves giving him a hand. They’d probably vote landlocked Arizona a navy if he asked for it.”6 Carl Hayden
died in 1972 and was buried in the family plot at Tempe Double Butte Cemetery. (See photo 12).

Dr. Benjamin B. Moeur (Arizona governor, 1932-1936)

Benjamin Baker Moeur lived in Tempe, Arizona for over forty years, from 1896 until 1937, during which time he became a
well-known physician, volunteered for school boards, owned numerous successful businesses, helped draft Arizona’s
1912 statehood constitution, and served as Arizona’s governor for two terms during the Great Depression. His two
gubernatorial terms are perhaps best remembered for a famous dispute with California over water rights in which Moeur
called up the Arizona National Guard and sent troops to the Colorado River to block construction of Parker Dam. (See
photo 13).


Howard J. Pyle was one of Tempe’s most outstanding and distinguished citizens, serving in numerous important
capacities both locally and nationally throughout his entire life. Born in Wyoming in 1906, he and his family moved to
Tempe in 1925. He began his career in Arizona as a radio announcer, achieving widespread recognition for his
broadcasts during World War II and his famous annual Easter Sunday broadcasts at the Grand Canyon. In 1950, he was
elected to the office of governor in Arizona, at that time only the second Republican ever to serve in that stead. After two
terms as Arizona’s governor, Pyle worked in President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s administration and was afterwards
appointed to serve as president of the National Safety Council. Following many years of service in that organization Pyle
returned to Tempe, where he remained active by speaking at events and writing weekly columns in the local newspaper.
His entire life was dedicated to public service, and he became a widely revered, highly-popular local celebrity for his
beneficent work. Pyle died in Tempe in 1987 at the age of 81. He famously referred to Double Butte Cemetery as
“Tempe’s Arlington” because of the fact that so many important individuals are buried there. (See photo 14).

The site contains numerous additional headstones of resonant importance, including those of military veterans from every
major American conflict since the Civil War. Below is an assorted example of some of the more significant epitaphs found
at Double Butte Cemetery:

- Sergeant John E. Campbell (1866-1910): “Charged San Juan Hill. In charge of platoon and mentioned by Col
  Roosevelt for gallant conduct.” (See also Crantz Cartledge, below). (See photo 15).

6 Los Angeles Times, April 18, 1971.
Tempe Double Butte Cemetery
Maricopa, Arizona

- Crantz Cartledge (no date): “Co. C – 1 U.S.V. Cav.” The First U.S. Volunteer Cavalry was Theodore Roosevelt’s famed Rough Rider regiment during the Spanish American War. Cartledge is at least the second Rough Rider veteran buried at Double Butte Cemetery, along with Sergeant John E. Campbell (mentioned above). (See photo 16).


- William Fellows (May 5, 1856-January 2, 1911): “Pvt Co D 197 Ohio Infantry. Civil War.” It is interesting to note the date of birth (1856) which would have made this individual no more than 9 years old while serving as a private in the Civil War. Unless he was a drummer-boy then this birthdate is almost certainly erroneous. (See photo 18).


- John Knight (October 5, 1851-September 6, 1904): (Woodmen of the World insignia). There are numerous headstones bearing the emblems of fraternal organizations, of which this specimen serves as an example. (See photo 20).


- James Waterhouse (1823-1909): “Veteran of Civil War” (See photo 23).

The biographical histories of these selected individuals—along with those of countless other persons of less public prominence but equal importance in community and cultural evolution—reveal a remarkable level of involvement at both the local and statewide levels of Arizona development, and it can be argued that few other historic cemeteries in the state possess such a wide diversity of prominent Arizonans interred within their boundaries. The approximately 8,000 persons buried in Double Butte Cemetery during the historic period of significance (1888-1962) are, each in their own respective manner, representative of Tempe’s many contributions to Arizona over the previous 130 years.

Perhaps less prominent, but equally important, are the countless graves of Tempe citizens who quietly played their own respective roles in the community’s evolution over the past century. Tempe is, and always has been, a place of tremendous diversity. Located as it is, directly between the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation (SRP-MIC) and the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), Tempe is a place that has long been defined by its relationship with Native American communities. In that same regard, Arizona’s proximity to the border with Mexico has also played a critical role in cultural development. Since its earliest days Tempe has attracted a wide range of Hispanic- and Mexican-American residents who served in a variety of capacities at the local level. So too did Japanese-American migrant farmers contribute to this dynamic of diversity, occupying portions of the eastern Salt River Valley beginning in the early 1900s and adding another layer of cultural complexity. The arrival of Anglo-American businessmen and entrepreneurs beginning in the 1870s and continuing for many decades thereafter provided yet another important cultural and ethnic linkage, one that at times bonded, and occasionally abraded, these groups during the course of everyday.7

As Tempe’s earliest cemetery, dating to 1888, Double Butte prominently portrays this remarkable diversity through its broad range of burials. Walking down the rows of gravestones, it is not unusual to find members of various ethnic groups buried side by side, a lasting tribute to those whose daily lives found them working and living near one another. No other place in Tempe so vividly portrays this cultural diversity in such a powerful and original setting.

A 1940s scrapbook of the Tempe Old Settlers Association named 91 early city pioneers; 82 of those named are buried at Double Butte. Indeed, the cemetery is the gravesite of Tempe founder Charles T. Hayden, his son U.S. Senator Carl Hayden, and numerous other Tempe pioneers and persons of transcendent importance in the history of the community, including the families of Fogal, Gilliland, Goodwin, Gregg, Laird, Miller, Moeur, and O'Conner. While Hayden, Laird and Moeur are memorialized in our built environment by buildings and structures directly associated with their productive lives,

---

7 Scott Solliday, “Historical Overview,” in Scott Kwiatkowski and Thomas Wright, Tempe (Hayden) Butte & Environs Archaeological and Cultural Resource Study, pp. 3-4. Although the Tempe community bears a close historical relationship with neighboring tribes, there is not a specific correlation between these tribes and Double Butte Cemetery, and this National Register nomination should not be construed as suggesting that such a correlation exists. See Logan Simpson Design, Inc. and Ryden Architects, City of Tempe: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Master Plan, p. 27.
Fogal, Gregg, Miller, and many other pioneer families are commemorated only at Double Butte and their graves are the only physical remnant of their lives in Tempe. (See photos 24-28).

Developmental history/additional historic context information (if appropriate)

Development of Double Butte Cemetery, 1888 to 1962

Tempe Double Butte Cemetery traces its roots back as far as 1888, the date of the first recorded graves in the cemetery register (six total interments are known to date from that year). For the next decade, Double Butte grew to become Tempe’s primary burial place. Accordingly, on September 13, 1897, the Tempe Cemetery Company was formed, becoming the first entity to administer the property. Officers included: Thomas Morrow (president); Jonathan L. Richard (vice president); Gabriel Cosner (secretary); and M.S. Johnston (treasurer). The articles of incorporation granted operating rights for twenty-five years, until September 1922. Upon executive board approval, the company made available one thousand shares of stock in Double Butte Cemetery, valued at ten dollars per share.8

Among the first sections to be professionally developed by the Tempe Cemetery Company, what has come to be known as the “Pioneer Section” offered family plats and was located adjacent to earlier, pre-1897 burials. Of the five original company executives named above, four of them are buried in the Pioneer Section. It is also in this, the oldest organized portion of the cemetery, that the graves of Tempe pioneers Charles Trumbull Hayden, Carl T. Hayden, and Benjamin B. Moeur are found. Alongside them are buried members of their immediate families, including Carl Hayden’s wife Nan, who sewed the first Arizona state flag in 1912. Governor Moeur’s wife, Honor Andersen Moeur, who served for many years as secretary of the Tempe Cemetery Association, is also buried next to her husband.9

As noted, the incorporation charter for the Tempe Cemetery Company expired in September 1922. Two years later a stockholder meeting convened to elect a new board of directors and to determine the future directional aspirations of the company. New directors were elected at a January 31, 1924 meeting, including: Joseph T. Birchett (president); D.G. Buck (vice president); Mrs. B.B. Moeur (secretary); Hugh Laird (treasurer); and Price Wickliff (sexton).10

Events in the 1920s had left the company in dire financial straits, and the cemetery itself suffered immensely as a result, with “many of the graves . . . badly sunken and the trees beginning to die from lack of water and care.” Recent banking failures at the local level had devastated the Tempe Cemetery Company’s pecuniary assets and the new board of directors was faced with the primary task of raising additional funds. By the end of 1926, after only a few months of effort, a fundraising committee had secured nearly $1,500 to be expended towards cemetery upkeep as well as the purchase of five additional acres of land from original donor Niels Petersen.11

By the time Joseph Birchett retired as president in 1929, the Tempe Cemetery Association had fully recovered from its earlier financial woes and had begun to envision greater expansion (ironically, the cemetery achieved fiscal prosperity just as the Great Depression struck and catapulted the nation into financial catastrophe). Some concern was expressed with the frequent practice of non-Tempe residents being buried in the cemetery, especially because of limited space. Prior to his departure, Birchett recommended that the cemetery expand to include both of the buttes and all land adjoining them, noting that he was “convinced that at some future time they will be valuable assets.” An imaginative Birchett foresaw the placement of permanent reservoirs and ponds “on some of the higher ground” as being conducive to the future construction of mausoleums and proclaimed that Double Butte Cemetery, if properly expanded and administered, “could unquestionably be made into one of the most beautiful and unique cemeteries in the whole country.”12

Birchett’s vision of lavish ponds and fountains on the slopes of the Double Buttes never came to fruition (perhaps due more to issues of geographic impracticality rather than financial concerns), but the cemetery did nevertheless continue to expand in other, more practical, directions. In 1938 Tempe Cemetery Association President Garfield A. Goodwin asked

---

8 Fox, A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery, p. 1.
10 Fox, A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery, p. 5.
11 Joseph T. Birchett, President’s Report, March 30, 1926, quoted in ibid, p. 6.
12 Ibid., p. 8.
the board of directors to approve a motion for the purchase of twenty-five acres of land abutting the western fringe of the existing grounds for the price of $3,200. In upcoming years burial plots would continue to fill these newly acquired lands: Sections F and G were filled between 1927 and 1936; Sections 1-7 reached capacity between 1926 and 1939; and Sections 8-12 had been bought out by 1958.

By the 1950s, the cemetery had grown to a size and scale that severely taxed the administrative abilities of a volunteer organization like the Tempe Cemetery Association. At a board of directors meeting on April 17, 1958, the three remaining members (E.P. Carr, Jr., Hugh E. Laird, and Clyde Gilliland) announced that a deal had been struck to “convey to the City of Tempe all of its right, title and interest in and to the property . . . on the condition that the City of Tempe assume its obligations to operate same as a cemetery.” Thus, after sixty years of private, volunteer-organization management, Tempe Double Butte Cemetery reverted to administration by the City of Tempe. It remains under city ownership to this day.

### Cultural, Social, and Historical Development in Tempe AZ, 1888 to 1962

As heretofore noted, Tempe Double Butte Cemetery provides understanding and appreciation of Tempe’s highly diversified past with unparalleled transparency. As the primary place of burial for community residents beginning in the late 1880s and extending into the modern era, the cemetery reflects, through its array of burial plots and headstones, the cultural and social diversity of Tempe over a period spanning generations and dating back to the community’s earliest years.

Because of Tempe’s location in the heart of the fertile Salt River Valley, the town was initially defined by the presence of farms spreading outward in all directions from the community’s core. Tempe’s future role as a transportation center became apparent with the arrival of the railroad (1887), a role reemphasized with the completion of the Ash Avenue Bridge (1913), allowing traffic—at that time mostly wagons—all-weather access to the north bank of the Salt River and, by extension, to Phoenix. Add to this Tempe’s fortuitous adjacency to the educational institution that would one day become Arizona State University, and one can gain a realization of the reasons for which the community so prominently exudes a wide range of cultural diversity.

The arrival of the railroad in 1887 sparked a significant economic fluorescence in Tempe, which now enjoyed a vital commercial link not only to nearby Arizona communities but to the entire outside world as well. Anglo-American opportunists flocked to Tempe, recognizing the inevitable expansion that would occur now that the railroad linked the community to peripheral business centers. This sparked widespread infrastructural expansion in the town’s core while simultaneously encouraging real estate investors to purchase farmlands skirting the town’s immediate fringe in anticipation of additional expansion. This resulted in continuing residential development, beginning especially in 1910 with the advent of the Gage Addition and perpetuated in 1924 with the platting of Park Tract south of 6th Street and west of Mill Avenue, neighborhoods that would cater predominantly to the Anglo-American middle-class contingent of the community’s population. Thus, the arrival of major transportation infrastructure in the 1880s initiated the economic ascendency that would ultimately bring countless persons to Tempe as permanent residents.

Surrounded by farms in its earliest days, many migrants arrived to serve as laborers in the fields, giving rise to a considerably large Hispanic/Mexican population as early as 1900 (many of these persons lived in the area known as San Pablo, near the present site of Sun Devil Stadium and slightly removed from the community’s commercial hub along Mill Avenue). Later, beginning in the 1910s and 1920s, the Sotelo Addition further to the east (near the present site of Four Peaks Brewery, once Borden Creamery) represented an even greater expansion of the local Hispanic/Mexican community. Today, this type of racial segregation is not so readily apparent, with the entire Tempe community bearing a semblance of cultural diversity throughout.

---

13 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
14 Tempe Cemetery Association Minute Book, April 17, 1958, quoted in ibid., p. 9.
15 For Tempe’s most current strategic approach to administering Double Butte Cemetery, as outlined in 2002, see Logan Simpson Design, Inc. and Ryden Architects, *City of Tempe: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Master Plan* (May 31, 2002). For historic preservation initiatives and design guidelines in particular, see ibid., Appendix D.
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The preeminence of large-scale farming operations in the Salt River Valley also give rise to an increasing migrant population beginning in the early twentieth century. Persons of Asian descent began arriving in greater numbers in the 1920s and early 1930s, when unfavorable conditions in the farming areas of southern California induced many such immigrants to move further east into Arizona. In the 1930s, under the gubernatorial term of longtime Tempe resident Benjamin B. Moeur, cultural tensions reached a climax when local Anglo-Americans began threatening and even carrying out acts of violence against migrant farm workers. An international incident with Japan seemed imminent, and an ambassador from that country visited Phoenix to speak personally with Governor Moeur in 1934 in hopes of easing tensions and devising a peaceful solution. Eventually the matter fizzled out, but not before many Asian-Americans found themselves terrorized by profound racial intolerance. All of this exemplifies the rapidly evolving nature of cultural and social diversity in the Salt River Valley.18

February 1885 saw the ceremonial opening day of the Tempe Normal School, whose board was headed by Tempe's founding pioneer Charles T. Hayden. A mere 31 students were on hand to mark the occasion (a stark contrast to the approximately 72,000 attendees enumerated in the school's 2011 student body).19 Any community boasting a major collegiate institution necessarily attracts a wide array of persons, both teachers and students. As the school expanded and its student body/work force grew, so too did Tempe witness a corollary expansion in its own population's cultural and social diversity. In more modern times, students from nations all around the globe come to Arizona State University in pursuit of a higher educational degree, thus perpetuating the college's role in the continuing evolution of Tempe as a cultural community.20

What role does Tempe Double Butte Cemetery play in all of this? All three of the above-named developmental themes (farming, transportation, education) brought—and continue to bring—an ever-increasing array of culturally and ethnically diverse inhabitants to Tempe. These seemingly disparate evolutionary phenomena are drawn together in a powerful and spiritual manner at Double Butte Cemetery. Persons of all ethnic backgrounds—regardless of previous neighborhood segregation in the local community or racial backlash that occurred between different ethnic groups—are here found in one and the same place, a lasting vestige of the fact that all were, during their lifetimes, a pivotal component of the community and assisted, through their daily activities, in creating the Tempe that exists today. As such, Double Butte Cemetery holds a unique distinction as the location that perhaps best exhibits the cultural and social evolution of the local community.

A fitting summarization comes from Ben Furlong, a longtime resident of Tempe, who wrote in 1997 that, "As communities grow, the important qualities of human interaction are often difficult to retain. Indeed, the effort to keep them requires constant and deliberate attention." Perhaps nowhere else in Tempe is this better exemplified than at Double Butte Cemetery, the site that most profoundly portrays the community’s evolution.21 The cemetery is now commemorated biannually with the “Tales from Double Butte” walking tours, which offers the public an opportunity to visit the grounds and learn about Tempe history, as told by numerous tour guides well-versed in local history. Thus, Double Butte Cemetery has become an important venue for the dissemination of historic knowledge and serves as an important link between the past and present.

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)

Primary Sources
- Selected Personal Correspondence with Cynthia Yanez, Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Administration Office.
- Los Angeles Times

18 See National Register Nomination for the Governor B.B. Moeur House (May 2012), esp. pp. 9-10. See also various articles in the Los Angeles Times between August and December 1934, cited in ibid.
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Secondary Sources

- Fox, Cheryl L. A History of Tempe’s Double Butte Cemetery. Unpublished manuscript in the possession of Cynthia Yanez at the Tempe Double Butte Cemetery Administration Office.


Previous documentation on file (NPS): Primary location of additional data:

preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67 has been requested)
previously listed in the National Register
previously determined eligible by the National Register
designated a National Historic Landmark
recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #
recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #

Name of repository: City of Tempe

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned):

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property  41.4
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)
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Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

Tempe Double Butte Cemetery is located at 2505 W. Broadway Road and occupies a prominent position at the base of two mountainous outcroppings, known locally as Bell Butte and the Double Buttes. The cemetery lies on the westernmost periphery of the city and is bounded by Broadway Road on the north, Interstate-10 on the east, Westcourt Way on the south, and 48th Street on the west.
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Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)
The cemetery property extends to these four streets and this is therefore the most simplistic definition of boundary.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Billy Kiser
organization City of Tempe date July 2012
street & number 31 E. 5th Street telephone 480-350-8870
city or town Tempe state AZ zip code 85281
e-mail billy_kiser@tempe.gov

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

- Maps: A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
  
  A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- Continuation Sheets

- Additional items: (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs:
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map.

Name of Property: Tempe Double Butte Cemetery

City or Vicinity: Tempe

County: Maricopa State: Arizona

Photographer: Billy Kiser

Date Photographed:

Description of Photograph(s) and number:

1 of 28. The Double Buttes, looking southeast (viewed from cemetery section D).

2 of 28. Bell Butte, looking east (viewed from cemetery section D).
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3 of 28. Main entrance, looking south, with the Double Buttes visible at left. Note the desert gravel sections to the left and the tree-lined lawn sections to the right.

4 of 28. Close-up of Double Buttes, looking southeast from the main entry road.

5 of 28. Historic wrought-iron fencing surrounds a family burial plot, looking southeast, with Double Buttes in the background. This type of infrastructure is common throughout the historic section of the cemetery to denote family plots. (Located in cemetery section D).

6 of 28. A second example of historic iron fencing around a burial plot. This example exhibits some damage from unknown causes. (Located in cemetery section B).

7 of 28. This type of concrete curbing is common throughout the Pioneer Section of Double Butte Cemetery and is used to denote burial plots. Typically, burial plots with fencing do not have such curbing (and vice versa). Note the chipping and cracking to the concrete, indicative of its antiquity. (Located in cemetery section D).

8 of 28. This plot—which contains no known burials—is circumscribed by an historic brick curb that was originally covered in cement. (Located in cemetery section D).

9 of 28. This photo shows an extreme example of damage to an historic headstone. Only a portion of the original remains intact, and what does remain is almost entirely illegible. Although it was obviously once a free-standing marker, it now lies almost flat on the ground. (Located in cemetery section C).

10 of 28. A second damaged gravemarker; note the bottom portion (original made of cement reinforced with three strands of rebar) is entirely missing, although it continues to survive as a free-standing object. (Located in cemetery section G).

11 of 28. Charles Trumbull Hayden (Section B).

12 of 28. Senator Carl T. Hayden (Section B).

13 of 28. Governor Benjamin Baker Moeur (Section 4).

14 of 28. Governor Howard J. Pyle (Section 4).

15 of 28. John E. Campbell (Section E).

16 of 28. Crantz Cartledge (Section A).

17 of 28. William E. Carver (Section D).

18 of 28. William Fellows (Section E).

19 of 28. James Gililland (Section C).

20 of 28. John Knight (Section B).

21 of 28. William S. McMannon (Section F).

22 of 28. Elizabeth Steele (Section C).

23 of 28. James Waterhouse (Section D).

24 of 28. Garfield Goodwin (Section C).

25 of 28. Fogal Family Plot (Section D).

26 of 28. Hugh Laird (Section 2).
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27 of 28. Winchester Miller (Section B).

28 of 28. Dr. John L. Gregg (Section B).

Property Owner: (Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name  City of Tempe

street & number  31 E. 5th Street  telephone  480-350-4311

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin, *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form*. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional certification comments, entries, and narrative items on continuation sheets if needed (NPS Form 10-900a).

1. Name of Property
   historic name     Tempe Municipal Building
   other names/site number

2. Location
   street & number     31 East Fifth Street
   city or town     Tempe
   state     Arizona code     AZ county     Maricopa code     013 zip code     85281

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
   I hereby certify that this _nomination     _request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.
   In my opinion, the property       meets     _  does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant at the following level(s) of significance:
   _national               X   statewide               local
   Signature of certifying official/Title     Date

   State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government
   In my opinion, the property _meets _does not meet the National Register criteria.
   Signature of commenting official     Date

   Title     State or Federal agency/bureau or Tribal Government

4. National Park Service Certification
   I hereby certify that this property is:
   __ entered in the National Register     __ determined eligible for the National Register
   __ determined not eligible for the National Register     __ removed from the National Register
   __ other (explain:)     ____________________________
   Signature of the Keeper     Date of Action
### 5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Check as many boxes as apply.)</td>
<td>(Check only one box.)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] private</td>
<td>X building(s)</td>
<td>1 contributing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X] public - Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 noncontributing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] public - State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] public - Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Government: City Hall
- Government: Government Office

### 7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modern Movement: Moderne
- foundation: Concrete
- walls: Steel; Glass
- roof: Steel
- other: 

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

0
**Tempe Municipal Building**

**Name of Property:**

**County and State:**

**Maricopa County, Arizona**

---

**Narrative Description**

(Describe the historic and current physical appearance of the property. Explain contributing and noncontributing resources if necessary. Begin with **a summary paragraph** that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, setting, size, and significant features.)

---

**Summary Paragraph**

Located on 5th street just east of Mill Avenue, Tempe Municipal Building was completed in 1970. The construction of this building incorporated the latest techniques of steel construction. The building is centered on 2 ½ acres of land that merges the building with plazas, gardens, pedestrian bridges, and promenade decks to achieve a “center-of-the-city” effect. The site also contains a sunken courtyard space known as the “Garden Level” where additional office space is located. One of the significant features of the Tempe Municipal Building are the intentional inversion of the glass pyramid to keep the building cool in the summer months, and to allow for significant public space on a small site. Additionally the building was turned forty-five degrees to the street grid to minimize glass exposure to direct sunlight. Finally, the use of structural steel as the main building material as an effort to explore this new technology is a significant feature.

---

The Tempe Municipal Building is located in the heart of downtown Tempe at 31 East Fifth Street, between Mill and College Avenues, just north of the Arizona State University Tempe campus, and is the centerpiece of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex. The Tempe Municipal Building has become the symbolic center, not only of the downtown, but the entire community. Adjacent to the hustle and bustle of Mill Avenue, citizens of Tempe know this building as the “upside-down pyramid.” Its unique form has made it an iconic part of the downtown atmosphere. Although not quite 50 years old, its distinctive form, as well as its historical impact on the city, qualifies the Tempe Municipal Building to be designated as a local landmark.

Tempe Municipal Building exists on the site of the 1914 Tempe City Hall. When construction of a new city hall building was first discussed, city officials were strongly considering moving it to a new location on Rural Road and Southern Avenue to escape the deteriorating conditions of the downtown district. Architect Michael Goodwin thought otherwise and saw this as a challenge and a beginning for revitalization of downtown Tempe. Goodwin convinced officials to keep the location, and he designed a new building that sparked the beginning of the revitalization project for downtown Tempe.

Over the past 140 years, Tempe holds national, state, and local significance for its important role in the development of the Salt River Valley as a center of commerce and education, as a critical link in the transportation networks during the settlement of the territory, and for its associations with important political figures. Tempe’s unique heritage is exemplified in its significant cultural architecture and infrastructure. These qualities exist today in the Tempe Municipal Building as well as the rest of the downtown area. The Tempe Municipal Building, located at 31 East Fifth Street, between Mill and College Avenues and forms the heart of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex in the historic core of downtown Tempe.

The property retains connections to the physical environment of its surroundings evident in the walkways and bridges that radiate outward into downtown in order to connect everything back to the city’s center. The decision to keep city hall functions in the historic commercial core of the community overcomes temporal changes in the built surroundings of the Tempe Municipal Building and lies at the heart of concept of a setting. The hotel, the Police/Courts Building, the Transit Center, the parking garage, the Brickyard, and the 525 Building all came later, along with a wide variety of new commercial and office buildings in and around city hall. All of these are, in many ways, the result of the continued existence of City Hall at the very heart of Downtown Tempe. A practical definition of setting in the context of the Tempe Municipal Building is simply at the heart of the community in the middle of the downtown commercial district that it helped preserve and perpetuate.

Tempe Municipal Building opened its doors to the public in 1970 and is a prime example of the Mid-Century Modern style of commercial architecture in Tempe. The property has been well maintained over the last forty years. Despite several expansions and alterations all of its original materials have been preserved. Mature landscaping around the property is all well maintained. With additions of other buildings in and around the complex, the only deviations from the original site have been within the complex itself, where pathways and pedestrian bridges have either been changed or removed. This prime example of a modern style has been exceptionally preserved; guessing its age might prove difficult.

The Tempe Municipal Building’s physical features relate closely to the features that are found within the Mid-Century Modern architecture style; these features are what define this property as historic. The movement of this architectural style to the Salt River Valley was an important event in history. It helped to further establish the valley just like the new Municipal Building helped to further establish downtown Tempe.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [ ] A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [X] C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [ ] D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- [ ] B removed from its original location.
- [ ] C a birthplace or grave.
- [ ] D a cemetery.
- [ ] E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- [ ] F a commemorative property.
- [X] G less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- Architecture
- Politics/Government

Period of Significance
1970

Significant Dates

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

- Cultural Affiliation
  Initiated the revitalization of Downtown Tempe

Architect/Builder
Michael Goodwin

Period of Significance (justification)

The subject property was built in 1970 by Architect Michael Goodwin and continues to serve as the city hall for the City of Tempe.

Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)

N/A
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Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance and applicable criteria.)

The Tempe Municipal Building derives significance from several important associations, including surviving as an example of the Mid-Century Modern architectural style. This significant style arrived in the Salt River Valley during the mid-1960s, when local architects ramped up efforts to reconcile the principles underlying architectural design with rapid technological advancement and the modernization of society. One of these local architects was Tempe born Michael Goodwin who, along with his father Kemper Goodwin, took on the challenge of designing the Tempe Municipal Building. The Tempe Municipal Building would go on to become the heart of the downtown Tempe, and serve as a catalyst for revitalization for the rest of downtown. This building is also significant for its use of new technologies and design strategies. The Mid-Century Modern movement brought with it the use of the new material, steel. Michael Goodwin’s cunning engineering of the steel to construct the upside down pyramid form was an early attempt at a passive solar design.

The Tempe Municipal Building derives significance because of its association with the broad patterns of community development. Accordingly, (under NPS Criterion C) the property must maintain integrity of design, workmanship, materials, and feeling in order to convey its significance. As seen in the following discussion, the property exceeds these minimum requirements and retains more than adequate integrity to qualify for designation and listing.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

INTENSITY

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register, a property must be significant under ordinance criteria and it must also possess sufficient integrity to communicate its significance to persons familiar with the property or to the community at large. The integrity of a property is evaluated according to aspects that must be present in different combinations depending on the criteria from which historic significance is derived.

Location

Tempe Municipal Building exists on the site of the 1914 Tempe City Hall. When construction of a new city hall building was first being discussed, city officials were strongly considering moving it to a new location on the Rural Road and Southern Avenue to escape the deteriorating conditions of the downtown district. Architect Michael Goodwin thought otherwise and saw this as a challenge and a beginning for revitalization of downtown Tempe. Goodwin convinced officials to keep the location, and he designed a new building that sparked the beginning of the revitalization project for downtown Tempe.

Over the past 140 years, Tempe holds national, state, and local significance for its important role in the development of the Salt River Valley as a center of commerce and education, as a critical link in the transportation networks during the settlement of the territory, and for its associations with important political figures. Tempe’s unique heritage is exemplified in its significant cultural architecture and infrastructure. These qualities exist today in the Tempe Municipal Building as well as the rest of the downtown area. The Tempe Municipal Building, located at 31 East Fifth Street, between Mill and College Avenues and forms the heart of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex in the historic core of downtown Tempe.

Design

Design is the composition of elements that constitute the form, plan, space, structure, and the style of a building. In many cases properties tend to change over time in order to more conveniently accommodate its occupants. In the case of the Tempe Municipal Building, the property has maintained its original design properties. The intent of Michael Goodwin was for this property to be the “center-of-the-city.” His original site plans incorporated these pathways that radiated out into the city from the building. These have since been modified to some extent to make room for adjacent new construction, but hints of them still exist. The Tempe Municipal Building received an award of merit from the Western Mountain Region of the American Institute of Architects in 1972.
Goodwin designed the building as an upside down pyramid for two reasons. First, he wanted this building to become an icon for the city, which it certainly has. Programs within the building have been organized in a way that is convenient for the public to access, with the most public necessities towards the bottom of the pyramid and the more private spaces near the top. Second, the building functions a passive solar building because of the inverted pyramid. With the walls slanted at a forty-five degree angle, the roof becomes a shading structure for the entire building. In winter the building is engineered to trap the heat in order to warm interior spaces. In 2010, the Tempe Municipal Building received the 25 Year Award from the Arizona Society of the American Institute of Architects, in part for its innovations in sustainable design. These design aesthetics could not have been achieved without the influence of the Mid-Century Modern style that arrived in the Salt River Valley in the mid-1960s. This movement brought with it new ideas and technologies that made the design of the Tempe Municipal Building possible.

Workmanship

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history. Workmanship is important because it can furnish evidence of the technology of the craft, illustrate the aesthetic principals of an historic period, and reveal individual, local, regional or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principals. Before construction had begun on the Tempe Municipal Building, a major stylistic shift in the architecture community had occurred. New construction materials and technologies were introduced to the United States in conjunction with the new stylistic approach that was known as Modern Style Architecture which aimed to simplify the form of the building using clean lines and little ornament decoration. Architect Michael Goodwin was inspired by these new techniques along with the new advances in the technology of steel construction, and aimed to integrate these aesthetics into the Tempe Municipal Building design. The excellent workmanship and attention to detail is what gave this building its character. The use of steel construction gave Goodwin the ability to be able to orient the building as an upside down pyramid in order to minimize the solar impact on the building. These specific techniques would not have been achieved without the invention of these new technologies that aided Goodwin in his excellent workmanship of this iconic building.

Materials

Materials are the physical elements used to construct a form or structure. In order for a property to be considered historic, the property must retain key exterior materials dating from the period of its historic significance. The Tempe Municipal Building continues to retain its key exterior elements in their original configuration. Architect Michael Goodwin chose those materials that exemplify technologies characteristic of the Mid-Century Modern style. Use of steel members to construct the frame of the Tempe Municipal Building’s structure was Goodwin’s experimentation of the limits of the material. The Tempe Municipal Building was awarded a national U.S. Steel award for its innovative techniques in steel construction and a merit award from the Western Mountain Region of the American Institute of Architects.

Goodwin also implemented a new type of structural glazing system engineered to withstand weather changes and multiple structural forces encountered because of the forty-five degree angle of the walls. The lustrous exterior glass reflects light evenly and efficiently without glitter or sparkles and is representative of the state of the art of energy conserving glass, a nascent technology in 1971.

Feeling

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s historic character. This property expresses the aesthetic sense of its Mid-Century Modern era of significance. The variety of Modern Style Architecture produced during the mid-century throughout Central Arizona is, taken together, emblematic of that time of strong economic growth. Goodwin’s intent for this building was for it to have a “center-of-the-city” feel. Its unique form invokes curiosity in passersby, but it also has an inviting quality that radiates to the rest of the city. Since Tempe Municipal Building so eloquently retains its original design, materials, workmanship, and setting as described previously, it creates a sufficient feeling and special sense of place as an historic property.
Despite preservation efforts strengthened by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, intensification, social vivification, and preservation of community cultural resources in urban areas across the country. Even as planning for a new Municipal Building began, the wholesale demolition practices of Urban Renewal were ongoing debate surrounding where to locate traditional city hall services.

Tempe was a small agricultural community through most of its history. After World War II, Tempe began growing at a rapid rate and soon the last of the farms disappeared. By 1970, Tempe had grown into a modern city and along with it, the teachers college had evolved into Arizona State University. Through annexation, Tempe’s corporate limits were rapidly expanding to the south both east and west until, the early 70s established the city’s ultimate boundaries. During this period of rapid areal expansion the traditional downtown commercial core of the community lapsed into a period of disinvestment and deterioration. As downtown businesses followed their customers into the suburb; the central business district, which had existed along Mill Avenue for almost 100 years began to transform itself into an automobile-oriented commercial strip, compromising both the historic integrity and the pedestrian character of the traditional downtown.

Municipal services struggled to keep pace with the rapid growth of the community until, by 1968; the Tempe City Council faced a momentous decision. Prior to redevelopment, the 300-foot by 300-foot city hall site housed the city jail, the firehouse, the library, and the court, all in one 1920s building, with numerous eclectic additions and with additional City offices located in various nearby residences and converted commercial properties. The need for expanded City facilities was obvious, but debate centered on the location for a new city hall.

Sentiments were divided between redevelopment of the tight downtown site or removal to a more geographically central location at the southwest corner of Rural Road and Southern Avenue; at the site of the planned new cultural complex on an expansive 22 acres. Centrally located and with ample parking provided in a park-like suburban setting, programming the new cultural complex soon sparked interest in relocating city hall out of the downtown. When the Mayor and Council considered options for a new municipal complex in 1968, some Council members, as well as several citizens, favored the Rural and Southern site, reasoning that the site was bigger and more conveniently located.

Tempe’s traditional downtown commercial center along Mill Avenue had been declining during the 1950s and 60s. What began as a disorderly adaptation of the Territorial era downtown to automobile-based commerce during the post WWII decade continued apace as the street increasingly dominated the sidewalk. Visual clutter was further compounded in 1959, when the Arizona Highway Department upgraded the status of Federal Highways US 60, US 70, US 80, US 89 and State Route 93 all of which crossed the Salt River on the Mill Avenue Bridge and were then routed through downtown Tempe. The associated program of right-of-way improvements and widening drastically altered the character of the central business district streetscape and building facades along Mill Avenue. Although targeted for redevelopment, opinions varied as to the appropriate method of redevelopment for downtown Tempe. Many community leaders touted the wholesale demolition and replacement tactics of “urban renewal” employed by many cities in the 1950s and 60s. Others favored a more hands-off approach to downtown redevelopment and Mill Avenue revitalization.

In a Tempe Oral History Project interview U.S. Representative Harry E. Mitchell, who was on the Tempe City Council at the time, observed, “It had gotten so bad and so low, people were embarrassed about downtown, even though it was an entry-way to the city, entry to the university. Most people tried to AVOID downtown, felt that it gave a very negative impact on the city - so most people just didn’t care. Anything was better. In fact, the first, I would say probably the first redevelopment between Second Street and Third Street, where America West is now, that whole area, probably all the way over to Ash Avenue, was just bulldozed, and there was a sign put up, “Will build to suit.” That was our first effort at urban renewal.”

By the end of the 1960s, Urban Renewal had suffered widespread criticism for its adverse effects on economic intensification, social vivification, and preservation of community cultural resources in urban areas across the country. Even as planning for a new Municipal Building began, the wholesale demolition practices of Urban Renewal were changing into what would become a more place-based redevelopment strategy under the Community Development Block Grant program. For the time being, however, several more downtown historic buildings would be lost to demolition despite preservation efforts strengthened by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.
and, in 1967, formed the architectural firm of Michael and Kemper Goodwin, Ltd. In addition to his work in architecture, Goodwin also became politically active, serving two terms in the Arizona House of Representatives in the 1970s (the first from there with a degree in architecture in 1963. Following his graduation, Michael returned to his Arizona hometown and became one of the most prosperous in Arizona. He specialized in educational facilities and designed more than 200 such structures over a period spanning several decades. Their designs included several buildings on the Arizona State University campus: the Memorial Union; Wilson Hall; and the Mathematics Building, among several others. Kemper Goodwin retired in 1975 and passed ownership of the firm along to his son, Michael. Kemper died December 24, 1997.

Following in his father's footsteps, Michael left Tempe for a time in the early 1960s to attend USC, graduating from there with a degree in architecture in 1963. Following his graduation, Michael returned to his Arizona hometown and, in 1967, formed the architectural firm of Michael and Kemper Goodwin, Ltd. In addition to his work in architecture, Goodwin also became politically active, serving two terms in the Arizona House of Representatives in the 1970s (the first and only architect to serve in that capacity in the State of Arizona). As his work began to garner considerable attention among colleagues in his field he won the Arizona Architects’ Medal in 1975 and, three years later, became the youngest person ever to be awarded the distinction of Fellow in the American Institute of Architects. The firm designed relatively few homes, concentrating instead on projects such as schools and government buildings.

Spurred on by Tempe’s centennial in 1971, Downtown Tempe, the Mill Avenue District, and Tempe Town Lake continued to be revitalized as an entertainment and shopping venue that attracts people from throughout the Valley and beyond. The commitment to downtown that began with the Tempe Municipal Building in 1971 was further bolstered in 1973 with the creation of the University-Hayden Butte Redevelopment Area and again in 1974 with participation in the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant Program. The center-city location of municipal government, selected by the City Council as a demonstration of confidence in the future of the downtown area, has come to represent the cornerstone of these downtown redevelopment efforts.

Now the centerpiece of the Harry E. Mitchell Government Complex, the Tempe Municipal Building is a unique pyramid of solar-bronzed glass and steel inverted in a sunken garden courtyard. Since opening in 1971, the Tempe Municipal Building has continued to provide a focal point for downtown redevelopment and a landmark for community building while supplying space for the growing community's city government. Aesthetics, accessibility, energy conservation, and expandability were the major components of its architectural concepts. The building provides maximum space without overpowering the available site in Tempe's compact central business district. The landmark building continues to exemplify progress in government and to have a timeless beauty compatible with ongoing redevelopment and reinvention of downtown Tempe. Certainly the Tempe Municipal Building meets the ordinance definition of a landmark, which is a property that "has achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years and which expresses a distinctive character worthy of preservation and which otherwise fulfills or exceeds the criteria for designation as an historic property."

Michael Goodwin, Architect 1939-2011

Tempe City Hall is significant under NPS Criterion C as the Work of a Master, noted long-time Tempe architect Michael Goodwin, who passed away May 9, 2011 at the age of 72. Along with his father Kemper, Michael Goodwin left an indelible mark upon the City of Tempe and the surrounding communities through his innovative architectural designs. Tempe's iconic upside-down pyramid arguably serves as Goodwin's greatest architectural accomplishment and provides a lasting vestige to the memory of a highly influential Tempe family. "He created stunning, striking works that were groundbreaking but practical for their environment," Tempe Mayor Hugh Hallman explained following Michael's recent death. Still another individual, commenting recently, noted that, "he was a visual artist whose structures weren't simply attractive and functional, but also a celebration of the land that surrounded them.”

Born in 1939, Michael Goodwin was the son of prominent local architect Kemper Goodwin and the grandson of early Tempe businessman Garfield Goodwin. Kemper Goodwin was born in Tempe, Arizona on April 28, 1906 and received his architectural training at the University of Southern California. Although he received his architecture license in 1931, Kemper did not establish his own firm until 1945. Kemper's firm ultimately employed more than forty individuals and became one of the most prosperous in Arizona. He specialized in educational facilities and designed more than 200 such structures over a period spanning several decades. Their designs included several buildings on the Arizona State University campus: the Memorial Union; Wilson Hall; and the Mathematics Building, among several others. Kemper Goodwin retired in 1975 and passed ownership of the firm along to his son, Michael. Kemper died December 24, 1997.

Following in his father's footsteps, Michael left Tempe for a time in the early 1960s to attend USC, graduating from there with a degree in architecture in 1963. Following his graduation, Michael returned to his Arizona hometown and, in 1967, formed the architectural firm of Michael and Kemper Goodwin, Ltd. In addition to his work in architecture, Goodwin also became politically active, serving two terms in the Arizona House of Representatives in the 1970s (the first and only architect to serve in that capacity in the State of Arizona). As his work began to garner considerable attention among colleagues in his field he won the Arizona Architects’ Medal in 1975 and, three years later, became the youngest person ever to be awarded the distinction of Fellow in the American Institute of Architects. The firm designed relatively few homes, concentrating instead on projects such as schools and government buildings.
In Tempe, Michael Goodwin designed several middle and high schools, including Marcos de Niza High School (1971) and Corona del Sol High School (1976). The former was considered to be revolutionary in design of an open-space campus, while the latter incorporated one of his earliest solar-based technological designs. Indeed many modern architects—and historians too, for that matter—acknowledge that Michael Goodwin's designs exuded a profound consciousness of the need to incorporate environmentally friendly, or "green," components into buildings to make them both more practical for their surroundings and more sustainable in the long-term. Goodwin, according to one historian, "was doing all that before it was a movement. And what he was doing was simply being a responsible architect who didn't put his ego ahead of the building's intended function.”

Michael Goodwin was also active in the Episcopal Church throughout much of his lifetime and was a founding member of the leadership group that brought the Cursillo Movement to the Episcopal Church in the 1970’s. He served on the Vestry and in other leadership roles at St. Augustine's in Tempe; Church of the Epiphany and St. Columba Mission in Flagstaff; St. Stephen's in Phoenix; and, most recently, at Transfiguration in East Mesa.

Mid-Century Modern Architecture in the Salt River Valley, 1945 – 1975

Mid-century modern was one of the most prominent architectural styles of its time because of its impact on technological and stylistic advances. This architecture had a dramatic impact on the Salt River Valley. It has been noted as the only true attempt at creating a distinct Arizona architecture style. Mid-century modern style evolved from a coalescence of three types of modern design: Art deco, stripped classical, and streamlined modern. Although all have slight variations in modern techniques, they all aim to do one uniform thing: simplifying the building by removing ornamental details and incorporating crisp lines and curves. Mid-century modern was greatly influenced by the industrial design style that preceded it. It uses glass, concrete, and steel while also incorporating new technologies, materials, and methods to produce its own distinctive forms and geometries.

The Modern style originated in Europe by a group of master architects including Mies van der Rohe and Le Corbusier. Images of their works travelled overseas to the states and sparked the modern movement beginning with the famous exhibit in the Museum of Modern Art in New York City in 1932. This movement was initially nicknamed the "International Style". It rapidly spread through the nation after being featured in articles in popular magazines like Better Homes and Gardens. Overnight, architects were adopting these new ideas into their own work and structures began to go up that resembled the work of the European masters.

The Mid-Century Modern movement flourished for 30 years, between 1945 and 1975. During this time there were many local architects who created noteworthy works. Some of these include Al Beadle’s IBEW Union Hall, built in 1967 and James Flynn’s 1974 Vlassis Ruzow and Associates Office, both located in the Metro Phoenix area. These works were prominent examples of the incorporation of steel and glass construction. Another example with great impact on the valley, even more so on the City of Tempe, was Michael Goodwin’s design for the Tempe Municipal Building.

In the mid 1960s, the City of Tempe was in a state of architectural turmoil. Buildings in the downtown area had been poorly maintained and city officials were to the point of relocating the city hall complex out of the downtown area. Architect, Michael Goodwin, intended this building to initiate the revitalization of downtown Tempe and it did become the catalyst for downtown revitalization. He envisioned the building as being the “lantern for the community.” Before the design phase started, Goodwin created the Tempe Redevelopment Committee who then convinced the city council to create the urban renewal program. This program used federal funds to acquire properties in the downtown area that they then assembled for redevelopment. Tempe Municipal Building was the start of that revitalization.

Located on 5th street just east of Mill Avenue, Tempe Municipal Building was completed in 1970. The construction of this building incorporated the latest techniques of steel construction. Goodwin used the structural properties of steel to design an inverted pyramid structure. The building is centered on 2 ½ acres of land that combines the building with plazas, gardens, pedestrian bridges, and promenade decks to achieve a “center-of-the-city” effect. The site also contains a sunken courtyard space known as the “Garden Level” where additional office space is located. This sunken courtyard was designed to create an intimate feeling for its occupants when they walked into the space. The intention of inverting the glass pyramid was to keep the building cool in the summer months, and to allow for significant public space on a small site. The design strategy of passive solar cooling and heating was achieved by trapping heat in areas of the walls so it would radiate into the building in the winter months. In the summer months, the affect is slightly different. The building was turned forty-five degrees to the street grid to minimize glass exposure to direct sunlight. The glass is tinted with a sun-bronze tint, and in combination with the shade provided by the angled walls it is estimated that only 18% of the sun’s heat permeates the building. City officials desired the extensive amount of glass so they could always have visual access to their surroundings. Tempe prides itself on being a “progressive, forward looking community” and the Tempe Municipal Building reinforces that statement with its bold form and advances in architectural technology.
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Understanding Cultural Resource Areas
Tempe Historic Preservation Commission Information Series

1) **What is a Cultural Resource Area? What does the term mean?**

2) A Cultural Resource Area is a category of land use used by Tempe General Plan 2030 (GP2030) to describe the Projected Land Use or the desired primary use of a land area anticipated to occur within the next 25 years. **GP2030 defines Cultural Resource Area as follows:**

   “**Cultural Resource Area** (existing density allowed by zoning). Areas identified on the density map, which are considered culturally significant to the character of Tempe, based on the 2001 Post World War II Subdivision Study. It is desirable to maintain the character of these areas. The underlying zoning should remain the highest appropriate density for these areas. These areas are shown as Cultural Resource Areas, with a projected density to match the zoning at the time this plan is adopted” (12/03/2003)

   ![Link](http://www.tempe.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3217#page=5)

3) **How does density factor in? What does density mean?**

   Tempe General Plan 2030 uses the concept of density in to define the Cultural Resource Area. **GP2030 defines density as follows:**

   5) *Concepts of density and building intensity...are measured in dwelling units per acre (shown as du/ac.). These characteristics reflect residential use within the next 25 years.*

   6) Density categories may or may not conform to the property’s zoning, because land use reflects how the land is used, while zoning dictates what is allowed within the designated zoning district. Density categories generally reflect how land is used for daily living.

   ![Link](http://www.tempe.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3217#page=5)

7) **How did the Cultural Resource Area concept originate?**

8) On September 2, 2003, members of the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission attended a meeting of the General Plan Advisory Team, a citizen group working to produce GP2030, and presented information comparing existing developed densities, densities permitted under the then current General Plan 2020, and densities proposed for adoption by General Plan 2030.

9) Based on this presentation, the Advisory Team decided unanimously to adopt the Cultural Resource Area classification for each of the thirty-one first- and second-tier historic subdivisions identified in the Solliday Survey of Post-World War II subdivisions in Tempe. **(Solliday 2001).**

   ![Link](http://www.tempe.gov/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=5397)
10) Why was the General Plan Advisory Team so concerned?

11) Tempe Preservation presented information comparing existing developed densities, densities permitted under then current General Plan 2020, and densities proposed for adoption by General Plan 2030. The Advisory Team clearly understood how changing development standards precipitate intensification of development in historic neighborhoods.

12) The Advisory Team felt strongly that protection and enhancement of Tempe’s heritage is critical to preserving the unique identity of our community.

13) Tempe Preservation data demonstrated the adverse effects on the integrity of historic neighborhoods that took place under Tempe General Plan 2020 and how these effects would be increased by the land use planning proposed in GP2030.

14) What was the intent of the General Plan Advisory Team?

15) Demonstration of the effects of increasing density on the diminution of character and loss of integrity of historic or historic eligible neighborhoods resulted in the Advisory Team unanimously adopting the Cultural Resource Area classification for all thirty-one potentially historic subdivisions identified in Solliday 2001.

16) The Advisory Team considered Cultural Resource Areas to be significant to defining and interpreting Tempe community history and stated it is desirable to maintain the character of these areas. Regrettably, they not only specified the intended outcome of the Cultural Resource Area classification, the also stated how that should take place, i.e.; “The underlying zoning should remain the highest appropriate density for these areas.”

17) So is zoning the same as density?

18) Not exactly, density specified in the land use plan is implemented by the corollary development standards provided by the Zoning & Development Code. Along with specifying density, zoning development standards regulate maximum building height, maximum lot coverage, minimum setbacks, required landscaping, required parking, allowable signs, development density, and other provisions of the code. Taken together, the development standards established for each zoning classification determine the limits of what can be constructed on any given parcel of land.

19) When GP2030 was first approved by the voters on December 3, 2003, Tempe was operating under Zoning Ordinance 808. For some time, the 808 development standards were used to govern proposed development in Cultural Resource Areas. This practice continued even after the current code became effective on February 22, 2005.

20) Use of the Cultural Resource Area classification gave planning staff an effective tool for diverting out-of-character development away from historically sensitive areas and into sectors such as the Transportation Overlay Zone or other parts of the city where higher densities of development were considered to be more appropriate.
21) **What was the intent of the Cultural Resource Area classification?**

22) Tempe’s built environment tells the story of Tempe’s growth through a blend of the past with the present, thus enriching our city, residents, visitors, and future generations. The intent of the Cultural Resource Area designation in GP2030 is to balance the rights of property owners with the value to the community derived from the conservation and enhancement of culturally significant properties and to maintain the character of these areas for future generations to enjoy and learn from.

23) The stated goal of the Cultural Resource Area to maintain the character of historically significant districts, neighborhoods, and properties, has begun to suffer from the mention of only density and not its regulatory context of related development standards in the language of GP2030.

24) Initially, it was taken for granted that in order to maintain the character or the density of these special parts of the city, development standards must be applied consistently and in totality.

25) **How is the Cultural Resource Area classification being administered today?**

26) More recently, density has been singled-out as the only development standard specifically cited in GP2030. Manipulating only the density standard and ignoring its regulatory context produces a random and meaningless result. Density, like all development standards, is effected by the size of the land area being considered for development.

27) Development standards also change over time and current requirements can produce incongruous results in established neighborhoods and historic districts. To offset this unintended effect, the Cultural Resource Area works to lock development to the zoning in place at the time GP2030 was adopted.

28) **How did the Cultural Resource Area classification get enacted?**

29) On December 4, 2003, Tempe adopted General Plan 2030, codifying the Cultural Resource Areas designation thereby theoretically balancing generally increased residential densities across the board with preservation of established neighborhoods and historic districts.


30) **What lies ahead for the Cultural Resource Area classification in GP2040?**

31) The Cultural Resource Area land use classification was initiated in GP2030 with the stated purpose of maintaining the character of Tempe’s historic and potentially historic districts, neighborhoods, and properties. For some time, this classification effectively diverted out of character development away from historically significant locations. More recent projects have demonstrated that the Cultural Resource Area concept is ripe for reinterpretation to improve its effectiveness as a conservation tool.

32) Tempe Preservation hopes to work closely with city staff in the revision of our land use planning and production of GP2040. Updating the concept of the Cultural Resource Area as a mechanism for protecting the historic integrity of the city’s historic and potentially historic districts, neighborhoods, and properties will be a major part of that initiative.