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 *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x' in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an 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 entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

	ame of F	Property					
histori	ic name	Central City Hi	storic District (Bo	oundary Increase)			
other	name/site	number <u>Bryant</u>	Neighborhood				
2. L	ocation						
street	& town	Roughly boun	ded by South Te	emple, 400 South, 700	East and 1100	East	not for publication
city or	town	Salt Lake City					
state	Utah	code	UT	county Salt Lake	_ code_035_	zip code	84102
3. S	tate/Fed	eral Agency Cer	tification		11111		
	Utah Di State or		y, Office of Historic bureau] meets ☐ does no	Date / Date	ster criteria. (S		sheet for additional
		c or certifying difficial					
	State or	Federal agency and	bureau				
l hereb	y certify tha y entered ir ☐ S	Park Service Cer t the property is: In the National Register see continuation sheet and Register	r.	Signature of the	Keeper	30al	Date of Action G-2-0

Central City Historic	District, Boundary	/ Increase
Name of Property		

Salt Lake City,	Salt Lake	County,	Utah	
City County at	nd State			

Ownership of Property (check as many boxes as apply)	Category of Property (check only one box)	Number of Resour (Do not include previous				
		Contributing	Noncontributing			
⊠ private	☐ building(s)	488	176	buildings		
public-local	⊠ district			sites		
public-State	☐ site			structures		
, ,						
☐ public-Federal	☐ structure			objects		
	object	488	176	Total		
Name of related multiple pro Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a		Number of contrib	outing resources pro gister	eviously listed		
		5				
6. Function or Use						
Historic Function (Enter categories from instructions)		Current Fu (Enter catego	inction ries from instructions)			
DOMESTIC: single dwelling		DOMESTIC:	single dwelling			
DOMESTIC: multiple dwelling		DOMESTIC:	DOMESTIC: multiple dwelling			
COMMERCIAL: business		COMMERCIA	L: business			
COMMERCIAL: specialty store		COMMERCIAL: specialty store RELIGIONS: religious facility EDUCATION: school				
RELIGION: religious facility						
EDUCATION: school						
		HEALTH CAR	RE: clinic, medical busine	ss & office		
		SOCIAL: club	house			
7. Description	en de la companya de La companya de la co					
Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions)		Materials (Enter catego	ries from instructions)			
·			,			
MID-19 TH CENTURY		foundation	STONE, CONCRE			
LATE VICTORIAN	DEV/IV/ALC	walls	BRICK, WOOD, ST			
LATE 19 TH AND 20 TH CENTURY F			VENEER, CONCR			
	ITURY AMERICAN MOVEMENTS	roof	ASPHALT, WOOD			
OTHER: World War II and Post-V	var ∟ra	other				

Narrative Description (Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

See continuation sheet(s) for Section No. 7

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increases Name of Property	Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah City, County and State
8. Description Applicable National Register Criteria (Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)	Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions)
☑ A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.	ARCHITECTURE COMMUNITY PLANNING
☐ B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.	DEVELOPMENT
☑ 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.	Period of Significance 1870-1946
Criteria Considerations Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)	Significant Dates
Property is:	
☐ A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.	Cignificant Daysons
☐ B removed from its original location.	Significant Persons (Complete if Criterion B is marked above) N/A
C a birthplace or grave.	Cultural Affiliation
□ D a cemetery.	N/A
☐ E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.	
☐ F a commemorative property.	Architect/Builder Various, mostly unknown
☐ G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.	
Narrative Statement of Significance (Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)	⊠See continuation sheet(s) for Section No. 8
 Major Bibliographical References Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more con 	tinuation sheets.
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 #	 State Historic Preservation Office ☐ Other State agency ☐ Federal agency ☐ Local government ☐ University ☐ Other Name of repository:
recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #	_

See continuation sheet(s) for Section No. 9

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase		Salt Lake City	/ Salt Lake C	ounty Utah	
Name of Property		City, County a	and State	santy, Stair	
10. Geographical Data			*		
Acreage of Property approximately 195 acres					
UTM References (Place additional boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)					
A <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/5/6/0</u> <u>4/5/1/3/2/4/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	B <u>1/2</u> Zone	4/2/7/2/6/0 Easting	4/5/1/3/2/2/ Northing	<u>′0</u>	
C <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/2/6/0</u> <u>4/5/1/3/0/6/0</u> <u>Northing</u>	D <u>1/2</u> Zone	4/2/7/5/0/0 Easting	4/5/1/3/0/4 Northing	<u>/0</u>	
Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.) See continuation sheet for boundary description and more UTM	referenc	es			
Property Tax No. various					
Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.) The boundaries enclose the most intact concentration of building the boundary increase and for the existing Central City Historic E				e areas of s	
11. Form Prepared By		23000 0011		(0) 101 00000	
name/title Elizabeth Egleston Giraud, AICP					
organization Salt Lake City Corporation/Planning Division		date	e <u>March 9, 1</u>	2001	
street & number451 S. State, Room 406		tele	telephone 801/535-7128		
city or town Salt Lake City		stat	e_UT zi	ip code <u>84</u>	109
Additional Documentation Submit the following items with the completed form:					
Continuation Sheets Maps A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the pro- A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having Photographs: Representative black and white photographs of Additional items: (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)	g large a of the pro	creage or nur operty.	merous res	ources.	
Property Owner					

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. 470 et seq.).

state ____zip code

street & number______telephone_____

name/title

city or town

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 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 Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section No. 7 Page 1 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

Narrative Description

Introduction

The boundary increase to the Central City Historic District encompasses a sixteen-block area directly east of the original district, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1996. It is referred to in this nomination as the "Bryant neighborhood," in reference to a junior high school that was established in the neighborhood in 1894, although the original building was replaced with another structure in 1980. The boundary increase consists of 661 buildings, 74 percent of which contribute to the character of the historic district. It is a neighborhood that is primarily residential with buildings similar in scale to those found in the Central City Historic District, as well as the University Neighborhood Historic District that borders the boundary increase to the east. The boundary increase forms a transition between the flat topography of Central City and the "benches" that characterize the University neighborhood. The northern and southern boundaries of the increase consist of the South Temple Historic District, associated with a tree-lined street of mixed land uses known for its historic mansions, and 400 South, a commercial strip of non-contributing buildings, respectively. South of 400 South is a neighborhood similar to Bryant, locally referred to as "Bennion/Douglas," that is also planned for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places as a second boundary increase to the Central City Historic District in 2001.

Many elements of the street pattern, architecture, and landscaping features in the boundary increase are a continuation of those found in Central City. These elements include ten-acre blocks, an eclectic range of styles, and a grass median strip, referred to locally as a "parking," in the middle of 800 East and 200 South. As in Central City, the boundary increase has suffered numerous intrusions. These differ from the original district in that they are multiple-unit residential properties and institutional uses, such as a large medical clinic and professional offices, as opposed to the retail commercial development found in Central City. For the most part, however, they affect the edges of the boundary increase, leaving the rest of the neighborhood largely intact so that it reflects its association with the growth and development of Salt Lake City.

Streetscapes and Landscapes

Streetscapes throughout the boundary increase are dominated by the wide, numbered streets (100 South, 200 South, etc.) and ten-acre blocks characteristic of the early platted areas of Salt Lake City. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, as development pressures increased, many of the large blocks were divided by narrow streets into courts that accommodated homes on lots that were much smaller than those seen on the numbered streets. With the exception of some of the small, inner-block courts, the streets have curb and gutter, and the numbered streets have "parking strips:" landscaped areas between the sidewalk and the street. These parking strips, coupled with lawns and mature trees, provide a pleasant sense of greenery that provides relief from the boundary increase's proximity to the downtown commercial core. The boundary increase also contains a "parking," or grass median, on 800 East, similar to the parking on 600 East in Central City. In an effort to beautify the city, parkings were also established on South Temple, 700 East, 1000, 1200 East and 200 South in the first decade of the twentieth century. Today, only those on 600 East, 800 East, 1200 East and 200 South remain.

Because the boundary increase is bordered on the north, south and west by wide, arterial streets, these edges have suffered the most intrusion by visually incompatible commercial and residential uses. Few extant,

Section No. 7 Page 2 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

contributing buildings remain on these perimeters. The western boundary, 700 East, is a six-lane vehicular corridor that was widened in 1958. The northern boundary, South Temple, is also a heavily trafficked street; it separates the boundary increase from the Avenues Historic District, characterized by its steep grade and two-and-a-half acres lots. The southern boundary consists of 400 South, which begins to curve steeply south at 1000 East to become 500 South. Created in 1936, this curve undercuts a geologic feature, the "East Bench Fault," that causes the topography of the southeast corner of the boundary increase to be very steeply pitched. Commercial uses, including family-style restaurants and hotels, dominate this thoroughfare, which is currently under construction for a light-rail line. The eastern boundary is the most intact and forms the smoothest transition to an adjoining neighborhood: the University Neighborhood Historic District.

Overall, one- and two-story homes with similar setbacks and side yards form the streetscape, and provide a uniform relationship to the street. Landscaping consists of mature, deciduous trees and lawns and shrubs in front of the homes. Most front yards are not fenced, but those that are fenced by compatible materials and appear very old: wood pickets or wrought iron. The few commercial retail buildings in the increase are generally early, neighborhood grocery stores and recently constructed convenience stores. It is the medical offices and clinics, as well as the out-of-period multi-family dwellings, which most visually mar the overall integrity of the district.

Architectural Styles and Types by Period

Single-Family Dwellings: Initial Settlement, 1847 to 1869

Like Central City, most of the buildings in the Bryant neighborhood were constructed as single-family, residential dwellings and present a similar range of styles, types and materials. Few buildings remain from the earliest period of settlement in the boundary increase; those that do exhibit classical details, such as wide frieze boards and cornice returns, and are of masonry construction with a stucco finish. The hall/parlor plan, associated with early vernacular architecture in Utah, is most apparent in one of the earliest homes, the Francis Hughes house at 856 E. 200 S., constructed about 1868 [photograph 1]. This plan, however, lingered for several more decades, long after most of the other residences in the neighborhood were constructed in styles contemporary to the period and used nationally. For example, the hall/parlor plan was used as late as 1900 in the neighborhood at 824 Menlo Avenue, although this example has undergone many alterations [photograph 2].

Single-Family Dwellings: Transition, 1870 to 1900

Other plans associated with early architecture in Salt Lake City, such as the central passage and the crosswing plan, are found in the Bryant neighborhood and were constructed during this period. The George Baddley house at 974 East 300 South is the only example of the central-passage plan in the boundary increase and was constructed in 1870 of plastered adobe [photograph 3]. Baddley was a potter, a distiller, and a member of the 1861 group called by Brigham Young to settle Utah's "Dixie," the southwestern corner of the state. His two wives, Eliza and Charlotte, inherited this property upon his death in 1875, but Charlotte soon moved to another house nearby and his surrounding land was divided into an interior court street, "Baddley Place," presumably to provide lots for other family members

The cross-wing plan replaced the hall-parlor as the most common Utah house type after 1880; forty-one examples exist in the Bryant neighborhood. The Thomas and Mary James house at 335 S. 700 East was

Section No. 7 Page 3 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

constructed in the late 1880's; the reasons for the popularity of this style described by local architectural historians are evident in the home:

The cross wing represented a departure, but not a radical departure, from the older Classical tradition, and its obvious similarity to the already established temple-form type made the transition all the more palatable. 1

The original hall/parlor form of the house was constructed of adobe and stucco with little ornamentation, with the exception of the attempt to portray the wall surface as stone by scribing the surface [photographs 4-5]. The Late Victorian-style cross-wing was added about 1890, as was the covered front porch, which is embellished with turned columns and a pediment. The one-over-one, double-hung windows with segmental brick arches are additional characteristics of this late nineteenth-century building form. Other outstanding examples of the cross-wing form include the Ebenezer and Esther Miller house at 1017 E. 300 South, built about 1890, and the Jane Chander house at 315 S. 700 E., constructed about 1888 [photographs 6-7].

Hall-parlor, central passage, and cross-wing plans are generally associated with vernacular building traditions in Utah, but "high-style" examples were also constructed during this period. One of the most significant homes in the boundary increase dating from this time is the Frederick Meyer house, located at 929 E. 200 South [photograph 8]. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1982 and recorded by the Historic American Building Survey in 1968, it is noted as the best example of one of three major house types used to express the Italianate style in Utah: the two-story box type, as distinguished from the two-story side passageway box and the one-story cottage. The house was built in two phases: a two-story main rectangular block with a one-and-a-half story side wing (1873) and a two-story extension that spans the rear of the house (c. 1898). The fact that the first section was constructed only three years after the comparatively vernacular Baddley house indicates that the architectural development of the neighborhood during the period of significance followed very different trajectories.

Other "high-style" residences in the boundary increase that date from this period include a less ornate Italianate example, the Hyrum and Ann Reeve house at 718 E. 300 S., and both imposing and modest variants of the Queen Anne style [photograph 9]. The James Freeze house at 734 E. 200 South was constructed in 1892, and displays the complex roof form, irregular massing, and exuberant use of materials associated with this style [photograph 10]. This home also illustrates the late Victorian tendency to incorporate elements of other styles: in this case, the Eastlake, as seen in the turned columns, delicate scroll-cut brackets and porch trim, and the wooden balustrade with a decorative paneled base. James Freeze, a polygamist with four wives who all lived in separate homes nearby, was a successful merchant of retail goods. He sold the house in 1901 to Dutch immigrants Wilhelmus and Frances DeGroot. Members of the DeGroot family lived in the home until 1997, when it was sold to an owner who intends to convert it into a reception center.

Single-family Dwellings, Mature Community: 1900-1925

More buildings are extant from this period than any other in the district (39 percent), and of this stock most were single-family dwellings. A handful of small residences exhibiting vernacular plans, such as shot-gun, hall-parlor and the previously described cross-wing previously described were built during the earliest years of this period. For the most part, however, residential architecture from this period exhibits the range of styles that

¹ Thomas Carter and Peter Goss, <u>Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940</u>, Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press, 1988, p. 37.

Section No. 7 Page 4 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

could be seen in almost every early twentieth-century neighborhood: Victorian Eclectic, Prairie, classical or colonial revivals, and after 1910, the bungalow. The largest homes in these styles are found on the numbered streets, while smaller versions can be found on the inner-block streets. Tracts of two or three identical homes are more commonly found on the inner-block streets, but are rare on the numbered streets. As in other communities in Salt Lake City, the predominant material was brick, although wood clapboard and novelty siding were also used. Wood details, such as gable-end shingles and for porch details, were frequently incorporated into the overall design. Many of the foundations are sandstone, cut with a rusticated face.

The most common style from this period is the "Victorian Eclectic," a term coined in Utah that usually describes a massing of a central block with projecting wings, classical porch details, and one-over-over windows with segmental brick lintels or wide, single-light windows with a transom and other Victorian details. Most are one-or one-and-a-half stories, such as the Charles and Clara Nelson house at 334 S. 900 E., circa 1910, but two-story examples can also be found, such as the Maurice and Effie Kaighn house at 120 S. 1000 E., constructed almost a decade earlier [photographs 11-12]. Although constructed in the same style and plan, they have markedly different appearances. The extra height of the Kaighn house causes it to appear as a hipped roof structure, and the gable end of the projecting block is not as prominent. Also, the porch of the Kaighn house is characterized by a wide fascia and a shallow-pitch roof, as opposed to the dominant pediment of the porch of the Nelson house.

The boundary increase also contains about twenty-four foursquare residences. The earliest examples (1892 to 1895) are one-story and have little embellishment. Several are located on inner block streets, such as Bueno, Linden and Menlo avenues. With one exception, those built after 1900 are two-story and are brick. Many have classical details, primarily seen in fascias and on porches; others have Craftsman elements and a few are heavily Neo-Classical. The Ernest Thompson house, constructed in 1902 at 955 E. 100 South and designed by architect Walter Ware, derives its Craftsman motif from the exposed brackets, the multiple-panes in the windows and the rectangular bay window in the second story [photograph 13].

Neo-classical Revival foursquare examples represent some of the most impressive homes in the district. These include the George Mateer house at 250 S. 1000 East, the George Roper house at 805 E. 300 South and the David Spitz house at 1073 E. 200 South [photographs 14-16]. The Mateer and the Roper residences were both constructed in 1909 and were designed by architect Bernard Mecklenberg. Essentially their form consists of two-and-a-half story boxes, but only the Roper residence is readily identifiable as a foursquare. The Mateer house, with its round-corner bay and wrap-around porch, and the Spitz house, with its two-story, pedimented porch, command more attention. All fall into the Neo-classical rubric through the use of modillions, dentil courses, and classically-detailed column, yet all are basic four-square forms under the ornamentation.2

Although not represented in numbers as great as the Victorian Eclectic or the foursquare, other early twentieth-century styles seen in the boundary increase supplement the diversity of architecture associated with the neighborhood's development. Arts and Crafts examples, both in Craftsman and Prairie School variants, can be found. Two examples include the John and Mary Ellen Birch house at 336 S. 1100 East, and Samuel

² Mecklenberg also designed another house in the boundary addition: the Hyrum Newton house at 322 S. 1000 East (1910), but this is a simpler, late-Victorian example.

Section No. 7 Page 5 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

Sherrill house at 975 E. 100 South, designed by the architectural firm of Ware and Treganza [photographs 17-18]. Both were constructed in 1908. The Birch house is a combination of gabled forms with wide eaves and knee brackets; the use of thickly cut wood clapboard and its low profile are in keeping with the Arts and Crafts ideal of unifying the house to the site and incorporating natural features into the design. The Sherrill residence is the only Prairie School example in the boundary increase. Sherrill was a building contractor and vice-president of Liberty Fuel, a successful coal mining company located at Liberty, Utah.

While the architecture of the boundary increase is characterized by diversity, more homes (one-hundred-and-one) in the neighborhood can be classified as "bungalow" than any other type [photograph 19]. Almost all were constructed of brick, although many used brick as a wainscoting with stucco above, and almost all are one- or one-and-a-half stories [photographs 20-21]. In the Bryant neighborhood, as in other older neighborhoods in Salt Lake City, they tend to show a Prairie School influence, typified by large, plate-glass windows; broad eaves; and long, wide concrete lintels and sills. Shallow-pitched, hip roofs are ubiquitous for this style, but their profiles vary through the use of clipped gables or front-facing gables [photograph 22]. Porch columns generally consist of plain, brick supports or battered piers. A few side-gabled bungalows, such as the Viggo Madsen house at 57 S. 800 East, also can be found, but this roof form is atypical for the bungalow in this neighborhood.

Single-family residences: Depression and Decline: 1925 to 1955

Bungalows in the boundary increase were constructed as early as 1906, but most of the construction dates of this type are clustered from 1910 to 1925. As their popularity waned, the bungalow was replaced by the period cottage. These were constructed of brick, generally have cross-gabled rooflines with steep pitches, and often have round-arched entryways that are exaggerated with extremely narrow, steeply pitched roofs. A few are embellished with stucco wall surfaces on entryways or gable ends and with false half-timbering. Most were constructed during a short period: 1925 to 1930, but a few were built as late as 1938. After the Depression and World War II, few single-family homes in the boundary increase were constructed. Inner-city neighborhoods like those in Central City could not compete with new suburban development. Additionally, few in-fill lots were available, and because of post-war zoning changes it was more profitable to demolish single-family structures and construct apartment buildings.

Multiple-family Dwellings: Duplexes and Apartment Buildings

Twenty-three duplexes were constructed during the historic period and represent four different styles. Most numerous are those constructed during the first decade of the twentieth century. These are characterized by flat roofs with heavy brick corbelling and are either one- or two-stories [photograph 23]. Their fenestration pattern consists of single-light windows with a fixed transom in the street facade, and one-over-one windows, either with segmental brick arches or wide stone lintels for secondary elevations. Most have some semblance of a porch: often this is only a landing with a minimal roof covering, although a few have porches with classical details that extend the full-length of the building. Linden Avenue and Reeves Court exhibit an exceptionally fine assembly of this type and style of duplex [photographs 24-25]. Other duplex examples include six Victorian Eclectic-style dwellings, with steeply-pitched front gables, two Tudor Revivals, and one Minimal Traditional style residence at 944-46 E. 300 S., constructed about 1940 [photograph 26-27].

The boundary increase contains 62 apartment buildings comprising 10 percent of the building stock. These buildings range in number of units from as few as four units to 114. The majority of the apartment buildings in the boundary increase were constructed after World War II, but 14 were constructed during the city's initial

Section No. 7 Page 6 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

apartment construction boom, lasting from 1901 to 1930. These multi-story apartment houses were a new building form for Salt Lake City and indicated the rapid urbanization the city was experiencing at the beginning of the twentieth century. This option attracted middle and upper class dwellers who were in transitional phases of their lives: unmarried young adults, newly-married or childless couples and widows, widowers and retirees. These apartment buildings were three to four stories high, were of brick construction, and relied on a variety of stylistic references, usually either Classical Revival or Tudor Revival, for differentiation. Two different types prevailed: the walk-up, in which each unit extended the full-length of the building, and the double-loaded corridor, in which a number of units opened off of a central hallway on each floor [photographs 28-29]. The walk-up was constructed before 1918, and the double-loaded corridor is associated with post-World War I development. In the boundary increase, there are seven of both types.

Apartment buildings constructed after World War II generally had a small number of units (between four and eight) with interior stairwells [photograph 30]. Because the circulation system was hidden from view, and because of the low number of units, they could be made to resemble other single-family, "minimal traditional" homes of this period, in that they had hipped roofs, were constructed of brick, and had similar fenestration patterns and materials: steel sash with a large, fixed window flanked by narrow casements divided into four lights. Often they were elevated on a high foundation in order to make the most of basement units.

This type persisted through the 1950's. Beginning in the early 1960s, another prototype was developed and proliferated throughout the boundary increase: the "box-car" apartment building. The original ten-acre blocks made for deep lots, and in order for developers to maximize their investment they re-oriented apartment buildings to the side, so that the street façade was either a blank wall or had only minimal window openings for the end units. At least one, the New Broadmoor Apartments at 938 E. 300 South, has a decorative, screenwall of concrete block on the street façade [photograph 31]. These boxcar apartments ranged between 10 to 40 units and were two or three stories. Each apartment opened to a covered concrete slab shared by all the units on that floor. The roofs were flat or had a very shallow gabled pitch. Overall, they resembled California motels of the 1960s.

Although the boxcar apartments had a deleterious effect on the streetscape, they were not as incongruous with the neighborhood's historic architectural pattern as the high-rise buildings that were erected in the late 1960s. These include the Sunset Towers, with 15 stories and 114 units at 40 S. 900 East, and the Stansbury, at 710 E. 200 South, with 76 units. Increasingly dense multi-family construction continued into the 1970s, but during this decade multi-family development took on a different form of being lower in height with a garden-style layout [photographs 32-34]. They were often constructed of brick and had a vertical orientation, achieved for the most part by using long, sliding windows placed in a recessed, vertical band of a contrasting wall material such as T-111 siding. Out of 15 that were constructed during the 1970s, only three were less than 10 units; the remaining averaged 30 units. By the mid-1980s, Salt Lake City was in the midst of an economic downturn and real estate slump, and there was little new construction in Central City during this time. Neighborhood residents' dissatisfaction with past planning decisions and development, coupled with an interest in living downtown and in historic preservation, led to zoning changes in 1985 and in 1995, when the city zoning code was re-written. These changes were enacted to protect the existing lower-density development.

Commercial

The few commercial buildings date from the historic period were used as neighborhood stores, and are still used for retail purposes [photograph 55]. In two instances, stores were connected to existing homes. These

Section No. 7 Page 7 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

prototypes exist at 908 and 916 E. 300 South, and at 818 and 816 E. 100 South [photograph 35]. The residential portions of these structures were constructed about 1895, and the commercial buildings were attached about ten years later.

The majority of the commercial structures in the boundary increase are affiliated with the medical profession, due to the proximity of Salt Lake Regional Medical Center, formerly known as Holy Cross Hospital, located at 1050 E. South Temple (but not included in this nomination because almost all of the buildings are out of the historic period), and the Salt Lake Clinic, located at 333 S. 900 E. Additionally, the neighborhood is only a couple of miles away from three other hospitals. The medical buildings include offices, clinics, and rehabilitation centers [photograph 36].

Institutional

There are three churches in the boundary increase: the Eleventh Ward, a neighborhood branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (951 E. 100 South), Mt. Tabor Lutheran Church (189 S. 700 East), and St. Paul's Episcopal Church (261 S. 900 East) [photograph 37]. Constructed in 1927, St. Paul's is the only contributing ecclesiastical structure in the boundary increase. It consists of a small campus and includes a Gothic Revival chapel and parsonage, both built in 1927 but designed by different architectural firms. Pope and Burton, well-known for their Prairie School domestic and religious designs, designed the chapel, and Ware and Treganza, designed the parsonage connected to the chapel.

Outbuildings

Outbuildings in the boundary increase consist primarily of single- and multi-car garages of frame construction [photograph 56, 57]. These are accessed from streets or alleys, and are placed behind residential structures at the rear of the lots. Carports generally accommodate the numerous apartment buildings, while the offices have surface parking lots. At this writing, none of the garages could be considered individually significant.

Summary

The architecture, landscape features and overall streetscapes are a continuation of those found in the original Central City Historic District, and are representative of the physical development of many decades of Salt Lake City's development, from the 1860s to 1950. Although there have been intrusions, overall the integrity of the neighborhood is high, and the trend toward commercial or large-scale multi-family development has slowed considerably during the last ten years. Almost all of the buildings are residential and were constructed as single-family dwellings; they retain their original scale, massing and materials and alterations that have marred their integrity could be reversed. The majority was built from 1870 to 1920, and portrays the multitude of architectural styles that proliferated in the United States during that time. The architecture and layout of the boundary increase reinforces its association with Salt Lake City's emergence as a city of regional importance at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Section No. 7 Page 8 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County County, UT

Summary Statistics

(Based on a February 2001 update of the 1995 reconnaissance level survey)

Evaluation/Status (661 total Primary) (188 total Outbuildings) (849 total both)	Contributing 74% (488 to 61% (114 to 71% (602 to	otal)		Non-co 26% 39% 29%	ontributi (173 to (74 tota (247 to	otal: 91 al)	altered; 82 out	-of-period)
Construction Dates (contributing	1860s-1870s 1%	1880s 3%		1890s 18%		1900s 36%		
buildings only)	1910s 14%	1920s 17%		1930s 4%		1940s- 7%	-1950	
Original Use (contributing	Single Dwellir 80%	ngs	_	Apartn 18%	nent Bui	ildings		
buildings only)	Commercial, 2%	Public 8	Religio	ous Buil	<u>dings</u>			
Architectural Styles* (contributing	Classical 5%	Picture 2%	esque	_	Victoria 45%	<u>an</u>	Bungalow/Ear 30%	rly 20 th Cent.
buildings only)	Period Reviva	<u>1</u>	World 4%	War II	Era	_	Modern 1%	<u>Other</u> 10%
Architectural Types (contributing	Settlement-E	<u>ra</u>	Victori 40%	<u>an</u>	Bunga 22 %	<u>low</u>	Four square 6%	
buildings only)	Period Reviva	<u>al</u>	<u>WW II</u> 1%	/Early F	<u>Ranch</u>		Double House 7%	<u>e</u>
	Apart./Hotel 10%		<u>Comm</u> 2 %	ercial/F	<u>Public</u>		Other 5%	
Construction Materials* (contributing	Adobe .5%	Stone 1%		Stucco 15%	o/Plaste	<u>r</u>	<u>Wood</u> 36%	
buildings only)	Brick 67%	Striate 11%	d Brick		Concre 1%	<u>ete</u>	Veneer 5.5%	

^{*}Total exceeds 100 percent due to the number of buildings constructed in more than one style and with more than one material.

Section No. 8 Page 1

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Narrative Statement of Significance

The Central City Historic District Boundary Increase is significant under criteria A and C. Under criterion A it is significant for its association with the transformation of Salt Lake City from an isolated, agriculturally based community to an industrial and commercial center of regional importance. It is presented as a boundary increase to the Central City Historic District because it represents a continuation of the pattern of land use and architectural development seen within the original boundaries of the district. While this district retains the large, ten-acre blocks and wide streets that characterized the earliest planning efforts of the Mormon pioneers who settled the Salt Lake Valley, it also exhibits the inner-block development and infill associated with the city's urbanization that roughly occurred from 1880 to 1910. This urbanization resulted from a greatly expanded economy, made possible primarily because of rail access to national markets and politics. Under criterion C the district is significant for the diversity and integrity of the representative architectural types and styles. The architecture of the rapidly growing city began to reflect new prosperity and an awareness of popular styles, representing a shift from early vernacular versions of the classical revival styles that the settlers knew from the communities they left behind. As in the existing Central City Historic District, the boundary increase neighborhood thus derives its greatest significance as an illustration of the progression from an insular, communal society to a politically and economically mainstreamed American city.

Initial Settlement: 1847 to 1869

The sixteen blocks included in the boundary increase encompass the northeastern corner of Central City and is part of a larger area, referred to by the same name, that is associated with the original plan of Salt Lake. Modeled loosely on L.D.S. Church founder Joseph Smith's "Plat of the City of Zion," Salt Lake City was divided into a grid pattern of ten-acre blocks, with a block in the center reserved for the temple and wide streets of 132 feet. The blocks were divided into 8 lots of 1.25 acres each, enough to accommodate a family and the agricultural needs of everyday living, such as a vegetable garden, fruit trees and a few livestock and chickens. This system was designed to establish an efficient use of land and prevent social isolation.

In February 1849, the city was divided into nineteen wards, the smallest ecclesiastical unit of the L.D.S. Church. Each ward contained nine blocks, and represented not only an ecclesiastical grouping but also served social and political purposes. A bishop presided over each ward and was responsible for both the religious and secular administration of matters in their districts. The Bryant neighborhood contains portions of the historic boundaries of the Eleventh and Tenth wards. ¹

Shortly after their arrival in the Salt Lake valley in 1847, Mormon leaders planned to erect an eight foot high adobe wall from the Jordan River east along Ninth South Street, to about 950 East, north to approximately Fifth Avenue and westward to the river. Beyond the wall to the south was the "Big Field," an area laid out in parcels

¹ The historic area of the Eleventh ward included the blocks bounded by 600 East, 900 East, South Temple to 300 South. The Tenth ward included the blocks bordered by 600 East, 900 East, 300 South and 600 South streets.

Section No. 8 Page 2 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

of five acres "to accommodate the mechanics and artisans." Much of the land within the wall was intended to be used for cropland, as the village settlement extended eastward only to 300 East. The wall was never finished as planned, but a fence of poles and adobe enclosed the entire area in the late 1850s and protected the land best suited and most convenient for crops. It also left the city with a physical demarcation between the initial layout of ten-acre blocks north of 900 South and the smaller blocks and streets associated with turn-of-the-century subdivisions in what had been the Big Field south of 900 South.

Commercial and residential activity revolved around the Temple core, yet despite the intentions of Mormon leaders to concentrate settlement close to the center of the city it did not take more than a few years for residents to move east. Some families moved beyond the eastern boundary of the city wall (at about 950 East), and by 1860 scattered homes could be found as far as Thirteenth East. An 1870 bird's eye view map shows an even pattern of development for almost all of the early platted areas, including the blocks from 700 to 1000 East that are included in the boundary increase.

The earliest residents in the Bryant neighborhood were, of course, Mormon immigrants, many of whom were born in the British Isles and immigrated to the United States upon converting to the L.D.S. Church. As in Central City, these residents were working-class families – painters, carpenters, and laborers. Extant homes associated with these early occupants include 856 E. 200 South, constructed for Francis Hughes, a painter; 234 S. 900 E., constructed for William Child, an upholsterer and his wife Agnes; and 847 E. 300 S., constructed for William Hawkes, a butcher, and his wife Ada [photographs 1, 38-40]. The fact that these homes are among the earliest in the boundary increase is reflected in the massing and floor plan associated with the pre-railroad era of the city's history. Both the Hughes and the Child residences are hall-parlor in plan, are one-story in height and have side-gabled rooflines. They also have the heavy fascias and cornice returns that are reminiscent of the classical styles favored by early Mormon settlers. The Hawkes home is a crosswing plan with a roofline that is more complex than that of the hall-parlor plan, and represented a later, but still early, phase of architectural development in the boundary increase.

Transition: 1870 to 1900

Brigham Young's ideal of maintaining Salt Lake City as an isolated, religious utopia was sharply curtailed by the events of the 1870s. The coming of the transcontinental railroad in Utah in 1869, the development of mining in the state and the subsequent influx of "Gentiles" (non-Mormons) transformed the city into a commercial center with a rapidly growing population. No longer would Salt Lake residents be dependent on an agrarian way of life; the expanding economy provided them with opportunity for employment downtown and in the rail yards (west of the commercial core). In response to increasingly concentrated places of employment, Salt Lake's mass transit system advanced from mule-drawn street cars in the central business district in the early 1870's to an extensive network that transported passengers throughout the valley by 1890. Because Central City was especially well-served by the streetcar system, residents could easily travel from their homes to jobs and businesses not only in the commercial and industrial sections of town, but also to new commercial centers and neighborhoods in the south part of city. By 1891, eight routes extended eastward from Main

² A/P Associates Planning and Research, *Salt Lake City Architectural/Historical Survey: Central/Southern Survey Area,* prepared for the Salt Lake City Planning Division, 1983, p. 21.

Section No. 8 Page 3

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Street to 700 East. Of these eight, one route went as far as 1300 East along 100 South, one extended to 1000 East along 200 South and another traversed 400 South to University Street, curving around the bench at 1000 East. All three lines tied into the Salt Lake and Fort Douglas Railroad that could transport passengers past 2100 South.³

This availability of public transit dramatically changed land-use patterns and introduced new building types. Since residential expansion was dependent on and followed the development of public transportation systems, it resulted not only in new subdivisions in the Big Field, but created much denser development in the older Central City neighborhoods. The large lots had become obsolete because their purpose as gardens and keeping livestock had largely ceased. Early pioneer families divided up their original lots and gave or sold them to family members, and developers purchased lots and subdivided them. Narrow, interior streets divided the ten-acre blocks, small parcels carved up the large lots, and lawns and shade trees replaced gardens and orchards. By 1898, the earliest year that Sanborn maps portray the Bryant neighborhood, ten interior courts were established. This does not count the numerous private alleys that also accommodated separate parcels and homes. Most of this inner-block development was completed by 1911, however, such development also occurred in the 1920's and after World War II on one street, Barbara Place, at the southeastern corner of the boundary add ition [photograph 19]. The increase in the density of the land-use pattern was first manifested in interior-block courts and later in multi-story apartment buildings that accommodated a diverse population.

Inner-block courts

Dooley Court, a quiet cul-de-sac that runs north from 200 South at 825 East, is illustrative of both the physical layout of these narrow, inner-block streets and of the economically disparate population that characterized Central City [photograph 41]. It consisted of twenty-two houses (twenty-one are extant) that were constructed in two phases. Originally called "Wellington Court," it was instigated by James Harvey in 1894. He constructed fourteen cottages in 1894 that faced each other along the center of the street. Four years later he built four two-story homes along 200 South Street, an asymmetrical cottage at the head of the cul-de-sac and two additional cottages [photograph 42]. The name of the street was presumably changed when a mining investor, William J. Dooley, purchased the property in 1903. ⁴ The remaining structures were built the following year.

Census data from 1910 and 1920 indicate that professionals and managers lived in the more imposing two-story houses on 200 South, while single-story cottages on Dooley Court housed railroad workers, salesmen and clerks. The early tenants were highly migratory, and with one exception, none of the renters stayed in the cottages more than five years. These census records also indicate that all the Dooley Court residents during this period were white, were born in the United States and were first generation children of immigrants from Canada, Sweden, Holland and the British Isles. They were almost all married couples with children. Sixty percent of the residents in 1910 were children under 14; in 1920, this had increased to 78 percent. Once the homes began to become privately owned in 1939, the residents became much less mobile.⁵

³ APA, p. 63

⁴ Mary Troutman, Wellington/Dooley Court: A Practical Alternative to the American Dream, research paper, 1994, p. 5.

⁵ Troutman, Wellington/Dooley Court p. 8.

Section No. 8 Page 4 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

The scale of the homes on Dooley Court is typical of the majority of dwellings found on the interior streets: they are small, one-story structures that range from 600 to 1,000 square feet with four or five rooms. The Dooley Court homes were built on sandstone foundations, with hipped roofs and hipped front bays. Original decorative elements were minimal, consisting of the front bays, segmented arched windows, and transoms above the front doors. Although these homes had front porches, they were very plain [photograph 43]. The four eight-room homes on 200 South, however, were much more elaborate and spacious. They are two stories, and are distinguished by decorative dogtooth brick courses, and distinctive porches with turned columns, square balustrades and intricate molding on the porch frieze. They are approximately 2,000 square feet.

Dooley Court offered a practical housing alternative to families who wanted to live in single-family residences but lacked the financial resources or stability needed to purchase their own homes. Housing options like those provided on Dooley Court offered pleasant cottages with modern amenities, lawns, porches and tree-lined play areas for children to migratory residents who sought living quarters that provided for easy relocation. ⁶

Commercial Development

With the exception of the medically related development that occurred beginning in the 1960's, almost all of commercial enterprises in the boundary increase were established during this thirty-year period. The 1898 Sanborn map indicates small businesses, including a handful of corner, neighborhood grocery stores, the N.R. Servis Candy Factory at approximately 850 E. 100 South, and the Standard Steam and Hand Laundry Co. at 145 S. Dunbar Avenue (now Lincoln Street). Larger concerns included nurseries, such as the Valley Home Greenhouse on Floral Lane (now Linden Avenue, between 1000 and 1100 East streets) and Eastern Nurseries at approximately 840 E. 300 South, owned by Edward Laker. The florists and nurserymen are not listed in city directories after 1898, and the laundry and candy factory do not appear on the 1911 Sanborn map.

The most imposing commercial enterprise was the Salt Lake Brewery, established in 1871 at 1000 East and 400 South. The location for the brewery was chosen because of a natural mineral water spring found on the site. By 1911, the site included four large, Romanesque structures designed by Richard Kletting, the architect of the Utah State Capitol and was one of the three largest breweries in the state, employing three-hundred men. Prohibition was the death knell for the brewery, and although there were efforts to revive the company as the Cullen Ice and Beverage Company, this endeavor was not as profitable as the brewery, and the buildings fell into decline. The brewery's office and bottling works, located across the street (and out of this boundary increase) at 462 S. 1000 East remain, but the original site was redeveloped as the City View Apartments [photographs 48-49] after World War II. ⁷

Extant commercial structures in the boundary district that date from the historic period consist of small, retail establishments, such as the Bryant Grocery at 702 E. 100 South, adaptively re-used as a ski store, and the Cyrus Foote Commercial building at 942-944 E. 200 South, which was constructed about 1920, and is currently a grocery store [photograph 55].

⁶ Ibid, p. 6.

⁷ Mary Troutman, Salt Lake City Brewing Company(Office and Bottling Works), Designation Form for listing on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources.

Section No. 8 Page 5

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Account of Thomas Child

The reminiscences of long-time Central City resident, Thomas Battersby Child, (1888 – 1963) provides an understanding of the transition the neighborhood east of 700 East underwent during this period. Child was born in 1888 at 145 S. 700 East. in a home constructed for his great-grandmother in 1855. In 1911, he moved with his wife to a house a few blocks to the south, 452 S. 800 East, where he resided until his death in 1963. He lived amidst generations of a large immediate and extended family, and describes in detail the homes and activities of numerous neighbors. His descriptions of his family's use of their property on 700 East and of changes that occurred both architecturally and horticulturally provide a compelling look at the appearance of the neighborhood and the interactions of its residents.

Child describes the progression of his family's building efforts. After living in the 1855 house for a few years, the house was sold "during the boom of the early 1890's for a good price...." His parents built a home for their family at the east end of the same lot, at the center of the block, anticipating the creation of an interior block street that failed to materialize. He states: "My father and mother thought a street would be cut north and south through the block which never worked out, much to their chagrin and embarrassment. The only entrance to the property was a driveway between the old Harrocks home and Grandpa Livingston's."

Child was born just before the Salt Lake and Jordan Canal, the main source of culinary and irrigation water in the city, was submerged. In the Bryant neighborhood it ran from 400 South to 300 South between 1000 East and 900 East streets, and as boy the canal was a source of income, as he caught frogs to sell for frog legs. In his neighborhood, the canal was probably covered sometime in the mid-1890s, and he writes, "The city canal was finally all covered over... It is a great change, probably the greatest in the landscape of our neighborhood."

Despite the modification in the area's appearance due to work on the canal, it is Child's accounts of the landscaping in the area that are particularly detailed. They reveal the transition that the neighborhood underwent from an agrarian landscape of irrigation ditches and stands of Lombardy Poplars, to one of streetcars and apartment buildings. He writes of his parents' home:

Our yard, as was [sic] all the yards at that time, was orchards and gardens. How vividly I remember the old coal shed on the alley, sturdily built with the studs on the outside and my pigeon coop on the one end, with the Red Astrican apple tree and swing right next.⁷

Two beautiful evergreen trees of different variety were in the front yard with a latticework fence or grill running south from a south porch... and to a driveway going to the barn. The driveway to the barn was bordered with a row of Lombardy poplar trees, as was the front yard boundary next to the sidewalk on 700 East. The sidewalks in those days were dirt and had Locust trees planted along the irrigation ditch between the sidewalk and wagon road. The front and south side was lawn with a garden of choice perennial flowers, rose bushes and shrubs growing next to the lattice fence.

Several times Child refers to his and his friends' use of the large fields near his home: "In front of our home was a big field which was used as playground by all boys of the ward...In fact, it was the trail from the school

⁷ Child, p. 2.

Section No. 8 Page 6 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

and developed into a nuisance." Assuming that this describes the area about 1900, development had not encroached into the middle of the block, and although his home was less than a mile from Main Street, his immediate environment retained some of its early, rural appearance.

The recollections Child provides, however, of his neighbors' homes, indicates that not only was the periphery of his and nearby blocks filling in with new homes, but that they were often occupied by non-Mormons. He refers frequently to friends who are non-Mormon, such as Julius Rosenblatt, the son of mining magnate Simon Rosenblatt, and Harry and Duncan Beveridge, whose father was a mining engineer. He also discusses the economic disparity that existed among the Mormon families in the area. His own parents suffered financial constraints, as indicated by his statement that "our home was never really finished until I was a boy of 17 or 18 years of age and could help my folks financially." Yet at a young age he perceived the affluence of fellow church member and polygamist James Perry Freeze, who supported four wives who lived on the corners of 700 East and 200 South: "Contrasting this [the economic situation of his aunts and parents], I have observed Brother James P. Freeze with a big fine house for each of his three wives operating two successful stores and a farm [photograph 10]." And his long description of his father's association with Francis Armstrong, a very successful businessman with a Queen Anne-style mansion at the corner of 700 East and 100 South, reveals his pride that his father, although poor, was accepted by this wealthy family. Overall, Child's recollections describe a neighborhood at the turn of the century that had absorbed residents of varying religions and economic means, all within a few decades of the settlement of a religious utopia with communal economic goals.

Mature Community, 1900-1925

By 1900, Salt Lake's economy was similar to that of any other American city of its size. It had vastly expanded beyond the cooperative venture envisioned by early Mormon leaders, and its citizens no longer had to endure a subsistence way of life. By 1900 Salt Lake City's population consisted of a blend of ethnic groups, class distinctions and religious affiliations. While the concentration of fine mansions built along South Temple Street during the first decade of this century are not found in the Bryant neighborhood, less elaborate but comfortable homes constructed by middle- and upper-class businessmen and professionals can be found throughout the boundary increase. At the same time, the number of owners who took in boarders indicates that the neighborhood housed many lower-income people as well. In the early years of the twentieth century, this part of Salt Lake City was quickly losing its early-settlement appearance. The variety of the residents' professions and business associations portray the complexity of the economy and society that Salt Lake had attained by the early part of the last century, and this complexity is reflected in the number of housing and types and styles found in the Bryant neighborhood.

Prominent businessmen include Stephen M. Covey (945 E. 100 S.), whose ventures remained profitable concerns for many decades [photograph 44]. Covey built his four-square house in 1907, and although he was

⁸ Child, p. 15.

⁹ Child, p. 7.

¹⁰ Child, p. 4.

Section No. 8 Page 7 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

a sheep man at the time, he established enterprises in irrigation, real estate development and entertainment. His best-known business was Little America, a large combination of gas station, café and motel that was built on the site in the western Wyoming desert where Mr. Covey had been lost in a blizzard years before.

Several affluent residents were associated with the state's booming mining industry. These include William Dooley, developer of the eponymous inner court, who had mines in Nevada and lived at 823 E. 200 South; Robert Lewis, who became Dean of the School of Mines at the University of Utah and who lived at 1023 E. 300 South, and Samuel Sherrill, vice-president of Liberty Fuel, a coal-mining concern (975 E. 100 South.) [photograph 18]. Several prominent lawyers and judges represented the legal profession in the neighborhood, including Thomas D. Lewis (921 E. 100 South.) and George Goodwin (217 S. 800 East.). Lewis lived in the neighborhood for almost fifty years, (1901 to 1949) before moving to California in 1956. In addition to his private practice, he served in the Utah State Legislature, taught at the University of Utah Law School, and served as a Third District Court judge from 1903 to 1914. Goodwin, after moving to Salt Lake in 1892 from the mid-west, where had had served as attorney general of North Dakota, established a successful law firm with Henry Van Pelt. He resided in his Bryant neighborhood home from 1900 to 1918. Many residents who either built homes or resided in the neighborhood during this period were physicians, salespeople or merchants.

Perhaps the resident who played the most cosmopolitan role in the neighborhood was Fortunato Anselmo, who lived with his wife, Anna, at 164 S. 900 East [photograph 45]. Anselmo lived in this foursquare home from 1920 to 1950, and is a significant figure in the history of Utah and Wyoming for his role in the Italian community. Appointed Italian vice-consul for these states in 1915, he presided over an office responsible for processing all requests for passports, visas and other documents that required official approval of the Italian government. He also served as a representative of the Bank of Naples; in this capacity he assisted local Italians in sending money orders to relatives in the "old country." This function was of vital importance to immigrants whose families in their native countries depended on their American earnings for support. The Italian immigrants were employed in industries that necessitated a mobile population: mining, smelting and the railroad, and they had to rely stability of the services Anselmo offered. Although his consular office was located at his place of business, 249 Rio Grande Street, his home served as a location for official receptions and informal entertaining for Italian dignitaries and personalities, as well as numerous public officials who often visited the Anselmo home as guests.

But not everyone in the Bryant neighborhood was prosperous and well connected. The census records of 1910 indicate that a substantial number of residents were working-class laborers and that at least half of the residents rented their dwellings. Although records indicate that the number of households who took in boarders to augment their incomes does not seem as prevalent until the late 1920s and 1930s, many households accommodated in-laws and extended family members. They also relied on teenagers who had left school in order to work. Overall, the illustration in the previous text describing Dooley Court held true for much of the neighborhood: laborers and trades people rented the small, modest homes located in the interior-block courts, while middle and upper-class residents occupied larger homes on major streets. The census record of Frank Assenberg (221 S. lowa Street), describes many households in the Bryant neighborhood during this era. In 1910, Assenberg, who was listed as the head of the household and worked as a teamster, was 22 years old, his wife was 20, and they had an infant daughter. Assenberg's mother-in-law, Ida Steurman, and her three children, ages 18, 14 and 12, also lived in the house. The children worked: the 18-year-old son was an elevator boy, and the daughters worked as servants in private homes. The Assenbergs and the Steurmans had immigrated to the United States from Holland in 1906. They rented their small, clapboard house on lowa

Section No. 8 Page 8 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Street, a thoroughfare located between 900 and 1000 East streets and 200 and 300 South streets [photograph 46].

Depression and Decline: 1923-1955

Beginning in the 1920s, the Bryant neighborhood and Central City began a slow and inescapable decline owing to the rise of the automobile, the attraction of new suburbs for people prosperous enough to have housing choices, and newly-enacted zoning regulations that allowed the encroachment of incompatible uses. This decline can also be attributed to the fact that Utah suffered depressed economic times much earlier than the rest of the nation because of the rapid deflation of commodity prices after World War I. The transition of the neighborhood was in part characterized by the construction of multi-family apartments and the conversion of many single-family homes into rentals, boarding houses and small apartment buildings. Accordingly, in 1927 Salt Lake City adopted its first zoning ordinance and established seven land-use zones. The fact that the Bryant neighborhood was zoned "Residential B-2," allowing apartments and hotels, as opposed to the lower-density "Residential A," which only allowed one- and two-family homes, reflected both the existing land-use patterns and the view of local government that the neighborhood could absorb higher-density land-use patterns. (The use of Residential A zones were located in the newly-built suburbs in the original Big Field).

City directories demonstrate that the trend of converting single-family homes into apartments began in the early 1920s, and continued through the Depression, the war years and into the 1950s. This occurred in the homes along the numbered streets, which were generally larger than dwellings on the interior block streets and could accommodate multiple units. For example, the 1926 directory lists John Stewart, an engineer with the Utah State Road Commission, as the sole household at 176 S. 1100 East [photograph 47]. By 1933, two additional separate households are listed, Omer Stewart and Haner Stewart, each married and presumably relatives. Five years later Mr. Stewart's residence housed six separate households. Out of a cursory study of 35 houses on the numbered streets that were converted into apartments, approximately half seemed to follow a similar pattern: single-family ownership in the early 1920s, single-family with a couple of boarders in the 1930s, and conversion into four or more apartments by the early 1950s. The other patterns include conversion from single-family to two-family units that did not increase in number, or the retention of single-family units until the 1950s that then exploded into five or more units.

Despite the lack of infill development potential and a perception that the neighborhood was in decline, there was still residential construction in the neighborhood during this period. Three notable developments include a group of bungalows on Barbara Place, constructed in 1922; a low-density garden-style apartment complex, also on Barbara Place, constructed in 1945, and a similar development at 808 E. 300 S. that was built in 1947. Barbara Place, located in the southeast corner of the boundary increase, did not exist before 1922, as it was created to accommodate the bungalow development at the east end of the street. Originally this land had been the site of three ice ponds that belonged to the Salt Lake Brewing Company, whose facilities were located at the west end of the block. The Halloran-Judge Company developed the bungalows, which consisted of twelve one-story, brick houses, six on each side of the street. They were Prairie School in design and were valued at \$3,000 [photograph 19].

Just after World War II, the west end of the street was filled in with a series of low-density apartment blocks, known as the "City View Apartments," that contrast sharply with the bungalows [photographs 48-49]. The

Section No. 8 Page 9

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

apartments consist of two-story, side-gabled buildings with some red brick cladding but exhibiting mostly asbestos siding. They show a slight Colonial Revival influence because of their symmetry and six-over-six light windows. They consist of four-unit blocks with central stairwells and two units per floor. An ambitious Salt Lake businessman, Sid Eliason, developed the City View complex. Eliason was born in Snowville, Utah, in 1902 and started his career of the Brigham City (Utah) National Bank. He went on to become the head of several different companies, most of which were related to construction, and was active in civic affairs. He was also the developer of the ten-story Charleston Apartments (470 S. 1300 East) east of Barbara Place, which were constructed in 1950 and are in the University Neighborhood Historic District, listed on the National Register in 1994.

The other post-war apartment development mentioned above was constructed in 1946 to 1947 by contractors Roy A. Menlove and Frank J. Miller, about whom little is known. Neither is there information on the subsequent owners, Joe and Emma Bertagnolli, who purchased the complex soon after its construction. These apartments are brick, two-stories in height and are similar in their configuration to the City View Apartments, as they consist of four-unit blocks with centrally placed entrances and stairwells [photograph 50]. This is a smaller complex, however, with 12 units as opposed to the 30 found in the City View. There is also a more formal site plan: it is laid out in an inverted "U" plan, while the City View is more amorphous as it follows steep topography.

Erosion of Residential Character: 1955 to 1995

The post-war development mentioned above may have been less desirable because it was rental, but at least it did not disrupt the historic residential and low-density character of the neighborhood. Overall, however, the blight suffered by the Bryant neighborhood accelerated during the 1950s and 1960s and to a large extent was exacerbated by insensitive government policies. In the case of the Bryant neighborhood, the policy at the local level was in the form of the adoption of the Residential "R-6" zoning in November, 1955, which expanded allowed uses to include "hospitals for human beings, medical clinics, sanitariums..." Although Holy Cross Hospital (now known as Salt Lake Regional Medical Center) had been a part of the neighborhood since 1875, its facilities were primarily contained for decades on the block bordered by South Temple, 100 South, 1100 East and 1000 East. The 1955 amendment to the zoning ordinance, however, changed the complexion of the neighborhood. At least fifteen clinics, medical office buildings and nursing homes were erected between 1959 and 1975 were erected, each one necessitating the demolition of at least two or three homes. Most of the medically-related buildings were one- or two-stories, but the Salt Lake Clinic, which relocated from 115 E. South Temple in 1959 to its present site at 333 S. 900 E., is several stories and continues to grow. Because the R-6 zone also allowed private clubs and fraternal organizations, a Y.M.C.A. gymnasium and swimming complex was completed in 1965 at 737 E. 200 S., on a site adjacent to Thomas Child's family home.

Efforts for Preservation

Within the past fifteen years the residents of the Central City, Bryant and University neighborhoods have become increasingly active in their attempts to reverse the encroachment of non-residential uses in these areas. Those residents who live furthest east have been the most successful because zoning patterns did not encourage intense development pressure to the same extent as it did in the neighborhoods closest to the

Section No. 8 Page 10 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

central business district. These neighborhoods have also become increasingly attractive to people seeking to avoid long commutes and who value the experience of living in an urban environment. Despite the unfortunate encroachment of incompatible commercial uses, the Bryant neighborhood has retained much of its earlier appearance, including many historic homes, tree-lined streets and landscaped parking strips between the streets and the sidewalks. As with Central City, the Bryant neighborhood is unique in Salt Lake, as it is one of the best-preserved residential areas where one can discern the original layout of the community and early attempts to alter this pattern in response to Salt Lake's transition from Mormon utopia to regional capital.

Section No.9 Page 1

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Bibliography

- Bird's Eye View of Salt Lake City, Utah Territory, 1870. Chicago, II: Chicago Lithographing Company. Original on file the Maps Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
- Boyce, Ronald R. An Historical Geography of Greater Salt Lake City, Utah. M.S. Thesis, University of Utah, 1957.
- Carter, Thomas and Peter Goss. *Utah's Historic Architecture, 1847-1940: a guide.* Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press, 1988.
- Child, Thomas B., Jr. *The Personal Journal of Thomas B. Child, Jr.* 1963. On file at the Salt Lake City Planning Division.
- [Miscellaneous Historic Site Forms and Intensive Level Survey Files]. Prepared by Cory Jensen, Roger Roper, et al. Available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Anselmo, Fortunato House. Prepared by Philip Notarianni, May 1979. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Central City Historic District. Prepared by Christine McKenna and Lisa Miller, February 1996. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Meyer, Frederick A. E., House. Prepared by Roger Roper and Deborah Temme, March 1983. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Ramsey, Lewis A. House. Prepared by Korral Broschinsky, March, 1999. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form: Historic Resources of Salt Lake City: Urban Expansion into the Early Twentieth Century, 1890's –1930's. Prepared by Roger Roper, xxx, 1989. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- Polk Directories, Salt Lake City, 1893-1993. Published by R.L. Polk & Co. Available at the Utah State Historical Society and the Marriott Library, University of Utah.
- Salt Lake City Bryant Neighborhood Reconnaissance Survey. Conducted by Cory Jensen, 1995. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Salt Lake City, 1889, 1898, 1911, 1950 and 1986. Available at the Utah State Historical Society and the Marriott Library, University of Utah.

Section No. 9 Page 2 Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Troutman, Mary. Salt Lake City Brewing Company (Office and Bottling Works), Designation Form for listing on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources, 1995. Copy available at the Salt Lake City Planning Division Office.

-----. Wellington/Dooley Court: A Practical Alternative to the American Dream. TMs, 1994. Copy available at the Utah State Historic Preservation Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *United States Census of Population: 1910.* Characteristics of the Assenberg, Frank, household.

Section No.10 Page 1

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Verbal Boundary Description

DESCRIPTION WRITTEN FROM SALT LAKE CITY SURVEY ATLAS PLATS AND OWNERSHIP RECORDS.

Beginning 165 feet South and 66 feet West from the Northwest corner of Block 59, Plat "B", Salt Lake City Survey, part of the Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence East 2314.48 feet more or less along South line of the South Temple Historic District to the East line of Block 57 of said Plat "B", point is also 165 feet South from the Northeast corner of said Block 57; thence South 626.43 feet along East line of said Block 57 and continuing to the Northeast corner of Block 56 of said Plat "B": thence East 862.56 feet along North line of Block 29, Plat "F" to the West line of University Neighborhood Historical District and the center line of 1100 East street; thence South 3035.8 feet along West lines of said University Neighborhood Historical District to the point 66 feet East from Southeast corner of Block 20, Plat "F"; thence West along South line of Block 20 of said Plat "F" 396 feet to the Southeast corner of Lot 2 of said Block 20; thence Northwesterly along a 329.78 foot radius curve to the right 198.51 feet; thence North 14°43'55" East 1.22 feet; thence Northwesterly along a 313.22 foot radius curve to the right 103.26 feet; thence North 32°09'24" West 39.17 feet; thence North 32°09'04" West 10.78 feet; thence Northwesterly along a 348.92 foot radius curve to the right 76.51 feet; thence South 69°35'22" West 1.12 feet; thence Northwesterly along a 329.78 foot radius curve to the right 78.71 feet to the point on South line of Fuller Avenue and the East right of way line of U.S. Highway 40; thence North along said East right of way 568.1 feet; thence West 224.05 feet; thence North 65 feet to the North line of Lot 1, Block 42, Plat "B"; thence West along a Lot line 107.25 feet; thence North 60 feet; thence East 33 feet; thence North 88.5 feet to the South line of Braddley Place; thence West along said South line 165 feet; thence North 33 feet; thence East 152.5 feet along North line of said Braddley Place; thence North 148.5 feet to the North line of Lot 7 of said Block 42; thence West 152.5 feet along said Lot 7 to the Northwest corner of said Lot 7; thence South 82.5 feet along West line of Lot 7; thence West 140 feet; thence North 82.5 feet to the North line of Lot 4 of said Block 42; thence West along Lot line 12.625 feet; thence North 165 feet to the North line of said Block 42; thence West along Block line 47.25 feet; thence South 115.5 feet; thence West 265.275 feet to the East line of Block 41; thence South along East line of Block 41, 379.5 feet; thence West 192 feet; thence South 5 feet; thence West 63.75 feet; thence South 11.5 feet; thence West 33 feet to the West line of Strongs Court; thence South 148.5 feet; thence West 41.25 feet along South line of Block 41, Plat "B" to the Southwest corner of Lot 2 of said Block 41; thence North 148.5 feet; thence West 49 feet; thence North 16.5 feet; thence West 173.25 feet; thence South 41.25 feet; thence West 107.25 feet to the West line of said Block 41; thence North along the West line 54.75 feet; thence West 249.3 feet; thence North 3 feet; thence West 16.5 feet; thence North 82.5 feet; thence East 49.5 feet; thence North 41.25 feet to the South line of Linden Avenue; thence West along said South line 187.75 feet; thence North 72°21'27" West along said South line 62.69 feet more or less to the East line of Lot 3, Block 40, Plat "B"; thence West 396 feet to the East line of the Central City Historical District and 66 feet West from West line of Block 40, Plat "B"; thence North along East line of Central City Historical District 734.31 feet; thence West 66 feet to the intersection of 700 East street right of way and North line of Markea Avenue; thence West along North line of Markea Avenue 303 feet; thence South 10 feet; thence West 27 feet; thence North 16.5 feet; thence West 165 feet; thence North 462 feet to the point 66 feet North of the North line of Block 46, Plat "B"; thence East along a line parallel to the said North Block line 561 feet; thence North 1355.45 feet more or less along East line of Central City Historical District to the point of beginning.

Section No.10 Page 2

Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

UTM References

E <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/5/0/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/1/0/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	F <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/2/6/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/1/2/0</u> Zone Easting Northing
G <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/2/6/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/2/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	H <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/1/0/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Zone Easting <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Northing
l <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/0/9/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/5/4/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	J <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/0/4/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/5/4/0</u> Zone Easting <u>4/5/1/2/5/4/0</u> Northing
K <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/7/0/2/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	L <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/9/2/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Zone Easting Northing
M <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/9/0/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/3/2/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	N <u>1/2</u> Zone <u>4/2/6/8/8/0</u> 4/5/1/2/3/2/0 Northing
O <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/8/8/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/3/9/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	P <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/7/2/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Zone Easting <u>4/5/1/2/4/0/0</u> Northing
Q <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/7/2/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/6/0</u> Zone Easting <u>Northing</u>	R <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/5/4/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/4/6/0</u> Easting <u>Northing</u>
S <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/5/4/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/7/0/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	T <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/3/8/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/7/0/0</u> Zone Easting Northing
U <u>1/2</u> <u>4/2/6/3/8/0</u> <u>4/5/1/2/8/2/0</u> Zone Easting Northing	V 1/2 Zone 4/2/6/5/4/0 Easting 4/5/1/2/8/2/0 Northing

Section No. 10 Page 1

Central City Historic District Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

Common Label Information:

- 1. Central City Historic District, Boundary Increase
- 2. Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah
- 3. Photographer: Elizabeth E. Giraud
- 4. Date: January 2001
- 5. Negative on file at Utah SHPO.

6. Photograph No. 1

Francis Hughes house at 856 E. 200 South. Camera facing southeast.

6. Photograph No. 2

Residential structure at 824 E. Menlo Avenue. Camera facing east.

6. Photograph No. 3

George Baddley house at 974 E. 300 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph No. 4

Thomas and Mary James house at 335 S. 700 East. Camera facing east.

6. Photograph No. 5

Detail of stone scribing at 335 S. 700 E. Camera facing north.

6. Photograph No. 6

Ebenezer and Esther Miller house at 1017 E. 300 South. Camera facing north.

6. **Photograph No. 7**

Jane Chander house at 315 S. 700 East. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph No. 8

Frederick Meyer house at 929 E. 200 South. Camera facing north.

6. Photograph No. 9

Hyrum and Ann Reeve house at 718 E. 300 South. Camera facing south.

6. Photograph No. 10

James Freeze house at 734 E. 200 South. Camera facing southeast.

6. Photograph No. 11

Charles and Clara Nelson house at 334 S. 900 East. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph No. 12

Maurice and Effie Kaign house at 120 S. 1000 East. Camera facing southwest.

Section No. 10 Page 2

Central City Historic District Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

6. Photograph No. 13

Ernest Thompson house at 955 E. 100 South. Camera facing northwest.

6. Photograph No. 14

George Mateer house at 250 S. 1000 East. Camera facing northwest.

6. Photograph No. 15

George Roper house at 805 E. 300 South. Camera facing north.

6. Photograph 16

David Spitz house at 1073 E. 200 South. Camera facing north.

6. **Photograph 17**

John and Mary Ellen Birch house at 336 S. 1100 East. Camera facing west.

6. **Photograph 18**

Samuel Sherrill house at 975 E. 100 South. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph 19

1051-1059 E. Barbara Place. Camera facing northwest.

6. Photograph 20

Brick bungalow at 338 S. 900 East. Camera facing west.

6. **Photograph 21**

Brick and stucco bungalow at 1023 E. 300 South. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph 22

Front-facing gabled bungalow at 121 S. Lincoln Street. Camera facing northeast.

6. **Photograph 23**

Early twentieth-century two-story duplex at 218-220 S. Iowa Street. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 24

One-story duplex at 749 E. Linden Avenue. Camera facing north

6. Photograph 25

Streetscape of 739-753 E. Linden Avenue. Camera facing northwest.

6. Photograph 26

Tudor-Revival duplex at 857-859 E. 300 South. Camera facing northeast.

Section No. 10 Page 3

Central City Historic District Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

6. Photograph 27

Minimal Traditional style duplex at 944-946 E. 300 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 28

Walk-up apartment building at 101 S. 800 East. Camera facing southeast.

6. Photograph 29

Double-loaded corridor apartment building at 706 E. 300 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 30

Post World War II apartment building at 1032-1034 E. 300 South. Camera facing south.

6. Photograph 31

New Broadmoor apartments at 938 E. 300 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 32

Sunset Towers condominiums at 40 S. 900 East. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 33

Stansbury condominiums at 710 E. 200 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 34

Shaughnessy condominiums at 253 S. 700 East. Camera facing southeast.

6. **Photograph 35**

816-818 E. 100 South. Camera facing southwest.

6. Photograph 36

Medical clinic at 745 E. 300 South. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph 37

St. Paul's Episcopal Church at 261 S. 900 East. Camera facing northeast.

6. Photograph 38

William and Agnes Child house at 234 S. 900 East. Camera facing west.

6. Photograph 39

William and Agnes Child house at 234 S. 900 East, Camera facing southeast.

6. Photograph 40

William and Ada Hawkes house at 847 E. 300 South. Camera facing north.

6. **Photograph 41**

West side of Dooley Court (825 East). Camera facing northwest.

Section No. 10 Page 4 Central City Historic District Boundary Increase, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, UT

6. Photograph 42

835 and 839 E. 200 South. Camera facing northeast

6. Photograph 43

160 S. Dooley Court. Camera facing west.

6. Photograph 44

Stephen Covey house 945 E. 100 South. Camera facing northwest.

6. **Photograph 45**

Fortunato and Anna Anselmo house at 164 S. 900 East. Camera facing northwest.

6. **Photograph 46**

Frank Assenberg house at 221 S. Iowa Street. Camera facing southeast.

6. **Photograph 47**

John Stewart house at 176 S. 1100 East. Camera facing west.

6. Photograph 48

1029-1033 E. Barbara Place. Camera facing west.

6. Photograph 49

1020 E. Barbara Place. Camera facing southeast.

6. Photograph 50

808 E. 300 South. Camera facing south.

6. Photograph 51

East side of Lincoln Street (945 East) between 100 and 200 South. Camera facing southeast.

6. **Photograph 52**

Houses from 225 to 237 S. on 900 East. Camera facing southeast.

6. **Photograph 53**

Residential structures from 950 to 970 E. on 100 South. Camera facing southeast.

6. **Photograph 54**

Streetscape of residential structures from 861 to 877 E. on 300 South. Camera facing northeast.

6. **Photograph 55**

Neighborhood store constructed about 1920 at 944 E. 200 South. Camera facing south.

6. **Photographs 56 & 57**

Representative examples of multi-car frame and concrete-block garage



