

Tempe Historic Preservation Office

ELLIOTT (GARBINSKI) HOUSE

Research Report

Tempe Historic Property Register #37 HPO 2009.02

Tempe Historic Preservation Commission

HPC Neighborhood Meeting 03/12/2009

14A-4 HPC Public Hearing 04/09/2009



photo: Tempe HPO 2009

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House located at 1010 South Maple Avenue in the 1924 Park Tract Subdivision is proposed for historic designation and listing in the Tempe Historic Property Register at the request of the property owner, Justin Garbinski. The property is eligible for historic designation as it is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and adequately retains its integrity.

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is significant as one of the best remaining examples of frame bungalow houses in Tempe. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type of construction (Bungalow House). Research in this report develops the significance of the Bungalow house form in the context of Residential Architecture in Tempe, Arizona from 1889 to 1945.

RESEARCH

As specified in the Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance, upon receipt of an application for historic designation the Historic Preservation Office shall compile and transmit to the commission a complete report on the subject property or district. This research will be condensed to produce the Staff Summary Report for public hearing. As required, the report will address the location, condition, age, significance and integrity of historic features and other relevant information together with a recommendation to grant or deny the application.ⁱ

LOCATION

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House was built during a construction peak in the Park Tract Subdivision from 1928 through 1930. For some time Tempe had been experiencing a housing shortage and the Park Tract Subdivision was designed to provide comfortable and modern family housing to meet pent up demand. The popular bungalow style helped fulfill the requirements for economy and efficiency. Park Tract Subdivision is identified as a Cultural Resource Area in Tempe General Plan 2030. Cultural Resource Areas are considered culturally significant to the character of Tempe and General Plan 2030 states it is desirable to maintain the character of these areas. General Plan 2030 recommends the underlying zoning in place at the time the plan was adopted should remain the highest appropriate density for Cultural Resource Areas. Accordingly, Cultural Resource Areas are indicated on the GP2030 Projected Land Use Map with the density of the zoning in place at the time the plan was adopted on December 4, 2003.ⁱⁱ

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is located on Lot 10 of Block 4 of the Park Tract Subdivision. Block 4 is at the northern edge of the subdivision along the 10th Street boundary midway between its western extent at the Union Pacific Railroad ROW and its eastern extent at Mill Avenue. Lot 10 is located on the west side of Maple Avenue approximately midblock. Subdivision of Park Tract predated adoption of a zoning ordinance by the Tempe Town Council and this property is currently zoned R-2: Multi-Family Residential.ⁱⁱⁱ

CONDITION

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is significant as one of the best remaining examples of frame bungalow houses in Tempe. Built in 1929, the house exemplifies characteristic bungalow features, such as intersecting gables, tapered and squared porch columns, and entry sidelights which, along with its clapboard exterior, remain in excellent condition. The house has changed little from its original configuration when its classic bungalow design was an important addition to the new neighborhood. The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House continues to convey its architectural qualities of design, workmanship, materials, and feeling.^{iv}

AGE

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is one of only 6 Tempe properties believed by the Tempe Historic Preservation Office to survive from 1929. Based on data from the Maricopa County Assessor's Office and Tempe HPO files, 122 Tempe standing properties are thought to predate the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House having year-built dates earlier than 1929.^v

SIGNIFICANCE

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is one of only 40 Tempe properties currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Biographical information regarding previous owners is not available and the basis for historic designation and listing in the Tempe Historic Property Register is provided by Sec. 14A-4. Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts at (a) [T]he following criteria are established for designation of an individual property, building, structure or archeological site: (1) It meets the criteria for listing on the Arizona or national register of historic places.^{vi}

Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance language agrees with National Register of Historic Places eligibility criteria C which states –

“The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- C. 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.”^{vii}

The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is significant as one of the best remaining examples of frame bungalow houses in Tempe. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Bungalow type of residential construction widely popular from about 1895 until about 1940.

INTEGRITY

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the Tempe Historic Property Register, a property be significant under ordinance criteria and must also possess adequate integrity to communicate this significance to persons familiar with the property and to the community at large. The integrity of a property is evaluated according to aspects which must be present in different combinations depending on the criteria from which historic significance is derived. For the case at hand, a building derives significance because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type of construction. Accordingly, 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 this minimum requirement and retains more than adequate integrity to qualify for designation and listing.^{viii}

Location – This property exists in its originally developed location. The Park Tract Subdivision encompasses a collection of historic resources directly associated with the early growth and development of Tempe and the Salt River Valley. The evolution of Tempe over the past 137 years 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 residential architecture and infrastructure. These exist today in the Park Tract Subdivision as manifestations of those Arizona pioneers who transformed the desert environment of the Salt River Valley into a community of enduring consequence and unequalled character unique in Arizona.

ELLIOTT (GARBINSKI) HOUSE

Tempe Historic Property Register #37 HPO 2009.02

4

Sited prominently at the middle of the 1000 block of South Maple Avenue, the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House occupies land that was originally included within the boundaries of the 1894 Tempe Townsite. Although not subdivided until thirty years later, the Park Tract subdivision was never annexed into the corporate limits of Tempe – rather uniquely, it was an integral part of the community from the onset. Today, the south portion of the Original Townsite, the historic Park Tract Subdivision is a busy and vibrant residential neighborhood. The City is currently experimenting with various traffic-calming features in the right-of-way however the clear and present landmark status of the Maple Ash Neighborhood retains its historic identity throughout the community and beyond.^{ix}

Design – Design is the composition of elements that constitute the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Because properties change through time, changes may acquire significance in their own right and changes do not necessarily constitute a loss of design integrity. Although an addition was made to the rear of the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House, the house continues to maintain original spatial relationships between major features; visual rhythms; layout and materials; and the relationship of other features as they were originally constructed and developed. Design aspects typify the Bungalow Style and continue to maintain this aspect of integrity.

Setting – Setting is the physical environment of a historic property that illustrates the character of the place. Although integrity of setting is not a condition precedent to designation in this case, the property nevertheless retains connections to the physical environment of its surroundings. Original relationships of buildings and structures to the streetscape and landscape; layout and materials of alleyways, walks; and the features of flood irrigation and other infrastructure remain largely intact and possess integrity.

Materials – Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. A property must retain key exterior materials dating from the period of its historic significance. Integrity of materials determines whether or not an authentic historic resource still exists. The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House retains key physical elements as they were originally configured to reveal the preferences, to indicate the availability of particular types of materials, and to exemplify technologies characteristic of the classic Bungalow house form.^x

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 principles of an historic period, and reveal individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles. This property conveys physical evidence of the crafts attendant upon the Bungalow form of residential construction in the 1920s American Southwest.

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 interwar period of significance. The physical features of the property, taken together, are sufficiently intact to convey their significance to someone

familiar with the original property as well as to persons throughout the community to whom the property distinguishes itself as historic. Retention and good maintenance of original design, materials, workmanship, and setting as described above is sufficient to create a discernable sense of place at the historic property.

Association – Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Like feeling, association requires the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character. This property maintains direct links between important events in community history and is emblematic of consecutive waves of suburbanization outward from the original settlement at the Salt River. Now standing as an anchor at the edge of the historic 1924 Park Tract subdivision, the historic property still clearly marks the last of the pre-war development that radiated in bands within the original townsite core.

CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES

Bungalows share a conscious search for the supposed simplicity of preindustrial times meant to counter the excess of the Victorian period by returning to a past when craft displayed the artisan's personal involvement with the work. The most prominent character-defining features of the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House are the shingled medium-pitched central and porch roofs with gables fronting the house and an intersecting perpendicular medium-pitched roof. Other significant character-defining features of the house include open gable eaves that are bracketed and feature lattice vents in the peaks. A short extension of the house to the south also has a medium-pitched roof and bracketed gable eaves. A low addition at the rear of the house has a low-pitched roof with open eaves and is also covered with clapboard siding. The front porch covers a single central entry, which has ten-pane sidelights, characteristic of the bungalow form. The porch roof is supported by two short, tapering pillars, set upon tall, square concrete piers. Two low concrete piers frame the two-step entry to the concrete-floored porch. Windows are double-hung and discretely placed. A single-leaf side entry has a concrete stoop. A clapboard garage is at the rear of the property. The historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is in excellent condition and retains the original character-defining features of its classic bungalow form intact.

HISTORIC CONTEXTS

The significance of community cultural resources is related to historic contexts. This research report for historic property designation looks at various contexts to synthesize information about the period, the place, and the events that created, influenced, or formed the backdrop of the historic resources. Cultural and environmental contexts provide a cultural awareness of the property and aid in the analysis and understanding of the resource. The following contexts help explain the cultural development and historic significance of the location and substantiate a recommendation for designation. Tempe Preservation uses two primary sources for historic contexts; City of Tempe Multiple Resource Area Update (Ryden 1997), and Post World War II Subdivisions Tempe Arizona: 1945-1960 (Solliday 2001).

Residential Architecture in Tempe, Arizona from 1900 to 1960

Residential and nonresidential structures within the area of the Park Tract subdivision were built between 1900 and 1960, with 1940 being the median year-built value (66 years old) and 1940 the most frequently occurring construction date (16 occurrences). The Solliday Survey (2001) identified 100 lots in the Park Tract subdivision and added 17 properties built between 1948 and 1960, to the 80 properties previously identified in the Tempe MRA (1997) as potentially contributing to an historic district. Built in 1929, this is one of only 6 Tempe properties known to the Tempe Historic Preservation Office to survive from that year. Based on data from the Maricopa County Assessor's Office and Tempe HPO files, 122 Tempe properties predate the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House having construction dates of 1928 or before. This is one of only 40 Tempe properties currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places.^{xi}

Residential Flood Irrigation: Tempe 1909~1958

During the initial period of Tempe's residential development it appeared that flood irrigation would continue to be regarded as an essential city service. Irrigation had been a part of Tempe's culture and landscape since the town's founding. When the earliest subdivisions were carved out of farms, developers simply dug more ditches to bring irrigation water to individual lots. The open ditches were gradually replaced by buried pipes beginning in the 1930s, but otherwise, the practice of irrigating residential lots continued virtually unchanged.

After construction, residential flood irrigation systems were turned over to the city, which operated them on behalf of the residents. Initially this extension of the municipal irrigation service was challenged by Salt River Project, which allowed the city to deliver irrigation water but only within the original incorporated area. Outside the one square mile area which included Gage Addition and Park Tract, the Project wanted to supply irrigation water directly to property owners. Its primary concern appears to have been the assessments it collected from landowners. If Tempe residents no longer received their water directly from the Project, they might fall behind in the annual assessments that every Project customer was required to pay in order to continue receiving water.^{xii}

Eventually, Project objections were overcome and SRP and the city signed a new water contract in 1948. As long as property owners in a neighborhood paid their past-due assessments and brought their accounts up to date, the Project allowed them to receive water from the city, which would then pay future annual assessments to the Project when it purchased water for distribution in the Tempe residential flood irrigation program. For the next decade, every new subdivision in Tempe was developed with an underground irrigation system. On November 8, 1948, College View property owners formed Improvement District Number 36 to extend city residential flood irrigation service to the subdivision.^{xiii xiv}

As a strategy for beautifying the city, the residential irrigation network was a success, as it allowed Tempe's new neighborhoods to quickly acquire lawns and much needed shade trees. However, as a self-supporting utility service, it was a failure. Irrigation customers paid very nominal fees, only \$6 per year in 1946, yet the service was expensive to operate. Unlike the potable water service which was self-supporting, the irrigation service operated with deficits that had to be covered by the city's general fund. As the size of the irrigation system continued to expand, so did the deficits.

In 1958, after learning that the deficit was now \$11,000.00, the city council tried to increase the irrigation fee, which was then \$15 per year. This produced uproar among longtime residents who had grown accustomed to the low-cost service, and the council retreated. Explaining their refusal to raise rates, several council members argued that residential flood irrigation contributed enough to the charm of the neighborhoods and to the character of Tempe to justify using money from the general fund to help pay for this beautification service. In the end, the city halted expansion of its residential flood irrigation service simply because it was a messy chore for homeowners and an expensive program for the city to operate. The last subdivisions to be served with city irrigation were those built in the late 1950s: Broadmor Estates (1956) and Tempe Estates (1958) located along College Avenue south of Broadway Road.

The Tempe historic context “Residential Flood Irrigation: Tempe 1909-1958” begins with the premise that historic sites include historic landscape features as integral parts of their identity. This context recognizes that preservation of the perceived and actual integrity of flood irrigated neighborhoods requires protection of historically accurate landscapes and landscape elements contained therein. The study of these historic landscapes and their elements provides an understanding of the cultural and social significance of other common visible features in these neighborhoods. Historic landscapes also reveal much about our evolving relationship with the natural world.

To a large extent, historic landscapes are representative of the time and era when they were originally established. Many architectural periods are closely linked to specific landscape patterns and plant palettes. Much of the mental imagery we conjure up when reflecting on Tempe’s historic neighborhoods includes recollections of their lush, flood irrigated landscapes. Although there are a variety of plants that have evolved to become associated with these historic landscapes, caution is necessary to avoid developing a false or created sense of history. Long-term effects of the systematic elimination or preservation of historic landscape elements and features will only become more apparent over time.^{xv}

Conservation of water and energy are important aspects of sustainable desert living. From the onset, development of Tempe’s irrigated neighborhoods was linked to flood irrigation from Valley canals. The shade trees and mesic vegetation create a microclimate effect in these neighborhoods by shading structures and grounds. Ultimately, this can cool neighborhoods by as much as ten degrees, thereby decreasing energy demand for air conditioning. Shade also decreases the evapotranspiration rate, allowing vital ground water to stay where it is needed and of being pulled from the ground by the desert sun.^{xvi}

The City of Phoenix has recognized the unique character and richness of associated historic landscapes and exempts historic districts and individual properties from its landscape ordinance, which requires all new development to establish a xeriscape design to better manage water use. The term ‘xeriscape’ originated in the early 80s and refers to the regulation and use of water on site. Over the past decade, xeriscape landscapes have increased in number and popularity as they help to inform the public about how designed and built landscapes can be made more sustainable.

While this conservation and education effort is appropriate to desert living, xeriscape landscapes are not associatively or historically appropriate in the setting of historically flood irrigated districts. Although neighbors will spend considerable time and resources on the betterment of their community through various efforts to conserve and enhance neighborhood quality of life, they often fail to understand that protection and preservation of the rich historic character of special neighborhoods that are candidate historic districts is integrally linked to continued maintenance of the integrity of historically accurate landscapes and landscape elements contained therein.^{xvii}

Tempe Preservation is working with Tempe Water Utility Department to implement incentives for water conservation strategies appropriate to historic preservation objectives in Cultural Resource Areas. The goal of this process is to address conservation principals common to overall neighborhood enhancement and environmental quality.

Community Planning & Development in Tempe 1924~1960 (Park Tract)

The Park Tract subdivision is a collection of cultural resources such as the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House which are directly associated with the early growth and development of Tempe and the Salt River Valley. The evolution of Tempe over the past 135 years 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 residential architecture and infrastructure. This exists today in the Park Tract Subdivision as manifestations of those Arizona pioneers who transformed the desert environment of the Salt River Valley into a community of enduring consequence and unequalled character unique in Arizona.^{xviii}

Park Tract is an early "suburban" residential subdivision that was platted by Hugh Laird and Fred J Joyce, April 10, 1924, on behalf of the Park Tract Trust and in response to a housing shortage in the City. The subdivision was designed to provide comfortable and modern family houses, influencing some of Tempe's prominent citizens to purchase lots and have their homes built here. Development of the subdivision began on 100 lots in the area roughly bound by 10th Street, Mill Avenue, 13th Street, and Union Pacific Railroad tracks. The subdivision experienced peak construction from 1928 to 1930

Hugh Laird came to Tempe with his family in 1888 at the age of 5 years. His residency in Tempe continued until his death in 1970. During that time his business and public service career included 60 years as a registered pharmacist, 66 years as owner of Laird and Dines Drug Store, twelve years as Tempe postmaster and two terms as a representative in the state legislature. Perhaps his most outstanding contribution to local politics was his 32 years of service on the Tempe City Council, including 14 years as Mayor. During the period from 1930 to 1962, Tempe's population rose from 2,500 to 25,000 and the town saw substantial growth far beyond its anticipated boundaries, especially after the close of World War II. Policies generated during Laird's lengthy tenure on the City Council did much to shape the present environment and image of modern Tempe. Park Tract platted in 1924 has a very high degree of overall integrity and represents an early "suburban" residential subdivision platted in response to a shortage of housing in Tempe.^{xix}

Bungalow House Architecture in Tempe 1889-1945

The first American house to be called a bungalow was designed in 1879 by William Gibbons Preston. Built at Monument Beach on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, the two-story house had the informal air of resort architecture. This house was much larger and more elaborate than the homes we have come to think of when we use the term Bungalow today. Over time the bungalow type became ubiquitous and widely adapted stylistically so that many architectural historians consider bungalow to be the building type with some stylistic elements derived from the origin in the Craftsman Movement or from some other regional, vernacular, or revival interpretation. Bungalow houses may reflect many different architectural styles, and the word *Bungalow* is often used for any small 20th century home that uses space efficiently. From the turn of the century and for period lasting roughly 30 years, the California architects, Charles Sumner Greene and Henry Mather Greene, are often credited with inspiring America to build Bungalows. Their most famous project was the huge Craftsman style Gamble house (1909) in Pasadena, California.^{xx xxi}

Architecture is much more than style of course, and an important factor in the sustained popularity of bungalows was their ability to meet owners' functional requirements while giving them something previously limited to the wealthy few – the latest in design. Throughout the Bungalow period the form was adapted to a range of architectural styles or movements. From the first Queen Anne Style Bungalows constructed as early as 1895 to the ultimate expression in Arts and Crafts and even Moderne Styles still being built at the end of the 1930s, Bungalows share a conscious search for the supposed simplicity of preindustrial times. Fundamentally, the Bungalow was meant to counter the excess of the Victorian period by returning to a past when craft displayed the artisan's personal involvement with the work. It is easy to see how the bungalow-whose existence was defined on the grounds of restoring family values-fit beautifully into the philosophies of the Arts and Crafts movement and exemplified the concept of a home for Everyman. The Bungalow would bring style to all people whatever their economic or social status.^{xxii xxiii}

In the Southwest, the California Bungalow and the Craftsman Bungalow were common stylistic renditions of the affordable house type that swept across America. Constructed toward the end of the Bungalow period, the historic 1929 Elliott (Garbinski) House is reported to be the best remaining example of frame bungalow styling in Tempe by Janus Associates, Inc., and the Tempe Historical Society, in their collaborative work on the Tempe Historic Property Survey (1980-1981). The house possesses many character-defining features of California Bungalow and Craftsman Bungalow types which remain in excellent condition today.^{xxiv}

The intent of this research is to inform an opinion of eligibility as the basis for a recommendation for or against historic designation. This research relies heavily on information in previous survey and inventory studies; Janus 1983, Ryden 1997, and Solliday 2001, along with additional field recognizance and verification necessary to achieve a reasonable degree of certainty regarding property status.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ City of Tempe, Tempe City Code Chapter 14A – Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance, Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 2004.42, 1-20-05 accessed 03/11/2009 online at:
<http://www.tempe.gov/citycode/14aHistoricPreservation.htm>

ⁱⁱ City of Tempe, Tempe General Plan 2030 Adopted: December 4, 2003, Chapter 3, Land Use, Design + Development, Land Use Element, accessed online 03/11/2009 at:
<http://www.tempe.gov/generalplan/FinalDocument/chapter3.pdf> 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.

ⁱⁱⁱ City of Tempe, Zoning and Development Code, amended: October 2, 2008, Part 2 – Establish Zoning Districts, Map (page 2-30) accessed online 03/11/2009 at:
<http://www.tempe.gov/zoning/ZDCCode/ZDCpart2.pdf> The Common Council of the Town of Tempe adopted its first Zoning Ordinance, Ordinance Number 177 on April 14, 1938.

^{iv} Tempe Historical Museum, accessed Friday, February 13, 2009 2:58:24 PM; Tempe Historic Property Survey: Survey Number HPS-163 (Elliott House)
http://www.tempe.gov/museum/Tempe_history/properties/hps163.htm [site includes link to Tempe Historic Property Survey].

^v NATIONAL REGISTER INFORMATION SYSTEM <http://www.nr.nps.gov/> Database refreshed on April 24, 2008

^{vi} City of Tempe, Tempe City Code Chapter 14A – Tempe Historic Preservation Ordinance, Ord. No. 95.35, 11-9-95; Ord. No. 2004.42, 1-20-05 accessed 03/11/2009 online at:

<http://www.tempe.gov/citycode/14aHistoricPreservation.htm>

Sec. 14A-4. Designation of landmarks, historic properties and historic districts.

(a) The following criteria are established for designation of an individual property, building, structure or archeological site:

- (1) It meets the criteria for listing on the Arizona or national register of historic places;
- (2) It is found to be of exceptional significance and expresses a distinctive character, resulting from:
 - a. A significant portion of it is at least fifty (50) years old; is reflective of the city's cultural, social, political or economic past; and is associated with a person or event significant in local, state or national history; or
 - b. It represents an established and familiar visual feature of an area of the city, due to a prominent location or singular physical feature; or
- (3) If it has achieved significance within the past fifty (50) years, it shall be considered eligible for designation as a landmark if it is an integral and critical part of an historic district or demonstrates exceptional individual importance by otherwise meeting or exceeding the criteria specified in paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection above. At such time as a landmark becomes fifty (50) years old, it will automatically be reclassified as an historic property.

^{vii} U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002; Listing a Property in the National Register of Historic Places, How to Apply Criteria for Evaluation <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/listing.htm> [The National Register's standards for evaluating the significance of properties were developed to recognize the accomplishments of all peoples who have made a significant contribution to our country's history and heritage. The criteria are designed to guide State and local governments, Federal agencies, and others in evaluating potential entries in the National Register.]

viii Garrison, James, 1999; Aspects of Integrity: Generalized Application [http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/Centennial\[SampsonTupper\]House.html](http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/Centennial[SampsonTupper]House.html) [State Historic Preservation Officer Jim Garrison created a matrix titled “Aspects of Integrity: Generalized Application” to illustrate how to evaluate the integrity of a property. This chart indicates those aspects of integrity that must be present for different property types to remain eligible. For example, to identify aspects necessary for a District to maintain eligibility under criteria C (Design/Construction) enter the chart criteria column at “C – Design/Construction” and move across to the property type column for “District”, to see that four of the seven aspects of integrity must be present to maintain the integrity of a district that has significance under criteria C, they are; Setting, Design, Feeling, and Materials. (see chart below)]

J. Garrison 1989

Aspects of Integrity: Generalized Application

Criteria	Property Types					
	Building	Distirct	Site	Structure	Object	
A. Event/ History	Location Materials Feeling Association	Location Setting Feeling Association	Historic	Location Setting Feeling Association	Location Materials Feeling Association	Materials Feeling Association
B. Person	Materials Feeling Association	Location Setting Materials	Historic	Location Setting Association	Materials Feeling Association	Materials Feeling Association
C. Design/ Construction	Design Workmanship Materials Feeling	Setting Design Feeling Materials	Architectural	Setting Design Feeling	Design Workmanship Materials Feeling	Design Workmanship Materials Feeling
D. Likely to Yeild/ Has Yeilded	Workmanship Materials	Location Materials	Archaeological	Location Materials	Workmanship Materials	Workmanship Materials

Aspects of Integrity: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, Association

ix As evidenced by the abandoned effort to designate the Maple Ash area historic whereby over 100 letters in support of the designation and listing were received by the city from concerned citizens throughout the community.

x U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, How To Evaluate The Integrity Of A Property accessed 03/11/2009 online at http://www.nps.gov/history/NR/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_8.htm

xi National Register Information System <http://www.nr.nps.gov/> Database refreshed on April 24, 2008

xii Pry, Mark E. 2003 – Oasis in the Valley; the story of water in Tempe, Tempe Historical Museum & Tempe Water Utilities Department, 2003 KARL: 2004.0000.0040

xiii Tempe Public Works, 1948; Improvement District Map Collection KARL 2005.0000.0045 College View & University Park Irrigation System Additions, Improvement District Number 36, 11/08/1948 [Tempe Public Works Engineering map collection]

xiv City of Tempe (Scott Soliday) 2001, Post World War II Subdivisions, Tempe, Arizona: 1945-1960 Historic Preservation Office.

xv Hansen, Eric M., 1999; F. Q. Story Neighborhood: an historic landscape threatened, Arizona State University, College of Planning and Landscape Architecture, 1999. KARL: 2004.0000.0206 [Tempe Redevelopment]

xvi Davis, Robinson, 2005; The Urban Forest; a study of the value and application of trees in an urban environment, Arizona State University College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (Professor Joseph Ewan, ASLA).

xvii Hansen, Eric M., 1999

xviii Tempe Historic Preservation Office 2006, "Preliminary Determination of Eligibility Attachment to Staff Summary Report Thursday, Oct. 12, 2006 Gage Addition Park Tract College View Subdivisions" <http://www.tempe.gov/historicpres/docs/MAHD-SSR101206%20PDE%20version100306.pdf>

xix Tempe Historical Museum, accessed Friday, February 13, 2009 2:58:24 PM; Tempe Historic Property Survey: Survey Number HPS-222 (Hugh Laird House) <http://www.tempe.gov/museum/hps222.htm> [Site includes link to Excerpts from Newspaper Articles and Documents about Hugh Laird]

xx Craven, Jackie (About.com) Picture Dictionary of House Styles in North America and Beyond: Bungalow Styles <http://architecture.about.com/od/periodsstyles/ig/House-Styles/Bungalow-Styles.htm> The Bungalow is an all American housing type, but it has its roots in India. In the province of Bengal, single-family homes were called bangla or bangala. British colonists adapted these one-story thatched-roofed huts to use as summer homes. The space-efficient floor plan of bungalow houses may have also been inspired by army tents and rural English cottages. The idea was to cluster the kitchen, dining area, bedrooms, and bathroom around a central living area.

xxi Ibid - The Green brothers also published more modest Bungalow plans in many magazines and pattern books.

xxii Winter, Robert and Alexander Vertikoff, 1996 "American Bungalow Style" Simon and Schuster in cooperation with American Bungalow magazine. Adaptation online at: <http://www.ambungalow.com/AmBungalow/whatStyle.htm> Bungalow stylistic chronology - Queen Anne Style (1885-1905), Mission Style (1890-1915), Tudor Style (1890-1930), Prairie Style (1900-1920), California Style (1900-1930), Craftsman Style (1900-1930), Foursquare Style (1900-1930), Period Revivals (1915-1930) Colonial, Log Cabin, Pueblo, Spanish Colonial, Chicago Style (1920-1930), Cape Cod (1930-1940), Moderne (1930-1940).

xxiii Library of Congress (accessed Wednesday, March 11, 2009) "Bungalows in the Historic American Buildings Survey: A Select List" online at http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/list/226_bung.html "The bungalow was one of the most popular styles of housing in the twentieth century before World War II. Typically the features consist of:

- a low profile of one or one-and-a-half stories
- a low-pitched roof which has widely overhanging gables or eaves with decorative braces
- the gables often form a porch with square columns or heavy battered piers, so the porch is included under the same low, overhanging roof as the main house

ELLIOTT (GARBINSKI) HOUSE

Tempe Historic Property Register #37 HPO 2009.02

13

-
- the presence of built-in cabinets, shelves, and seating
 - the emphasis on the natural quality of materials such as wood

Its practical layout--with living space all on one floor around one central room--and its affordability, combined with artistic touches, appealed to a wide audience. As the style gained in popularity, designs proliferated across the country through pattern books and mail order catalogs by companies such as Sears, Roebuck & Co. and Montgomery Ward.”

^{xxiv} Janus Associates, Inc. (1980), Tempe Historical Museum: Tempe Historic Property Survey HPS-163 http://www.tempe.gov/museum/Tempe_history/properties/hps163.htm The Elliot House is the best remaining example of frame bungalow styling in Tempe. Built in 1929, the house exemplifies characteristic bungalow features, such as intersecting gables, tapered and squared porch columns, and entry sidelights. The clapboard exterior is in excellent condition, and the house has changed little from its original configuration. The house was built during the height of construction in the Park Tract, between 1928 and 1930. Tempe had been experiencing a housing shortage for many years, and the Park Tract was designed to provide comfortable and modern family type housing. The popular bungalow style fulfilled these requirements. This house, with its classic bungalow design, was an important addition to the new neighborhood and continues to convey its architectural qualities of design, workmanship and setting.