

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District  
Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona  
County and State

**8. Statement of Significance**

**Applicable National Register Criteria**

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

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

**Criteria Considerations**

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

Property is:

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

**Areas of Significance**

(Enter categories from instructions.)

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ARCHITECTURE

**Period of Significance**

ca. 1895-1955

**Significant Dates**

N/A

**Significant Person**

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

**Cultural Affiliation**

N/A

**Architect/Builder**

N/A

**Period of Significance (justification)**

The period of significance for the district begins in the 1890s when the first dwellings were built. Postwar development ended in the mid-1950s; after 1955, there was a hiatus that lasted until the 1970s.

**Criteria Considerations (explanation, if necessary)**

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District  
Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona  
County and State

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

Barrio Santa Rosa is a historic district significant at the local level under Criteria A and C in the areas of community planning and development and architecture. The district's period of significance is from ca. 1895 to 1955. The neighborhood is distinguished by streetscapes and dwellings that represent the survival of the traditional Hispanic urban model and the traditional Hispanic vernacular building tradition into the twentieth century, as well as the gradual transformation of these traditions, as Hispanics assimilated Anglo-American practices in spatial values, building materials, and construction techniques.

---

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

Barrio Santa Rosa possesses significance in the area of community planning and development because it represents the confluence of different concepts of public and private space—the Hispanic urban and rural models and the Anglo-American suburban model. In Tucson, barrios like Santa Rosa developed as a response to the increasing social, economic, and political marginalization of Hispanics in what was, after all, their own land; in this respect, the barrio functioned as a support system.

Barrio Santa Rosa possesses significance in the area of architecture because it is distinguished by the Hispanic vernacular building tradition, based on Hispanic precedents and modified by the selective adoption of materials and construction techniques imported by Anglo-Americans. The characteristic property type is the vernacular single or multiple dwelling built in the Sonoran tradition with bearing walls of adobe brick masonry and flat or pitched roofs. A few dwellings in Anglo-American styles are also present, but these too are constructed of adobe. This architectural blending occurred not only in Tucson, but also in other communities in the Southwest that were originally settled by Hispanics.

---

**Developmental history/additional historic context information** (if appropriate)

Historic Context

In 1775, the Royal Presidio of San Agustín del Tucón was founded on the east bank of the Río Santa Cruz as one of the presidios of the line, or *cordón*, along the northern frontier of New Spain. Across the river, the pueblito of San Agustín, consisting of a Pima village with a *visita* (outlying mission) of San Xavier del Bac, was already established. The presidio garrison arrived early in the following year and eventually the settlement took form. Historian Thomas Sheridan (1986:14) describes the way of life:

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Tucson had evolved into a typical agrarian community of northern Sonora, a self-sufficient settlement of rancher-farmers supporting a garrison of soldiers, no different in most respects from many other such pueblos scattered across New Spain's northern frontier. Tucsonenses...relied upon a mixed economy of both agriculture and stock raising to make a living. They ran their livestock on the semiarid plains and uplands, and raised food for their families and forage for their animals on floodplain fields. It was a way of life geared towards subsistence rather than commercial exploitation or expansion.

Over the following half century, during which Sonora became a state of the Republic of Mexico, Tucson maintained trade and communication with the rest of Sonora by regular pack trains, but daily life remained the same. Because of the threat of Apache raids, dwellings remained concentrated within the walls of the presidio, although some were built just outside the walls on the south and southwest (Officer 1987:288) and "a scattering of individual [fortified] *ranchos* stretched [along the Santa Cruz] as far south as Punta de Agua" (Sheridan 1986:78).

*Tucson's Barrios*

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona

County and State

The United States acquired this portion of northern Sonora in 1854 with the Treaty of La Mesilla (known to Anglo-Americans as the Gadsden Purchase), but U.S. troops did not relieve Tucson's Mexican garrison until 1856; the U.S. Territory of Arizona was created in 1863. With the gradual subsidence of the Apache threat, Tucson began to expand. As Anglo-Americans bought or claimed lots within the area of the presidio, Tucsonenses "continued to hold the fields and some of the lots within the walls but they claimed much more property to the south of the fort, where some had lived when not under fire from the Apaches" (Officer 1987:288). Prior to 1880, when the Southern Pacific Railroad arrived, Tucson was developing as a bicultural, bilingual frontier community (Officer 1981). As the railroad initiated the wholesale transplantation of Anglo-Americans and their culture, Hispanic and Anglo-American relations deteriorated (Luckingham 1982). As Sheridan (1986:42) puts it, "the railroad destroyed the frontier and drove a deep wedge between the Anglo and Mexican communities in town." Economically, Hispanic businessmen could not compete with Anglo-American entrepreneurs backed by Wall Street and foreign capital (Griswold del Castillo 1984).

Anglo-Americans settled in subdivisions north and east of the Southern Pacific tracks, which formed a de facto boundary, dividing Tucson into ethnic enclaves: Hispanic on the south and west, Anglo-American on the northeast (Gourley 1992). In a study of interethnic relationships in Tucson, one informant (born in Tucson in 1870) recalled that Anglo-Americans settled in the northeast "partly to get away from the Mexicans, and partly because there was higher ground out that way... You see, most of the easterners resented mixing with the Mexicans. Most of them got over that after they had been here for a while, but they were still separated" (Getty 1950:99).

Hispanics still constituted a majority of the city's population in 1900 (54.7 percent), but as more Anglo-Americans arrived the percentage steadily dropped (to 36.8 percent by 1920) (Sheridan 1986:3). Anglo-Americans had acquired most of the agricultural fields—simply more land for development—and were in the process of acquiring most of the grazing land. As the traditional agropastoral economy disappeared, most Tucsonenses—with the exception of the relatively small Hispanic middle and upper classes—adapted to an Anglo commercial economy by working as an ever-increasing proportion of a low-paid labor force. As marginalization in the economic sphere was accompanied by similar marginalization in the social and political, the barrios "offered [Tucsonenses] both identity and security, protecting them against some of the most overt manifestations of subordination or discrimination" (Sheridan 1986:225).

Area of Significance - Community Planning and Development

In the early 1880s, most of Tucson's urban core conformed to the traditional Hispanic urban model, characterized by blocks formed of contiguous rooms built up to the street. The model was oriented inward to the family space of the courtyard, and street facades were accented only by the rhythm of apertures along the uniform continuous adobe walls. Passage from the street to the courtyard was through a *zaguán*, or entryway, which mediated between public and private space. Functions other than domestic, such as stores or offices, were distinguished only by the occasional sign. The predominant property type was the Sonoran row house. This was Tucson's original "Barrio Viejo" that later succumbed to urban renewal. The remaining portion of this core is in Barrio Libre Historic District, which borders Barrio Santa Rosa on the north. Beginning in the late 1880s and early 1890s and continuing into the first decades of the next century, Hispanics established their own neighborhoods outside this urban core. Following the pattern discussed above they were almost entirely south and west of the Southern Pacific tracks. Most were south of downtown (a few, like Barrio Anita, were to the north). However, they all continued the pattern of ethnic separation. The classic urban property type—the Sonoran row house—appears in the earlier barrios like Santa Rosa, but the detached single-family house gradually became the predominant type.

Tucson's original townsite was platted in 1872, recorded in 1874, and incorporated in 1877 (Bufkin 1981). Outside of the existing core, which had an irregular pattern of streets that grew up around the former presidio, the townsite was laid out in 400- by 400-foot blocks; each block contained 12 lots, fronting the north-south streets, with an alley between. The townsite was a typical example of "the city engineer's imposition of a grid plan" that was not well-suited for either southern Arizona's environment or for residential development (Jackson 1985:135). Development south of 17th St., in the area that would come to be known as Barrio Santa Rosa, began in the 1890s (Sheridan 1986). In 1904, the City replatted several blocks in this area with 16 rather than 12 lots and Abraham Franklin, one of Tucson's prominent Jewish businessmen, resubdivided Block 142 (bordered by 19th St., 7th Ave., 20th St., and 8th Ave) into 32 lots. Block 142 is bisected by an east-west street, Armijo, and laid out so that the majority of the lots face north or south (see Figure 1). As noted in Section 7, the interior of this block has its own special character. Two other blocks in the district were resubdivided in 1905 and 1924, but only minor changes were made. Many of the lots in the district, especially those on the 12-lot blocks,

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona

County and State

have been split multiple times over the years. This lot-splitting occurred in both Hispanic and Anglo-American neighborhoods within the original City grid.

The earlier buildings in Barrio Santa Rosa generally followed the traditional Hispanic urban model, as described above, in the form of Sonoran row houses. Eventually, as noted above, the detached single-family house predominated. This represented a fundamental shift in spatial values, from what has been termed the "space-positive" tradition to the "space-negative" (Carruthers 1986). The former was rooted in the concept of the room as a self-sufficient multipurpose living space (Wilson 1997). Floor plans were linear, formed incrementally of these modular units, each with its own exterior door. Streets and courtyards were "positive" living spaces, the former public and the latter private. In contrast, Anglo-Americans perceived the house subdivided into rooms as the basic building unit, surrounded by "negative" space, resulting in the typical Anglo-American residential suburb with its uniform lots and setbacks (Veregge 1993).

During the initial phase of the neighborhood's development, from the 1890s up to 1920, Santa Cruz, the neighborhood's parish church, was built. The church (listed in the National Register in 1994) is at 6th and 22nd; it was consecrated in 1918 and assigned to the Order of Discalced Carmelites (Vint 1994). The centrality of the Catholic faith in the barrio is still evident. Many of the dwellings have tile images of the Virgin (usually the Virgin of Guadalupe) on the front walls (Photograph 23, 23-25 19th). Several have *nichos* (shrines) in the front yard (Photographs 9 and 12). The figures most frequently displayed in the nichos are the Virgin and St. Jude, as is the case in other Tucson barrios (Husband 1985).

Data from the 1929 Tucson city directory provide a socioeconomic profile of the neighborhood towards the end of its second phase of development, before the Depression. The data is not comprehensive; city directories in the Southwest and California were often haphazard in recording information for Hispanic neighborhoods (Camarillo 1979; Sheridan 1986). The directory lists occupations for 178 of the neighborhood's residents. Using the categories employed in the Arizona Historical Society's Mexican Heritage Project study of Tucson's occupational structure (Sheridan 1986:Appendix B), the breakdown is as follows:

<u>Occupational Category</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Pastoral/Agricultural	4	2.3
Proprietorial	10	5.6
Managerial	6	3.4
Sales/Clerical	8	4.4
Skilled Workers	34	19.1
Semiskilled Workers	26	14.6
Unskilled Workers	90	50.6
Total	178	100.0

The percentages correspond with the averages for Tucson's Hispanic workforce at the time, except for a relatively high number in the unskilled workers category. Four ranchers accounted for the pastoral/agricultural category; they represent the decline in the number of Tucsonenses tied to the older way of life. Six of the ten proprietors were grocers in the neighborhood. As noted in Section 7, the store and dwelling were typically combined in one building. Four of the grocers were Chinese-American, which was common in Tucson's barrios, reflecting what has been termed "the symbiotic dependence of Chinese merchants on Hispanic purchasers" (Lister and Lister 1989:11). Of the other proprietors, one had a barbershop in the neighborhood and the remainder operated businesses downtown (drugstore, grocery, and cab company). In the managerial category, three were inspectors or foremen for the Southern Pacific; the others were foremen for local businesses. Seven clerks and one salesman account for the sales/clerical category.

Most of the skilled workers were employed in the building trades (carpenter, mason, plasterer) or in the Southern Pacific shops southeast of the depot. The semiskilled workers category consists mostly of teamsters; in 1929, these still included actual teamsters besides motor truck drivers. Over half of those in the unskilled workers category (55, or 31 percent of the barrio's workers) were listed simply as "laborers"; i.e., they did not have steady employment with a given company. As Sheridan (1986) points out, many of these workers had multiple skills, but this was the only work they could find. As was the case elsewhere in the Southwest and California, they constituted a floating pool of workers that could be exploited (typically by Anglo-American corporations) to provide labor at the lowest wages (Vélez-Ibáñez 1996).

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona

County and State

The Southern Pacific was the largest single employer of the neighborhood's workers, as would be expected because it was the largest single employer of Hispanics in Tucson at this time. Most of these jobs were at the low end of the wage scale because the railroad unions that controlled access to many skilled, well-paid jobs blocked Hispanics from these positions until the 1960s (Sheridan 1986). However, as noted above, Hispanics were able to secure skilled work in the railroad shops. The second largest employer of the neighborhood's workers was the City, mainly with the Water Department, located at 18th Ave. and 11th St., or with the Street Department.

This profile provides a picture of hard work with a relatively slim margin of economic security and within little more than a decade even this was imperiled. The Depression of the 1930s was called in Spanish *la crisis*, and with good reason: on many jobs, Hispanics were the first workers to be laid off and "the slight [economic] gains of the first two decades of the century were reversed by poverty and unemployment during the third" (Sheridan 1986:235). Yet Tucson's Hispanic community rallied and relief efforts were organized, among them the *Comité Pro-Infantil* formed by the *Alianza Hispanico-Americana* and other groups; the committee provided food for children at Drachman and other barrio schools (Sheridan 1986). Federal relief efforts helped also, particularly the Works Progress Administration.

In the early 1940s, a study of Tucson's housing was conducted by planning consultant Ladislas Segoe as part of a comprehensive regional plan (Bufkin 1981). The study found two areas of Tucson where the housing was so substandard that major redevelopment was recommended. These areas consisted of the old Hispanic core (including what is now Barrio Libre Historic District) and the neighborhoods immediately to the south (including Barrio Santa Rosa). For Barrio Santa Rosa, the housing statistics were as follows (Segoe and Faure 1942):

- Dwelling units occupied by owner, 27 percent
- Dwelling units with more than 1.51 persons per room, 41 percent
- Dwelling units with no indoor bathroom, 80 percent
- Dwelling units in serious disrepair, 43 percent

The study also found that although the neighborhood was predominately Hispanic, over a quarter (27 percent) of the residents were "non-white," which at that time meant neither Hispanic nor Anglo. These "non-whites" consisted of African-Americans, Native Americans (Tohono O'odham), and Chinese-Americans (the grocers noted above) (Getty 1950).

By 1942, when Segoe's study was issued, the recently created Tucson Housing Authority had already selected a site in the middle of Barrio Santa Rosa for defense worker's housing. The National Defense Act of 1940 included Public Law 671, an extension of the United States Housing Act of 1937. P.L. 671 authorized the U.S. Housing Authority to work with local housing authorities to provide housing for the millions of workers migrating to defense industrial centers (which included Tucson) (Kelly 2000; Lusignan et al. 2004). The Tucson project, designated La Reforma and completed in early 1943, consisted of 162 units in eight courtyard blocks, covering the area from 19th south to 21st, and from 10th east to Meyer. As stipulated by P.L. 671, the project was converted to subsidized housing for low-income families after the war.

The postwar years witnessed a general outmigration from the older barrios. Many Hispanics who had served in World War II and the Korean conflict, who were eligible for the Veterans Administration home loan program, moved to new subdivisions, leaving the older generation behind (Officer 1964). However, Barrio Santa Rosa was an exception because the neighborhood still had vacant lots (mostly in the southern portion), where 16 new dwellings were built within the decade following the war. During this time, as noted in Section 7, the neighborhood gained an important resource in the form of Pio Decimo, a Catholic community services center.

Following the passage of the United States Housing Act in 1949, a measure to provide more public housing in Tucson was defeated by five to one (Arizona Daily Star 27 September 1950). Roy Drachman, one of the city's most prominent businessmen, characterized the Housing Act itself as "dangerous socialism" (Tucson Daily Citizen 22 September 1950). However, in 1965, Tucson voters approved the City's proposal to demolish most of Tucson's old Hispanic core as part of the federal urban renewal program (Bufkin 1981). The required corollary of this "slum clearance" was the construction of a second public housing project next to La Reforma, on the west. Designated Connie W. Chambers Homes (after Cornelius "Connie" Chambers, the THA director at the time), the project consisted of 200 units and a recreation center. However, little was done to ameliorate substandard housing elsewhere in the neighborhood. The county assessor's records from this time show that many dwelling units still lacked indoor bathrooms and were in poor condition. In 1979, the City introduced the Old Pueblo South Community Plan; its goal was to "revitalize" the neighborhoods of Armory Park,

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Pima County, Arizona

Name of Property

County and State

Santa Rita, Ochoa, Santa Rosa, Barrio Libre, and El Hoyo "by upgrading the physical and social environment" with "an area-wide program to rehabilitate deteriorated houses and construct new dwellings" on vacant lots (City of Tucson 1979:2).

In Barrio Santa Rosa, a few new subsidized single-family dwellings were built. La Reforma was classified as "obsolete" and demolished in 1983. The gentrification of the neighborhood began in the late 1980s when relatively affluent Anglo-Americans began moving in, to rehabilitate older dwellings or construct Neo-Traditional buildings on lots where older dwellings had been demolished. The corresponding rise in property taxes has adversely affected lower-income families in the neighborhood. In 1995, the City received a HOPE VI grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a third experiment in public housing. This resulted in major redevelopment of most of the area west of Meyer. Connie Chambers was demolished and replaced with Posadas Sentinel, a 120-unit project consisting of 60 subsidized and 60 non-subsidized units. A new community center was constructed, and Drachman, the neighborhood's elementary school, was relocated to the site of the original Santa Rosa Park; the new park is north of the school.

Community activists consider the demolition of La Reforma and Connie Chambers to have been an unwarranted disposal of viable housing; further, they maintain that what the City actually means by "revitalization" is simply the displacement of lower-income families to other areas and the encouragement of gentrification (Regan 2001). Although La Reforma and Connie Chambers were stereotyped as "the projects" and typically associated with family dysfunction and crime, many former residents remember both as close-knit, supportive communities (Kelly 2000).

Area of Significance - Architecture

The building tradition of the Sonoran frontier was characterized by adaptation and expediency. Tucsonenses survived "largely because they understood the limitations imposed by a harsh environment, and learned to live within them" (Sheridan 1986:14). Their architecture during the Spanish Viceregal and Mexican Republic periods was composed, quite literally, of earth and timber (Bunting 1974, 1976). Bearing walls were built of adobe brick and mud mortar with (or, often, without) foundations of stone rubble masonry. Walls were typically of bonded two-wythe construction, with a one-to-ten ratio of thickness to height. Dwellings were limited to a single story, but with high walls; thus a typical 15-foot wall would have a thickness of 18 inches or more. Openings were spanned with pairs of roughly hewn mesquite lintels. On the exterior, walls were plastered with mud or (commonly) left exposed.

Roofs were built of logs with diameters of 9 to 12 inches, stripped of bark, laid on 20- to 40-inch centers, and covered with a decking of saguaro ribs, followed by multiple layers of brush or other organic material and earth, ranging in depth from 8 to 24 inches. The roof surface was graded to channel rainwater to drains that pierced the parapet. In this building tradition, the essential unit, or module was a rectangular room 12 to 15 feet wide, depending on the span of the roof beams, and not much longer. At the most basic level, the room was a self-sufficient multipurpose living space (Wilson 1997). The traditional floor plan was linear, formed incrementally of these modular units, each with its own exterior door. The households of presidial Tucson lived in a contiguous series of such rooms built along the interior of the presidio walls (Gallegos 1935).

As Tucson, the largest settlement in the U.S. Territory of Arizona, grew from the 1860s through the 1880s, this frontier model was expanded into the traditional Hispanic urban model, with the Sonoran row house as the characteristic property type. As noted above, the largest surviving concentration of these row houses is in Barrio Libre Historic District, the only remaining portion of the old Hispanic urban core (Giebner and Sobin 1972, 1973). As the city became a distribution node within the U.S. market economy, particularly after 1880 when the Southern Pacific Railroad arrived, manufactured building products and materials became increasingly available. For walls, adobe brick remained the principal structural material; when fired common brick became available, it was used primarily to cap adobe brick parapets. Cylindrical metal *canales* (roof drains) replaced wood troughs. Glazing and ready-made window sash and paneled wood doors became available, as well as milled lumber for door and window frames. Yet the basic form remained and initially, at least, Anglo-American influence did not alter the essential Hispanic nature of Tucson's architecture.

However, as Anglo-American building techniques and concepts of architectural space were gradually introduced, basic changes occurred. The first was manifested in the introduction of wood frame technology: earth roofs were covered with (and, in new construction, eventually displaced by) lightweight gabled or hipped roofs framed of milled lumber, and clad in wood shingles, terne plate, or corrugated iron. As noted above, the second and more fundamental introduction was the

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona

County and State

Anglo-American idea of the house subdivided into rooms as the basic building unit, as contrasted with the traditional Hispanic idea of the self-sufficient room as the basic unit; furthermore, Anglo-Americans introduced the concept of the residential suburb with its uniform lots and setbacks (Veregge 1993). Hispanic builders selectively borrowed these ideas and concepts, just as they borrowed new materials and building techniques, while at the same time retaining key elements of their regional tradition. This architecture of cultural convergence would characterize Hispanic vernacular in the region until the middle of the next century.

Architect Harris Sobin (1975, 1977) developed an evolutionary model to describe these developments. In his study of the historic architecture of Florence, Arizona, Sobin discerned a sequential pattern consisting of acculturation (the Sonoran style), fusion (Early and Late Transitional styles), and importation (American Victorian styles). The Sonoran style is defined as the original Hispanic building tradition. Early Transitional is the first hybrid phase combining the Sonoran adobe brick form, linear plan, and lot placement with Anglo-American features (gabled roof, window sash); original Sonoran dwellings with a pitched roof added over the earth roof are termed "Transformed" Sonoran. Late Transitional is the succeeding hybrid phase, distinguished by adobe brick walls, square plan, broad porch, hipped roof, and setbacks. The sequence ends with American Victorian styles that represent a complete break with the regional building tradition; a typical example would be a Queen Anne built of fired brick.

This model has since become standard for explaining architectural developments in Tucson, and has been used in guidebooks for the general public, such as the *Tucson Preservation Primer* (Giebner 1981) and, most recently, *A Guide to Tucson Architecture* (Nequette and Jeffery 2002). Sobin's model does effectively describe the development of Tucson's Anglo-American architecture during the Territorial period, wherein cultural hybrids are simply a brief intermediate phase prior to the wholesale importation of late-nineteenth century architectural fashion from the Eastern U.S. But, as Husband (1988) points out in her study of Tucson's suburban row houses (i.e., row houses in barrios outside the old Hispanic urban core), this mid- to late-nineteenth-century sequence is inadequate for describing the early twentieth-century architecture of these barrios. To document the survival of the Sonoran Tradition into this period, cultural geographer Eliza Husband (1988:17-30) uses a simplified typology of the basic forms: parapeted Sonoran and pitched-roof (hipped or gabled) Sonoran. Typical examples are 1010-1014 Rubio (Photograph 24), 904 8th (Photograph 25), and 821-823 8th (Photograph 26)

However, these are not static categories. As noted above, one of Sobin's evolutionary types is the Transformed Sonoran, where the traditional flat roof was covered with a framed pitched roof. This process continued throughout the early twentieth century. However, by the mid-1910s, asphalt roofing was available, which obviated the disadvantages of the traditional earthen roof. At the same time, the influence of the Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival style filtered down to the barrios as a fashion for flat-roofed step-parapeted dwellings. Changes in roof form were also associated with building additions. In its suburban form, the Sonoran row house was subject to incremental modular change in the traditional manner. The surviving examples of three-or-more-unit dwellings in Barrio Santa Rosa began with one or two units to which additional units were added incrementally. One of the few examples in the neighborhood of a row house with more than three units is 827-835 8th (Photograph 1). The building was constructed sequentially, starting with the northernmost portion, and had its present footprint by 1919. The building originally had a pitched roof, which was changed to the present parapeted flat roof ca. 1930. A typical three-unit Sonoran row house is 1015-1019 Meyer (Photograph 2); in this example, two units were built ca. 1925 and a third was added ca. 1930, along with the front-gabled roof.

Overall, the frequency of the three-or-more-unit row house declined over time. As Husband (1988:12) notes, "the growing predominance of the two-unit, rather than three-or-more-unit, dwelling" reflects the popularity of the Anglo-American "duplex" form. In terms of lot placement she also notes that

row houses in the suburbs were typically placed at the front of the lot just as they had been downtown. In Sanborn maps showing suburban row houses, it can be seen that the first set of rooms was also placed to one side, evidently to leave room for further additions. As a long-term process, this did not often have time enough to happen in suburban barrios before the row-house form was abandoned....As many as a third of the one-room adobe houses, by 1920, were centered on the lot from side to side. They were no longer placed to leave room for a developing row, but apparently reflected the Anglo model of a house set back from front and side property lines [Husband 1988:11].

With regard to the morphology of pitched roofs, hipped roofs tended to predominate in the earlier years, particularly the hipped roof with gabled vents (gable-on-hip) that was also a characteristic feature of Anglo-American dwellings at that

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Pima County, Arizona

Name of Property

County and State

time (Photograph 11). From the late 1910s, gabled roofs became more common, with a lower pitch and slatted gable vents showing influence of Craftsman/Bungalow models (Husband 1988) (Photograph 26).

By the mid-1950s, the Sonoran Tradition had died. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Tucson's Anglo-American establishment regarded adobe as an inferior building material, associated with a backwards culture. Yet this adobe vernacular tradition persisted in the city's barrios until the postwar period, when it was abandoned because of economic and social factors. Today it has become fashionable, as seen in the many recent Neo-Traditional dwellings in the barrio that echo the real examples.

Barrio Santa Rosa is distinguished by its examples of the architectural development of the neighborhood from the Sonoran row houses of its early days to the Ranch era. In Tucson's other older barrios, the immediate postwar period saw an exodus of the younger generation and no new construction. Barrio Santa Rosa was an exception, and actually had an influx of young families. Most of them eschewed the adobe vernacular tradition and built simple Ranch-style dwellings. In this sense, the Ranch style is the final chapter of this barrio's historic architectural development.

Tucson's barrios have many traits in common, as well as many differences, the latter depending largely upon age and location. Barrio Santa Rosa is most similar to Barrio Libre Historic District, and in many respects is a southern continuation of that district, containing examples of the classic Sonoran row house together with single-family dwellings in the Sonoran Tradition and Anglo-American styles. Today, despite the major redevelopment that has occurred in the neighborhood since the 1940s, Barrio Santa Rosa has retained much of its distinctive historic built environment and has maintained its connections with the traditions that created it.

---

## 9. Major Bibliographical References

---

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

### Primary Sources

Plats, Pima County Recorder's Office, Old Pima County Courthouse, Tucson.

Property Record Files, Pima County Assessor's Office, Old Pima County Courthouse, Tucson.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, City of Tucson. 1919 ed., rev. 1922, 1930, 1951, 1960. On file, Arizona Historical Society Library and University of Arizona Special Collections, Tucson.

Tucson City Directory. On file, Arizona Historical Society Library, Tucson.

Tucson City Maps. On file, Arizona Historical Society Library, Tucson.

### Secondary Sources

#### *Arizona Daily Star*

1937 Santa Rosa Park Dedication Includes Talk By Mayor. 12 March. Tucson.

1950 Tucson Voters Overwhelmingly Defeat Public Housing Measure. 27 September. Tucson.

#### Bufkin, Don

1981 From Mud Village to Modern Metropolis: The Urbanization of Tucson. *Journal of Arizona History* 22:63-98.

#### Bunting, Bainbridge

1974 *Of Earth and Timbers Made: New Mexico Architecture*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

1976 *Early Architecture in New Mexico*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

#### Camarillo, Albert

1979 *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1930*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

#### Carruthers, Kenneth D. B.

1986 Architecture is Space: The Space-Positive Tradition. *Journal of Architectural Education* 39(3):17-23.

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District

Pima County, Arizona

Name of Property

County and State

- City of Tucson  
1979 *Old Pueblo South Community Plan*. Rev. City of Tucson Planning Department, Tucson.
- Gallegos, Hilario  
1935 *Reminiscences of an Arizona Pioneer*. *Arizona Historical Review* 6(1):75-81.
- Getty, Harry T.  
1950 *Interethnic Relationships in the Community of Tucson*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Giebner, Robert (editor)  
1981 *Tucson Preservation Primer: A Guide for the Property Owner*. College of Architecture, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Giebner, Robert C., and Harris J. Sobin  
1973 *Tucson's Barrio Histórico*. *Arizona Architect* 16:8-13.
- Giebner, Robert C., and Harris J. Sobin (editors)  
1972 *Barrio Histórico, Tucson*. College of Architecture, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Gourley, John  
1992 *The Pueblo and the Public: Urban Realities in Counterpoint*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Griswold del Castillo, Richard  
1984 *La Familia: Chicano Families in the Urban Southwest, 1848 to the Present*. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana.
- Husband, Eliza  
1985 *Geography of a Symbol: Hispanic Yard Shrines of Tucson, Arizona*. Master's thesis, University of Arizona, Tucson. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.  
1988 *Tucson's Suburban Adobe Row Houses*. Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission, Tucson.
- Jackson, Kenneth T.  
1985 *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kelly, Regina (editor)  
2000 *Don't Look at Me Different: Voices from the Projects/ No me veas diferente: Voces de los proyectos*. Tucson Voices Press, Tucson.
- Lister, Florence, and Robert Lister  
1989 *The Chinese of Early Tucson: Historical Archaeology from the Tucson Urban Renewal Project*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Luckingham, Bradford  
1982 *The Urban Southwest*. University of Texas Press, El Paso.
- Lusignan, Paul R., Judith Robinson, Laura Bobeczko, and Jeffrey Shrimpton  
2004 *Public Housing in the United States, 1933-1949*, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form.
- Nequette, Anne M., and R. Brooks Jeffery  
2002 *A Guide to Tucson Architecture*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Officer, James E.  
1964 *Sodalities and Systemic Linkage: The Joining Habits of Urban Mexican-Americans*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.  
1981 *Arizona's Hispanic Perspective: A Research Report*. Arizona Academy, Phoenix.  
1987 *Hispanic Arizona, 1536-1856*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Regan, Margaret

Barrio Santa Rosa Historic District  
Name of Property

Pima County, Arizona  
County and State

2001 Don't Look at Me Different. *Tucson Weekly* 11 January. Tucson.

Segoe, Ladislav, and Andre M. Faure

1942 *Rehabilitation of Blighted Areas, Conservation of Sound Neighborhoods*. Prepared for the Tucson Regional Plan. Ladislav Segoe and Associates, Cincinnati.

Sheridan, Thomas

1986 *Los Tucsonenses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854-1941*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Sobin, Harris J.

1975 From *Vigas* to Rafters: Architectural Evolution in Florence, Arizona. *Journal of Arizona History* 16:357-382.

Sobin, Harris J. (editor)

1977 *Florence Townsite, A.T.: Final Report of Florence Townsite Historic District Study*. Harris Sobin and Associates, Tucson.

*Tucson Daily Citizen*

1950 Low-Rent Housing Debate Held Here. 22 September. Tucson.

Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos

1996 *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Veregge, Nina

1993 Transformations of Spanish Urban Landscapes in the American Southwest, 1821-1900. *Journal of the Southwest* 35:371-459.

Vint, Robert

1994 Santa Cruz Catholic Church, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form.

Wilson, Chris

1997 When a Room is the Hall: The Houses of West Las Vegas, New Mexico. In *Images of an American Land: Vernacular Architecture in the Western United States*, edited by Thomas Carter, pp. 113-128. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**

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

**Primary location of additional data:**

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other
- Name of repository: \_\_\_\_\_

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Geographical Data**

**Acreage of Property** approximately 30 acres  
(Do not include previously listed resource acreage.)

**UTM References**

(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)