

## NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION SUMMARY SHEET

**Property:** Indian House Community Residential Historic District

**Location:** Bounded by 5<sup>th</sup> Street, E. Wash, Kane Estates, Sahaura St.; Tucson  
Pima County, Arizona

**Ownership:** Private

**Nomination Prepared By:** Ralph Comey Architects  
Janet H. Strittmatter, Inc.

**Description:** The Indian House Community Residential Historic District is a subdivision made up of distinctive residences on large lots with native vegetation and a rural atmosphere. The residences are examples of Southwestern Revival and contemporary styles. Besides the residences, major features that add to the distinctive atmosphere include the desert landscaping, artifacts such as fence posts and cattle guards, and the dirt access road.

**Significance:** The district is nominated under Criteria A, C, and D for its unique role in early subdivision development in Tucson, for its layout and role in architectural development, and for the information that could be yielded from the archaeological sites.

**Suggested Level of Significance:** Nominated under Criteria A, C, and D at the local level of significance.

**Status:** For concerns regarding Criterion D, see attached comments from Carol Griffith, Deputy SHPO (archaeologist). Carol has stated that she is willing to work with the preparers. Revisions will address these concerns and any comments/suggestions from the HSRC. Photos and USGS maps to be sent to SHPO with final version of the nomination.

**INDIAN HOUSE COMMUNITY  
RESIDENTIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT  
TUCSON, ARIZONA**

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES  
NOMINATION**

**HISTORIC PROPERTY INVENTORY FORMS**



AUGUST 5, 2000

**PREPARED BY:  
RALPH COMEY ARCHITECTS  
&  
JANET H. STRITTMATTER INC.**

## **Comments on Criterion D for the Indian House Community**

The archaeology on the property should be viewed as contributing elements to the district. I question calling the cattle guard archaeology but it does appear to be part of the built environment associated with the district. The trash areas, barn, and kiln area would be contributing properties to the district and could provide information about the history of this community. There may be additional features such as wells, privies (?) etc. that could also contribute information. What is lacking in the nomination is a context statement that includes the archaeological features. The nomination, as currently written, focuses on the archaic and prehistoric periods but the nomination does not include any resources associated with these periods. The historic context statement provided should focus on the period of significance and should include a discussion of research issues that could be addressed by the study of the archaeological resources.

Comments from Carol Griffith, Deputy SHPO



=====

**4. National Park Service Certification**

=====

I, hereby certify that this property is:

- entered in the National Register  
    \_\_\_ See continuation sheet.
- determined eligible for the  
National Register  
    \_\_\_ See continuation sheet.
- determined not eligible for the  
National Register
- removed from the National Register
  
- other (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Keeper

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Action

=====

**5. Classification**

=====

Ownership of Property (Check as many boxes as apply)

- private
- public-local
- public-State
- public-Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)

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

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
<u>  6  </u>	<u>  5  </u> buildings
<u>    </u>	<u>    </u> sites
<u>    </u>	<u>    </u> structures
<u>  4  </u>	<u>    </u> objects
<u> 10  </u>	<u>  5  </u> Total

*sites, not objects*

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register \_\_\_\_\_

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

=====

**6. Function or Use**

=====

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat: Domestic Sub: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Current Functions** (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat: <u>domestic</u>	Sub: _____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

=====

**7. Description**

=====

**Architectural Classification** (Enter categories from instructions)

<u>20th Century Revivals</u>
<u>Pueblo Revival</u>
<u>Territorial Revival</u>

**Materials** (Enter categories from instructions)

foundation	<u>concrete, stone</u>
roof	<u>composition built-up</u>
walls	<u>stucco</u>
other	_____

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

=====

**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.)

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

Areas of Significance (Enter categories from instructions)

community planning & development  
architecture

Period of Significance 1926-1950

Significant Dates N/A

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

N/A

Cultural Affiliation N/A

Architect/Builder W. P. Henderson, Starkweather & Morse,  
Gordon Luepke, W. P. Thompson

Narrative Statement of Significance (Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

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 #

Primary Location of Additional Data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
Other State agency
Federal agency
Local government
University
X Other see continuation sheet

Name of repository:

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 1

---

### SUMMARY STATEMENT

Located in the east central part of Tucson, the Indian House Community Residential Historic District (1926-1950) is made up of eleven distinctive residences, on two- to six-and-one-half-acre lots, which are excellent examples of Southwestern Revival and contemporary styles within a unique, informally planned, semi-rural subdivision (Map 1). The subdivision plat called Indian House Estates was established in 1949, but Indian House (#9) (the first residence and subdivision namesake), Indian House Road and several other residences date from the late 1920s and early 1930s. Neighbors believe that the name "Indian House" may mean that the first house was built by native Puebloans who accompanied Santa Fe architect, William Penhallow Henderson, to Arizona to undertake this project for his client, Nan Wood, an artist and the widow of an eastern industrialist (see Section 8).

Indian House Community follows in the tradition of several other Tucson desert subdivisions which were established to promote a distinctive Southwestern lifestyle. The large lots, the dirt access road, the native desert and the densely vegetated wash to the east help maintain a rural atmosphere. An aerial photograph dating around 1950 (Fig. 1) shows a polo field, a horse stable and a nearby guest ranch and ranch school, all activities and enterprises which were important in Tucson at that time. The distinctive Pueblo Revival style houses, influenced by the earlier architecture of the Puebloans and the Spanish Colonial settlers, create a strong Southwestern presence. The implementation of early deed restrictions ensured continuity of architectural appearance and land use. The community layout, the desert landscape and the architecturally significant houses combine to create a distinctive, unified historic district with a visible sense of time and place.

The most significant factors in providing cohesiveness to the Indian House Community are the pervasive desert environment and the architectural integrity and stylistic unity of its older residences. Of the eleven residences in the historic district, six are contributors. A further, more subtle, element in adding historic flavor to Indian House Community is its expression of a particular Southwestern way of life which once existed. A few artifacts of that life still remain such as fence posts, an old cattle guard, two trash dump sites, an old kiln and a

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 2

---

crumbling horse barn. Of these artifacts, four are contributing historic ruin sites. The houses themselves provide a stronger expression of that lifestyle.

Development within the Community began in 1929 with the construction of Indian House (#9), 365 N. Indian House Road, by Nan Wood, an artist and widow from Dayton, Ohio. (However an early residence nearby on the site of Brandes School, a facility for asthmatic children built in 1940 to the south, may have been the residence of Leon Moore, a Tucson attorney, who bought the quarter section containing the future Indian House Community in 1916). Two other houses were built by Nan Wood in the early 1930s. Five more were added in the late 1940s, around the time that May Carr, a widow and a rancher's wife from Sonora, Mexico, purchased the property and subdivided Indian House Estates. The remaining houses were built in the early 1950s.

The community layout, the desert landscape and the eligible residential properties are significantly intact and display a high degree of integrity. Additionally, the condition of the houses is good and maintenance over the years has helped to preserve the appearance and unique sense of place in Indian House Community. Likewise, the early deed restrictions helped preserve the community in the past, and new deed restrictions of 1999 plus National Register status and a proposed City of Tucson historic overlay zone will help protect it in the future.

### DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

The subdivision plat of Indian House Estates was approved by Pima County in 1949 (Map 2). At that time, the subdivision was located in the desert east of the Tucson city limits. The 1950 aerial photograph (Fig. 1) shows that to the north, 5th Street was unpaved. To the east was a densely wooded wash. To the west was an airstrip serving the Wagon Wheel Guest Ranch which faced Broadway Boulevard, paved at that time. On the south edge of the Indian House Estates, just east of the guest ranch, was the Brandes School for asthmatic children. Beyond 5th Street to the north, a few subdivision streets were being laid out. The rest of the land in the vicinity of Indian House Estates was undeveloped desert. Tucson has since grown up around and far beyond today's Indian House

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 3

---

Community, as illustrated by the 1998 aerial photograph (Fig. 3). To the north, 5th Street has been paved. Beyond 5<sup>th</sup> Street are residential, grid-plan neighborhoods. To the west, Sewell Elementary School and residential development has replaced the airstrip. To the east, the wash has been channeled and beyond the wash are apartments. To the south, Brandes School disappeared and on that property a commercial development is currently under construction. North of the commercial property is Kane Estates, an intense development of single family houses along a cul-de-sac, Wendrew Lane. (Kane Estates subdivision [Map 6] was created in 1956 from land that was once part of the Indian House estate [see Section 8]. Owing to its association with the Indian House property, Kane Estates should be added to the historic district when its residences come of age.)

Internal development within the Indian House block is a critical issue. Currently, after a recent change of ownership, thirteen houses are being developed in a new subdivision, Sonoran Village, created from the two northeastern parcels, lot #4 and lot #5, of Indian House Estates. A northwest parcel, lot #7, also recently changed ownership. However, the area comprising Indian House Community Residential Historic District remains essentially as it was in the 1940s.

Thus, Indian House Community is surrounded now by developed properties on all sides, however, the core area containing the historic properties remains remarkably unchanged. The historic district retains a unique sense of privacy and place. This is due to the large lots, the continuous desert vegetation, the original unpaved access road, Indian House Road, and the strong, almost timeless visual quality of the houses themselves. Equally important, the original deed restrictions, which were in force for fifty years, permitted only one house per lot (Fig. 4). The three most recent, non-contributing houses did not increase the community density. After the first deed restrictions expired in January 1998, the new higher density housing project, Sonoran Village, was begun. This development is very different in character since it allows a cluster density of three houses per acre.

The new deed restrictions, enacted in 1999 and signed by the majority of the property owners in the historic district, permit subdividing of parcels to one full acre per lot but otherwise restrict further development (Fig. 5, Map

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park ServiceNational Register of Historic Places  
Continuation SheetSection Number 7 Page 4

3). Thus, the community should continue to have a low-density appearance. A current threat to the character of the neighborhood is the possibility of higher density development of lot #7 and incompatible construction on lot #1. The owners of these parcels did not sign the new deed restrictions. These properties lie outside the proposed historic district. Indian House Community is in the process of obtaining further protection through the establishment of a local Tucson overlay historic zone which will encompass the historic district and adjacent, related properties. Such a district would require that new development be given additional review.

**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**

Indian House Community is a non-professionally planned neighborhood which developed informally. The first improvement on the estate was undoubtedly what became Indian House Road which, in a gently winding pattern, eventually crossed the property from north to south. In 1929 Nan Wood built Indian House (#9) on a gentle rise in the center of the property and a short distance to the west from the road (Fig. 6). In 1934, Nan Wood built another large house (the Hill/Hubbell House [#D]) across the road and a short distance south (Fig. 7). Probably soon after, the Guest House/Alberts House (#E), originally a guest house for the Hill/Hubbell House, was built slightly to the southeast. Around that time, or perhaps later, the stable (#G) (Fig. 8), corrals and polo field were built. Thus, the first three dwellings and outbuildings on the Indian House estate were built by Nan Wood. According to long-term resident, Ruth Hileman, at some point in time, the property was called Indian House Ranch.

No further major construction occurred until the Kane/Beal House (#F) was built in 1944. It was located south of the Hill/Hubbell House and was used by the Kane family, prominent guest ranch/restaurant owners, as an alternative home to their Rancho del Rio Guest Ranch. After May Carr bought the Indian House property in 1945 and subsequently sold off parcels, there was a flurry of construction during the late 1940s. The Carr/Newell House (#11) was built in 1948 by May Carr as a caretaker's residence. The McLain/Rodgers House (#A), 1948, the McDonald/Hileman House (#B), 1948, and the Van Cliburn House

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 5

---

(#D), 1949, were built on properties purchased from May Carr in a loose grouping around Indian House.

These earliest eight houses constructed prior to 1950 give the Indian House Community its strong visual quality and form the basis of the historic district. The five houses constructed since 1950, including the three entered from Sahuara Street, the Reckart House (#8), the Martin House (#13) and the Matsushino House (#C), and one from 5th Street, the Perrillo/Keyes House (not within the district boundaries), do not have the same relationship to the neighborhood.

In the 1950 aerial photograph (Fig. 1) Indian House Road was a dirt road, visible in its present configuration. The subdivision, while not professionally designed, was organically and carefully thought out. The houses were individually sited rather than being placed in a standard arrangement. The driveways and pathways likewise were distinctive. There was pedestrian and equestrian circulation within the subdivision, as illustrated by the pathways or trails linking some of the houses to the stable and to the polo field. Thus, Indian House Estates reflected nearly the same informal, rural desert quality it has today.

The pervasive, unaltered desert vegetation throughout the Indian House Community is one of its unique characteristics. The desert, of the type known as "creosote desert," consists mainly of a vigorous stand of creosote shrubs. Along the roads are a scattering of prickly pears, cholla and other cactus. A few other areas to the north and south contain concentrations of prickly pear, and there are a few trees (palo verde, mesquite and desert willow). A dense band of mesquite trees follow the wash. The creosote shrubs are spaced apart, as is typical for desert plants, but in places they grow to a height of five or six feet. One can see objects through them fifty feet or so away, but beyond that, little can be seen. One can stand on Indian House Road and see nothing of the nearby buildings beyond the neighborhood. Even to the east, the two-story apartments are not conspicuous since the remaining trees along the wash help to screen them. Thus, the desert growth expresses a strong natural presence and helps create a feeling of remoteness and isolation.

The story of horse culture on the Indian House property is not fully documented. However, there are many trails in the community. According to Ruth Hileman,

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 6

---

the Gillhams, early occupants of the Hill/Hubbell House (#D), around 1948 had horses and rode. Most likely others did too. The horse barn (#G), currently a ruin, is generous in size with ample corrals (Fig. 8). The 1950 and 1953 aerial photographs (Fig. 1, Fig. 2) show a network of trails running through Indian House Estates. One trail runs north from the barn and corrals to the polo field and across 5<sup>th</sup> Street to a dirt road to the north. Another network extends west and connects with the houses. One trail goes southwest from Indian House Road and connects with the guest ranch driveway and across Broadway to another trail going south. The aerial photographs do not show a clearly defined trail from Brandes School to Indian House Estates, but there is a trail from the school extending south across Broadway Boulevard. Thus it appears that horseback riding was an activity within the Indian House Estates at least up to 1953.

Likewise the story of the game of polo at Indian House is unclear. The 1950 aerial photograph (Fig. 1) shows the polo field, but the 1953 aerial photograph (Fig. 2) shows the field starting to re-vegetate and containing an equestrian track. The horse barn was large enough to stable two polo teams for a few days, but not longer. It could have housed a few horses permanently. It appears that polo was played at Indian House up until the late 1940s.

The presence of cattle on the property is not fully documented. Marge Kittle, resident of the McLain/Rodgers House (#A) from 1948 to 1966, recalls seeing cattle around her family's house. She said cattle roamed throughout the region. Recently, Ann Leenhouts, the present owner of Indian House (#9), found the pieces of an old cattle guard nearby, indicating the presence of fencing and livestock at one time (Fig. 8).

### ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

#### Materials and Features

Early homes in the historic district reflect construction practices used regionally as well as in Tucson. Materials were local, imported from Mexico or were shipped in from elsewhere. Locally fabricated elements included adobe bricks

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 7

---

and millwork. Skill levels in the work force were undoubtedly not uniform – there were experienced journeymen with training, and inexperienced workers without formal training. Although it can be assumed that most workers were local, some construction workers for Indian House (#9) may have been Native Americans from Santa Fe, New Mexico. In general, workmanship in the historic district was good.

Since there is a very narrow range of styles used in Indian House Community there is also a limited pallet of materials. All houses are of masonry construction with little wood frame, except for roof construction. Walls are predominately mud adobe brick with some use of concrete masonry units. Masonry walls have an exterior stucco finish and plaster on the inside. With the exception of the pitched roof of the Guest House/Alberts House (#E), roofs are generally flat behind parapet walls and clad with composition roofing. Commonly, *canales* (Spanish word for roof drainspouts) project through the parapets. Windows are generally steel casement and doors are of paneled or hand-carved wood. On the exterior, exposed wood is found in viga protrusions and lintels. (*Viga* is the Spanish word for log beam, similar to that used in pueblo construction.) Inside, most houses feature exposed vigas in ceilings of major rooms. Some houses have fine interior millwork and paneling. There are clay tile and colored concrete floors.

Since the contributing houses were built before air conditioning was in common use, the need for natural cooling was a design consideration. Houses were inspired by Native Pueblo and Spanish Colonial precedent and used traditional elements – thick masonry walls, small window openings and high ceilings. (The intention was to contain the cooler night air and allow the air, as it heated, to rise.) Some houses, however, used larger window openings for ventilation. As they became available, evaporative cooling and air conditioning were added to all houses. Tree-shaded patios, swimming pools, fountains and ramadas provided exterior shading and natural cooling which made outdoor living a pleasant experience, even in hot weather. (*Ramada* is the Spanish word for sunshade or arbor).

The houses in the Indian House Community historic district are large, one-story, residences. Rear porches, for the most part, have not been used. Indian House (#9), 365 N. Indian House Road, and the Kane/Beal House (#F), 310 N. Indian

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 8

---

House Road, have pueblo-style front porches, and the Hill/Hubbell House (#D), 300 N. Indian House Road, has a sheltering portico. The MacDonald/Hileman House (#E), 315 N. Indian House Road, has an entry ramada. Sundecks, pergolas, ramadas, enclosed "Arizona rooms" (sun-rooms) and patios are typical. The McLain/Rodgers House (#A), 364 N. Indian House Road, the Van Cliburn House (#6), 431 N. Indian House Road and the Guest House/Alberts House (#E), 250 N. Indian House Road, have Arizona rooms. Patios are commonly located at the rear of the house however the Van Cliburn House has a handsome landscaped front patio and Indian House has four charming side and rear patios. Privacy, and the creation of sheltered, intimate space as a contrast to the desert are considered to be important in the neighborhood, and most patios have four- to six-foot high walls. Landscaping is used to help create intimacy as well as shading.

The exterior of the houses in Indian House historic district are simple without ornamental features. The interiors likewise are simple, with the expression of natural materials – stained concrete floors, light-colored plaster walls and oiled wood plank and beam ceilings. Most houses have beehive or sculpted fireplaces. There is some use of hand-decorated ceramic tile, especially in kitchens. Good examples of decorated tile use can be seen in the Hill/Hubbell House and the Van Cliburn House. Indian House has some special designed doors. According to its current owner, Richard Hubbell, the Hill/Hubbell House has magnificent, seventeenth-century, carved wooden doors and shutters imported from Mexico.

The architectural styles in the Indian House historic district are consistent with the prevailing styles in Tucson (and elsewhere in the Southwest) during the same period. However, the preponderance of the Pueblo Revival style in the historic houses reflects the influence of both Nan Wood, original owner, and May S. Carr, who established the subdivision. Nan Wood's New Mexico connections, artistic interests and choice of Santa Fe architect, William P. Henderson, as the designer and builder for her house, set the tone. The deed restrictions, established by May Carr in 1949, helped maintain the architectural character of the properties (see Section 8.) The Territorial Revival Kane/Beal House, built in 1944, is a related style. The later, non-historic houses are both Pueblo Revival-influenced Neo-Eclectic and Ranch style houses.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 9

---

### Architectural Styles

The Indian House Community Historic District is architecturally significant as an important collection of Southwestern Revival style residences. The six historic contributing houses show a strong Santa Fe influence, with five being of the Pueblo Revival style, Indian House (#9), Hill/Hubbell House (#D), Carr/Newell House (#11), McDonald/Hileman House (#B) and Van Cliburn House (#6), and one being of the Territorial Revival style, Kane/Beal House (#F). These houses were built between 1929 and 1950.

Of the five non-contributing houses in the district, two were constructed during the historic period (before 1950). One was of the Pueblo Revival style, the McLain/Rodgers House (#A), but it has been altered to have an idiosyncratic appearance. The other house was most likely a vernacular type, the Guest House/Alberts House (#E), but it has been extensively enlarged and remodeled and given a Ranch style appearance. The other three non-contributing houses, built after 1950, can be categorized as Pueblo-influenced Neo-Eclectic. They include the 1997 Reckart House (#8), the 1957 Martin House (#13) and the 1996 Matsushino House (#13).

(Not part of the historic district is the Jay/Ginsburg House, 340 N. Indian House Road, built around 1954 and Pueblo Revival-influenced Neo-Eclectic in style. Also not included within the current district boundaries is the Perillo/Keyes House, 5940 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, built around 1954 and Contemporary in style. The Kane Estates subdivision, developed in 1956 by the Kane family, the original owners of the Kane/Beal House (#F), contains fifteen, brick Ranch style residences. These seventeen properties have good integrity and are candidates for inclusion when they meet the age criterion.)

To summarize, currently there are fifteen (15) individual resources in the historic district, including eleven (11) residences and four (4) sites. There are six (6) contributing Southwestern Revival style houses, built before 1950. Of the contributing houses, five are Pueblo Revival and one is Territorial Revival in style. The four contributing sites probably date to the 1930s and 1940s and include two historic trash dumps, one kiln ruin and one stable ruin. There are five (5) non-contributing residences. Two of these, built before 1950, have altered

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 10

---

appearances. Three, built after 1950, are Neo-Eclectic in style with traditional influences. Adjacent to the current district boundaries, seventeen additional, contemporary style residences built after 1950 await future inclusion in the Indian House Community Residential Historic District.

The accompanying nomination forms use style terms generally described by Virginia and Lee McAlester in *A Field Guide to American Houses* (1984, 1997) or Marcus Whiffen in *American Architecture Since 1780* (1992). In this nomination, Territorial Revival is considered to be a Southwestern Revival style parallel to the Spanish Colonial Revival (or Spanish Eclectic) style. The term Pueblo Revival (or Pueblo-Spanish Revival) as described by the McAlesters and Whiffen is applied where appropriate. The McAlesters group Contemporary and Ranch under a common style, Modern, whereas the terms Contemporary and Ranch are used independently here. The McAlester's term Neo-Eclectic covers some of the more recent houses in the Indian House historic district which contain both traditional and contemporary features. This homogenization of architectural styles is found frequently throughout Tucson and elsewhere in houses built during the post- World War II period.

### **Pueblo Revival Style (Pueblo-Spanish Revival)**

The Pueblo Revival style was introduced into the Indian House property by Nan Wood who hired the Santa Fe architect, William Penhallow Henderson, to design and build Indian House in that style in 1929. Very popular in New Mexico by that time, the Pueblo Revival style drew on regional historical precedents and was inspired by flat-roofed Spanish Colonial and Native American pueblo prototypes. (*Pueblo*, the Spanish word for "people" or "settlement," refers to ancient or modern communal villages built by Southwest native peoples or to the tribal groups which occupy these villages.) Especially in New Mexico, California and Arizona, the early twentieth-century fascination with Pueblo art and culture, the rustic lifestyle, the very direct use of natural materials, such as mud adobe, plaster and wood, helped promote the style. Also Pueblo Revival was consistent with the objectives of the Arts and Crafts movement during the early years of the twentieth century which favored simple, functional expression and the use of natural materials and hand craftsmanship. The Craftsman style was an outgrowth of the Arts and Crafts movement.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 11

---

The Pueblo Revival is typified by flat roofs with parapet walls and a cubic articulation of rooms expressed in plan and elevation. This arrangement creates a stepped-back appearance and a broken roof line which resembles the prototypical pueblos. Projecting vigas and canales at the roof lines provide a rhythmic ornamentation. The hand-built theme is expressed in rounded corners, irregular wall surfaces, usually earth-colored, and rough-hewn, wood vigas, window and door lintels and porch columns. Sunlight falling on Pueblo Revival facades creates vivid patterns of light and shadow. Several of the following Pueblo Revival style residences were designed by well-known local and out of state architects (see Section 8).

Indian House (#9) is organized as a cluster of rooms around a central patio. It has the articulated façade and stepped roof line characteristic of the Pueblo Revival style. Its plain stucco walls are punctuated by the typical projecting vigas and canales and timber lintels and porch columns. The original 1929 portion of Indian House is the work of architect, William Penhallow Henderson (Fig. 9).

The Hill/Hubbell House (#D), another Pueblo Revival style example, likewise has a cluster organization, with a diagonal axis to the road. The step backs are very pronounced and the roof levels are quite varied. The projecting vigas form a strong visual pattern. The windows facing the street are quite small. Larger glass areas face a shaded patio. This house is clearly the work of a highly skilled, unidentified architect.

The Van Cliburn House (#6) is organized in wings, rather than articulated rooms. It has a simple, rectilinear profile with rounded corners and parapets, random placement of window openings, and a long row of projecting vigas facing the street. A wall with a handsome buttressed gate entrance encloses a pleasant front patio. A glazed Arizona room faces south. A huge picture window in the living room frames a handsome view to the north. This house was designed by Tucson architects, Starkweather & Morse.

The Carr/Newell House (#11) has a very pueblo-like organization with its linked collection of rooms along a linear axis. There are the typical exposed wood lintels and projecting canales. The windows and door openings are informally

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 12

---

placed and the house has a modest, domestic scale. The original portion of the Carr/Newell house was designed by Tucson architect, William P. Thompson.

The McDonald/Hileman House (#12) like the Van Cliburn House, is organized in wings. An early addition, designed by Tucson architect, Ned Nelson, created the projecting entry arcade and family room. The house contains the typical Pueblo Revival features seen throughout the Indian House historic district.

### **Territorial Revival Style**

Spanish Colonial architecture in the Southwest evolved through time and contact with Anglo-Americans to become the Territorial Style. In the Hispanic tradition, early houses were rectangular, or cubic in form, presenting high, flat facades of exposed adobe on stone foundations with flat roofs. Drainpipes or canales pierced the parapet walls. Doorways were recessed and windows, appearing informally placed from the exterior, reflected the interior room arrangement. Because of adobe deterioration, the houses were eventually stuccoed and brick courses were added to parapets. Gradually the style was transformed through contact with Anglo-American settlers from the East. In southern Arizona, during the 1880s, sloping or pyramidal roofs were added above existing flat roofs to provide better roof protection. With the widespread adoption of pitched roofs, parapets and canales were eliminated, making the walls lower with changed proportions. Window and door detailing showed an Anglo influence. In the New Mexico variant of the style, window and door details and porch framing had Greek Revival features. The flat roof version also persisted and the parapet cap became more elaborate. Front porches were added. Early to mid-twentieth century examples of this style are called Territorial Revival. In Tucson, they are popularly and simply known as "Territorial style" houses.

The Kane/Beal House (#F) is the single example of the Territorial Revival style in the historic district. It has stuccoed parapet walls, canales and a brick cap. The wood, double-hung windows show an Anglo influence. The deep recessed entry, however, is less characteristic of the style.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 13

---

### Contemporary Style

The Contemporary style developed during the late 1940s in the work of innovative architects and was the most favored for custom-designed houses built between 1950 and 1970. This style evolved from the International style and the Craftsman and Prairie styles as well as from the traditional Japanese villa, rural Alpine and Scandinavian forms, and from the early western ranch architecture which also inspired the Ranch style. Like the International style, it is based on certain intellectual premises relating to design, construction and the use of materials. There is one non-contributing example of the Contemporary style in the Indian House neighborhood which is eligible to be added to the historic district once it reaches fifty years of age. According to the McAlesters, the Contemporary residential style is characterized by two distinctive subtypes based on roof shapes, flat (with overhangs) or gabled, although shed roofed examples can be found. Contemporary houses often use natural materials, such as wood, brick and stone. The gabled roof subtype often features overhanging eaves frequently with exposed roof beams. Posts or piers may support the gable.

The Perrillo/Keyes House, 5940 E. 5th Street, uses natural materials; wood, brick, concrete and stucco. The gently sloping roof has overhanging eaves with exposed roof framing. The walls are organized in panels, with windows expressed as bands of glass.

### Neo-Eclectic Style

Although in Tucson a few pre-1940 styles continued to be built into the 1950s, the period between 1950 and 1970 was dominated by the Ranch and to a lesser extent, the Contemporary styles. By the late 1960s, however, styles based on traditional precedent became increasingly popular, and during the 1970s, this trend continued. Unlike earlier styles, this one was first introduced by homebuilders, rather than architects, who wished to exploit the public's resurgent interest in traditional design. The Neo-Eclectic style borrows forms and details from the preceding Revival style, but freely applies them to a variety of building forms with little concern for historically accurate detailing.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 14

---

There are three Neo-Eclectic style, non-contributing houses in the Indian House Community historic district. The Reckart House (#8), 410 N. Sahuara Ave., the Martin House (#13), 358 N. Sahuara Ave. and the Matsushino House (#C), 348 N. Sahuara Ave., have some Pueblo Revival style features. The Jay/Ginsburg House, 340 N. Indian House Road, outside the historic district boundaries, is constructed of face brick but has Pueblo Revival style forms and details.

## Vernacular Architecture

Vernacular architecture is commonplace architecture. The work of ordinary people and not trained professionals, vernacular architecture represents either "folk" or "popular culture.". After the 1880s, Anglo-Americans introduced the railroad and industrialized, popular (mass or normative) culture into Arizona. In the Indian House historic district, there is one residence with popular vernacular origins, the Guest House/Alberts House (#E). Vernacular architecture is often best described by its form or morphology. Form, the basic building envelope, is the product of the structure's plan in combination with its wall height and roof form.

The Guest House/Alberts House, was probably built in the 1930s to serve as a guest house for the Hill/Hubbell House (#D), part of Nan Wood's estate at that time. The first structure had a modest, nearly rectangular, massed-plan (more than one room in width and depth). Its single-story adobe walls were capped by a pair of shed roofs forming sloped, exposed-beam ceilings beneath. The original plan included a living room, kitchen, two bedrooms and a sunroom (possibly a porch later enclosed). With later additions, it became a most charming Ranch style home.

## Ranch Style

The Ranch style originated in California in the 1930s and gained popularity in the 1940s to become the dominant style throughout the country during the 1950s and 1960s. The popularity of spreading Ranch houses on large suburban lots was made possible by increased use of the automobile. An attached built-in garage further increased façade width. The style is based loosely on early Spanish Colonial precedents and modified by certain Craftsman and Prairie

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 15

---

School early 20<sup>th</sup> century influences. It is also based partly on the forms of early indigenous west coast ranch and homestead architecture.

The style is expressed by one-story shapes with low-pitched roofs in hipped or gabled forms. Eave overhangs usually are generous, often with rafters exposed. Wood and brick wall surfaces with ribbon and picture windows, sometimes with shutters, are common, and sometimes touches of traditional Spanish or English Colonial inspired detailing are used. Decorative iron or wooden porch supports are typical, and private courtyards or rear patios are a common feature. In the Southwest, the Spanish Colonial influence is recognizable. Fired adobe walls with grouped windows under overhangs and blank walls facing the east or west solar exposure are frequently seen.

The Guest House/Alberts House (#E) has sloping roofs with exposed rafter overhangs, exterior adobe masonry walls, large windows and, with the recent addition of a large master bedroom wing, an elongated, rambling floor plan. It is surrounded by attractively landscaped courtyards, the work of the prior owner, Mrs. George Burton Smith, founder of the Tucson Garden Club. As noted above, its vernacular origins, prior to alterations, are difficult to see today.

Excellent examples of the Ranch style can be found in Kane Estates, the subdivision created in 1956 by the Kane family, builders of the Kane/Beal House (#F). Non-contributors owing to their age, these fifteen Ranch style residences of red brick have the characteristic spread-out plan and incorporated carports.

### **MODIFICATIONS AND BUILDING CONDITION**

#### **Integrity in Indian House Community**

Of the eight houses that currently meet the age criteria (fifty years old or more), two have been altered to the extent that their integrity has been compromised. Of the other six, five have had room or wing additions which have been carried out with sensitivity and restraint and which do not detract from the original design. Thus the six historic contributing houses have retained their integrity.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

# National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 16

---

The proposed Indian House Community Residential Historic District is smaller than the what is shown on the subdivision plan of 1949 (Map 1). The southern area extending towards Broadway has been lost to commercial development. The area just north was developed as Kane Estates, a typical neighborhood of fifteen houses. The three northeastern lots which abut 5<sup>th</sup> Street are currently being developed with higher density housing. The two northwestern lots may soon be developed. The polo field is gone and the wash has been straightened and channeled. Most of the riparian vegetation is gone too. However, the core area defined by the historic district and the deed restrictions of 1999 has not changed. The contributing houses are still located on lots ranging from one to over six acres each and are still surrounded by native desert. The appearance of the Indian House Community remains much the same.

## Condition

Generally, houses in Indian House Community are in good condition. However, three houses soon will need painting and other minor maintenance work.

Yard areas around houses in Indian House Community consist of native desert. Generally, these are in good condition and little maintenance work is required. Yard areas within patio walls are landscaped with grass and other non-desert plants. These areas are well-maintained.

## Archaeological

According to archaeologist, Sharon Urban, of the Arizona State Museum, there have been no archaeological surveys on or near the Indian House historic district. However, Indian House Community contains some interesting site features from the past. Southwest and northeast of Indian House are the sites of two old trash dumps (#I and #J). A few old bottles and can still be found and, as they appear after rainfall, these artifacts might date from the 1930s. Nearby, on lot #11 is the location of an old kiln (#H). The only remains are a brick or two laying on the ground.

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

## National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section Number 7 Page 17

---

### Methodology

Ralph Comey Architects and Janet H. Strittmatter Inc. were selected in the Spring of 2000 by the Indian House Community to inventory historic resources and to prepare a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. For the inventory, fieldwork was done, photographs were taken and individual Arizona historic property inventory forms were completed.

Ralph Comey and Janet Strittmatter interviewed personally or by telephone current and former owners or residents of Indian House Community properties including Ann Leenhouts, Walter Hileman, Ruth Hileman, Heather Alberts, Richard Hubbell, Gary Wagman, Tony Martin, John Swain, Robert Beal, Heath Howe, Pita Newell and Marge Kittle. For a number of years, community residents have conducted on-going research in neighborhood history and have compiled files of photographs, clippings, old publications and other data.

In addition, conversations were held with Tucson City Planner, Dave Taylor, planner and historian, Alex Kimmelman, University of Arizona College of Architecture curator, R. Brooks Jeffrey, City of Tucson historic preservation administrator, Marty McCune and city planner, J. T. Fey.

Research material was gathered from the Arizona Historical Society Library in Tucson, the Special Collections at the University of Arizona Library, the University of Arizona Main and Architectural libraries, and the Tucson Public Library. Subdivision and property information, including the identification of some early property owners, was obtained from city and county records with the assistance of Robert Brey, a retired title officer. The identification of other historic occupants was supplied by current residents.

We believe that the photographs attached to the forms are the best possible; several photos were taken more than once. However, many residences are and have been throughout their history visually obstructed by heavy vegetation and early garden walls and some photos are not particularly descriptive.

Both visual inspection and historic documentation were used in determining contributing or non-contributing status of each building. Contributing structures

United States Department of the Interior  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places  
Continuation Sheet**

Section Number 7 Page 18

were defined as being: (1) constructed within the period of significance (between 1929 and 1950); (2) sufficiently intact with alterations or additions which do not compromise the architectural integrity of the structure and (3) of significant architectural value, including stylistic merit, and exhibiting unique or unusual design and/or craftsmanship quality. In the case of historic archaeological sites, eligibility was determined by historic associative merit.

Alterations or additions were considered intrusive if they compromised the architectural integrity and appearance of the residence. Also, additions which screened the original structure from view were considered intrusive. Houses with such alterations were considered non-contributing structures. Thus, non-contributing structures were defined as residences which were (1) altered to such an extent that the original design intent or character was compromised and (2) built after the period of significance (constructed after 1950).

**Contributing Residences**

No.	Address	Name	Date
6	431 N. Indian House Road	Van Cliburn House	1949
9	365 N. Indian House Road	Indian House	1929
11	330 N. Indian House Road	Carr/Newell House	1946
B	315 N. Indian House Road	McDonald/Hileman House	1948
D	300 N. Indian House Road	Hill/Hubbell House	1934
	310 N. Indian House Road	Kane/Beal House	1944

**Contributing Ruins/Sites**

No.	Location	Resource	Approx. Date
G	300 N. Indian House Rd. (rear)	Horse Stable Ruin	1930s
H	330 N. Indian House Rd.	Kiln Ruin	1930s
I		Trash Dump #1 Site	1930s
J		Trash Dump #2 Site	1930s