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Further Investigations: Architecture at the Turn of the Century

BY PETER L. GOSS
GUEST EDITOR

BARELY MORE THAN A DECADE AGO THE Utah Historical Quarterly devoted its first entire issue to Utah architecture, entitled “Toward an Architectural Tradition.” The publication of this issue in the summer of 1975 coincided with a great interest in historic preservation in anticipation of the American bicentennial celebration. The issue contained several articles that surveyed the state’s architecture as well as articles that dealt with, as the introduction of the issue
points out, “select personalities and distinctive structures in defining the uniqueness and charm of certain Utah communities.” The intervening decade has produced an abundance of new research by scholars encompassing the fields of geography, folklore, and demography, as well as history and architectural history. Some of us viewed “Toward an Architectural Tradition” as an overdue tribute to one aspect of the state’s rich material culture. The articles placed an emphasis upon the variety and unique qualities of Utah architecture.

In hindsight that issue of the Quarterly could be construed as an apologia at a period when it was necessary not only to make the state’s citizenry aware of its architectural heritage but also to establish a toehold for Utah architecture in the regional history of the American West. As the reader will discover, the thrust of this issue, “Architecture at the Turn of the Century,” is just the opposite. Its contributors present the reader with a variety of topics in Utah’s architectural history that relate the state and its people to the mainstream of American thought and activity between 1890 and 1910. This point is paid particular attention by Tom Carter in his article on the rebuilding of Sanpete Valley.

This issue commences with the life of Frederic Albert Hale, an easterner educated in architecture at Cornell University. Hale is the epitome of the professional architect. Fresh from a decade of practice in Denver, he became the architect to Salt Lake society at the turn of the century. Nearly half his residential practice, with its wide variety of popular styles, was for wealthy clients whose names compose the nucleus of the membership in Salt Lake City’s prestigious Alta Club. The basis of a good deal of this wealth was due to land speculation and growth in the Utah mining and mineral industries. This prosperity attracted a number of non-Mormons, or gentiles, to Utah. Such an example is the non-Mormon developer Gilbert Chamberlin, responsible for the Perkins’ Addition. Like Hale, Chamberlin had been attracted to Salt Lake City from Denver by the rigorous promotional efforts of the city’s mostly gentile Chamber of Commerce. As Roger Roper discusses, an aspect of the significance of Chamberlin’s legacy—a streetcar suburb—had tremendous impact upon future city planning and the evolution of zoning.

The turn of the century’s economic growth, despite occasional downswings, was also felt in the more rural areas of the state such as Davis County. Here professional design services were needed every bit as much as in the more populated cities of Ogden and Salt Lake,
albeit on a lesser scale. My article discusses how such a market for services kept William Allen, a native brickmason and builder turned architect, busy for more than two decades and focuses upon the designs of a series of residences for successful individuals involved with agribusiness and commerce. Allen’s clients and their families are treated in detail in Glen Leonard’s article which examines their British connection, kinship ties, agribusiness, and commercial interests as well as community service.

Moving away from the Wasatch Front to the rural Sanpete Valley of central Utah, Thomas Carter documents architectural change and a rebuilding process that occurred in the post-1890 period, materially illustrating the monetary effects of local economic prosperity in the sheep industry and a period of great change in Mormon history.

The idea for this issue was originally based upon the presentations made at the Utah Architectural Symposium in November 1982, sponsored by the Utah Centennial Foundation and the Utah Endowment for the Humanities. The articles on William Allen and Allen’s clients are expanded versions of papers presented at the symposium. Thomas Carter’s and Roger Roper’s articles are recent investigations based on extensive fieldwork, including measuring most of the buildings discussed. The biography of the prominent Salt Lake City architect Frederic Albert Hale by Judith Brunvand is based upon her master’s thesis in art history at the University of Utah.

Research undertaken by the authors and on-going research by the staff of the Utah State Historical Society’s historic preservation office has led to the nomination of many buildings discussed in these articles to the National Register of Historic Places. To assist the reader in identifying such structures the words “National Register” have been added to captions where appropriate.
Frederic Albert Hale, Architect

BY JUDITH BRUNVAND

Frederic Albert Hale (1855-1934) was among the most prominent of Salt Lake City's local architects in the decades spanning the turn of the century. Along with his notable colleagues, Richard K. A. Kletting and Walter E. Ware, he is representative of the professional

Ms. Brunvand is head of gifts and exchanges for the Marriott Library, University of Utah.

Above: Fig. 1. The Commercial National Bank, formerly at 25 East 200 South, and Frederic Albert Hale. USHS collections.
architect of the time. That is, in contrast to the earlier architect-builder, these men had had professional training in architecture or engineering and made their living by designing buildings rather than by building them. Hale, Kletting, and Ware designed important buildings in the commercial, institutional, and residential sectors; but Kletting and Ware are now remembered more for their commercial and institutional designs, while Hale, perhaps because most of the more than thirty commercial structures he designed in Salt Lake have been demolished, is better remembered for his residential buildings. He was the favorite architect of Salt Lake's "society" set; at one time there were at least ten of his mansions on South Temple alone, and six of the many elegant and spacious dwellings he designed for Salt Lake's wealthy businessmen have been placed on the State and National Historic Registers.

Salt Lake City was an attractive place for a young architect in the 1880s and '90s. The *Utah Statistical Abstract*¹ shows that the population more than doubled between 1880 and 1890, from 21,000 to 45,000, and by 1910 had doubled again to 93,000. The city had become a regional trade center and had begun to take on a solid and permanent look with substantial downtown buildings financed by the successful mining operations around the state. Wealthy businessmen and mining magnates were not only spending their profits on commercial structures but were also constructing imposing mansions for their families and meeting their social needs with churches, clubhouses, and lodges for the various fraternal orders.

The prospects for a successful architectural career were readily perceived by Fred Hale when he came from Denver to design and build the Commercial National Bank (fig. 1), for he relocated in Salt Lake City as soon as that building was completed. A newspaper clipping from 1890 records his confidence:

Mr. Fred Hale, architect of the new six-story Commercial National Bank Building, has great confidence in the building prospects of Salt Lake City. In evidence of this fact, he leaves a successful practice of seven years' standing in Denver and locates in this city. Mr. Hale is well known throughout Colorado and Wyoming and his reputation has preceded him in Utah.²

¹*Utah Statistical Abstract* (Salt Lake City: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, Graduate School of Business, University of Utah, 1983), pp. 1-22.
²The clipping is from a scrapbook kept by Fred Hale, now in the possession of his grandson, Dr. Edward Girard Hale of Salt Lake City. It is dated 1890, but the source is not noted.
Hale’s architectural career had actually begun many years earlier in his home state of New York. He was born in Rochester on December 25, 1855, and attended school there, spending his summer vacations working for two local architects. After graduation he worked for two years as a schoolteacher. In April 1875 he enrolled at Cornell University and again spent the summer working for an architect. Having by this time decided to become an architect himself, he registered as a student in architecture when he returned to Cornell in the fall. On the advice of his father, Hale persuaded the department head, Charles Babcock, to allow him to omit the general education requirements. He attended Cornell for two years, taking courses in geometry, perspective, drafting, drawing, building materials, mechanics, designing, architectural history, and German. He realized, however, the limits of these practical courses and did a great deal of reading on his own in such authors as Shakespeare, Ruskin, Turgenev, Scott, and Longfellow. In 1877 he left school to try to find a position in architecture, but he realized his education was by no means complete and noted in his diary:

March 3, 1877. I fear I have missed the mark by not taking the regular course here at college. Father has always wished me to study only such things as pertain to architecture. I now think his ideas on that subject very erroneous. A broad education is far more ennobling and I may say more practical (often a hated word) than a narrow one. An architect should certainly have a fine education.

Almost immediately upon leaving school Hale found a position with James C. Cutler, an architect practicing in Rochester, and stayed with him for two years, from 1877 to 1879. While with Cutler, Hale and another young architect, W. L. Morrison, won first prize in a competition sponsored by the magazine *Carpentry and Building* for the design of a country house. Early in 1880 Hale left Cutler’s office to become head draftsman for Robert Roeschlaub, one of Denver’s most prominent and successful architects. He stayed with Roeschlaub for three years, leaving in 1883 to form a partnership with H. B. Seely. That partnership lasted three years; in 1886 he went back to Roeschlaub, this time as a full partner in the firm of Roeschlaub and Hale.

---

6Charles Babcock was appointed the first professor of architecture at Cornell when the curriculum was established in 1871.

7The diary kept by Fred Hale is also in the possession of Dr. Edward G. Hale.
Besides working in Denver, Hale also did buildings throughout Colorado and Wyoming. A partial list of his accomplishments from 1880 to 1889 includes eight commercial blocks, eight churches, three public schools, two banks, a hospital, a courthouse, a power station, a baseball park, dormitory buildings for the University of Colorado, and the first building for the University of Wyoming. He was also doing work in residential architecture; several of his houses from that period are pictured in a promotional booklet, *The Architecture of Fred A. Hale, 1890-1907*, and one of his Denver houses, the J. M. Curry residence, was featured in the *Western Architect and Building News.*

During the ten years spent in Denver, Hale also married and began a family. In 1882 he had returned briefly to Rochester to marry a hometown sweetheart, Mary Frances (Minnie) O'Grady, and the young couple left on the evening train for Denver immediately after the wedding. Three of their four children were born in Denver: Edyth Mae (1883), Girard Van Barkaloo (1886), and Frederic Albert, Jr. (1888). A third son, Edward Lincoln, was born in Salt Lake City in 1895.

The move to Salt Lake City in 1890, after the commission for the Commercial National Bank, was immediately productive. As a result of the bank, which was described in a contemporary report as the most magnificent and costly structure in the city, Hale had become known to the wealthy and influential men belonging to the Alta Club, and they provided the foundation for his successful practice in Salt Lake City. The number of business buildings and homes Hale designed for them is impressive and included their own clubhouse. There were at least five commercial structures for merchant Fred Auerbach, including the Eagle Block, formerly at 71-79 West South Temple, frequently mentioned as one of Hale's most prominent buildings. There were development houses for John Donnellan, a commercial block for Thomas Kearns, a business building for J. J. Daly, the Summit Block for David Keith and James Ivers, and a business block for David Keith. Most of these buildings have since been demolished; those existing today are the Alta Club, the David  

\[5\text{For a more complete list of Hale's works see Judith Brunvand, "The Salt Lake City Architecture of Frederic Albert Hale" (Master's thesis, University of Utah, 1980), appendices a, b, c, d. There is a xerox copy of the illustration from the }\textit{Western Architect and Building News}\text{ in MS. 1773, Utah State Historical Society Library, Salt Lake City.}\]

\[6\textit{Utah: Her Cities, Towns, and Resources} (Chicago: Manly and Litteral, 1891), p. 93.\]
Frederic Albert Hale

Keith Building at 242-256 South Main, and the building for J. J. Daly at 37 West Third South.

Hale’s residential commissions, a number of which were for these notable business clients, have fared somewhat better than the commercial designs. He solicited residential work from the society set with a creative advertisement in the form of a letter placed in a “Blue Book” type of publication known as the *Excelsior Address Book.*

Salt Lake City
Tuesday

My Dear C----,

This city is perfectly lovely. It cuddles up in the lap of the grand Wasatch Mountains and views the prettiest of peak-encircled valleys and silvery waters of the lake. And such hospitable people! Such delightful homes. You know Mary is about to build a house. John is disgusted with renting and “wrastling with landlords,” as he expressed it. M. devotes half her time inspecting new houses. Yesterday we drove down East Drive past Liberty Park, to see Mr. DeGolyer’s new house—a perfect mansion; then over to Ninth East Street, where we found the charming home of Mr. C. S. Davis, in dark red sandstone and stained shingles. On the East Bench we visited Mr. F. B. Stephen’s unique dwelling, and “last, but not least,” the residences of General Daggett and Major Downey on Brigham Street. All beautiful dwellings and so convenient. We later visited Mr. Fred Hale, the architect, in the Commercial Bank building, and examined Mary’s plans—such a pretty hall, lovely rooms and just lots of closets, and all at a moderate cost. Mr. Hale designed all the above houses, also L---s house in Denver, where he formerly practiced his profession. *****a “high five” tonight, so I must dress.

Goodbye.

Ever your
Dorothy

P.S. No! I won’t write----one.

Those houses mentioned in the letter for DeGolyer, Stephens (fig. 8, on right), and Daggett have been demolished, but the Major Downey house (figs. 4 and 5) at 808 East South Temple still stands and has been renovated for office use. The C. S. Davis house (figs. 2 and 3), near Ninth East in those days, has a new street in front of it and stands at 2157 South Lincoln. Other extant residences for wealthy Alta Club members include the magnificent mansion built for David Keith (figs. 12-16) at 529 South Temple, now used as corporate headquarters; the O. J. Salisbury mansion (figs. 10 and 11)

---Excelsior Address Book and Family Directory, 1893 (Salt Lake City, 1893), p. 73.
at 574 East First South, now the Evans and Early Mortuary; the Nelden house (fig. 9) at 1172 East First South, now an apartment house; and the C. B. Markland house (figs. 4 and 7) at 1205 East South Temple, still a private home. Six other large residential commissions by Hale for Alta Club members have all been demolished. These include residences designed for Robert Harkness, Duncan MacVichie, Henry B. McMillan, Edward S. Ferry, and J. B. Cosgriff, all on South Temple, and the James Ivers house on First South.

Besides providing for the housing needs of Salt Lake society, Hale also designed for their social requirements. He was probably the most prominent clubhouse architect in the city. In addition to the Alta Club, he was commissioned to do buildings for the Elks Club, the Salt Lake Country Club, and the Eagles Club. Only the Alta Club continues to serve its original purpose. The Eagles Club Building (404 South West Temple) until recently housed the offices of the Equitable Life Insurance Company. The Elks Club (formerly at 59 South State) made way for an office building. The Country Club

Figs. 2 and 3. Two views of the C.S. Davis house, 2157 South Lincoln Street. Photographs not credited otherwise are courtesy of the author.
building (2375 South Ninth East, fig. 20), in a poorly preserved state, functions as a clubhouse for the Forest Dale Golf Course.

Despite having designed eight churches during his years in Denver, Hale did only one in Salt Lake. However, this church, the First United Methodist Church at 203 South Second East, is a downtown landmark and one of his most interesting buildings.

In addition to his architectural contributions to Salt Lake City, Hale was active in community and social affairs. He served as a director of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce and as a member of the Board of Public Works. He was active in Republican party affairs and was a member of the Alta Club, the Elks Club, and the Salt Lake Country Club. He was involved in musical events, though to a lesser degree than in his Denver years when he had performed at the Tabor Opera House. As a member of the championship Country Club golf team, he was featured many times in the pages of the *Salt Lake Herald* and was well known for his jaunty red golf coat. He is remembered as a dignified, cultured, and well-informed gentleman, an accom-

*Salt Lake Herald*, November 20, 1903; July 31, 1904; August 1, 1904; October 25 and 26, 1908.
plished conversationalist, and a man of magnetic personality with a keen and somewhat whimsical sense of humor. Just after his death on September 6, 1934, an editorial in the Salt Lake Tribune praised his commercial designs as “ornaments of the municipality” and his residential work as “some of the most attractive palatial residences of Salt Lake City.”

Fred Hale is indeed notable as the architect of some of Salt Lake City’s most attractive residences. He is recorded forty-seven times in the Salt Lake building permit records as the architect of private homes, and there are six more in the city known or thought to be his through other sources. At least twenty of these were large, expensive dwellings, an indication of his popularity among Salt Lake’s wealthiest society. Besides the existing major residences already mentioned are the Bidwell house at 866 East South Temple, the Teasdel house at 304 First Avenue, the F. B. Stephens house at 169 Thirteenth East, the G. H. Davis house at 361 Seventh Avenue, the Keith-Griffen house at 34-35 Haxton Place, and the Grant Hampton house at 370 A Street.

Hale’s residences represent a wide range of styles and illustrate the beauty and quality of his designs as well as his originality and versatility within the popular styles of his time. Five of them, the C. S. Davis, Downey, Bidwell, Markland, and Stephens houses, are examples of what Vincent R. Scully has defined as the Shingle style. It is related to the Queen Anne style; both were popular from approximately 1880 to 1900, and they have many features in common. Asymmetrical plans, towers or turrets, several gables, upper and lower porches, decorative shaped shingles, windows of different sizes and shapes—often with leaded or stained glass, circular bays, and bay windows are features that both styles share. What differentiates the two is that the Shingle style is much quieter and less extravagantly decorated than the Queen Anne. There are fewer projections, towers are more integrated into the design, porches are often recessed rather than protruding, and there is little or no “gingerbread” trim. Most notable, of course, the Shingle style residence is completely covered with shingles, though there are also many examples with a stone or brick lower story.


Fig. 5. The Downey house, 808 East South Temple. National Register.

Fig. 6. The Bidwell house, 866 East South Temple. National Register.

Fig. 7. The Markland house, 1205 East South Temple. National Register.
The earliest of Hale's Shingle style houses, the C. S. Davis house (figs. 2 and 3) and the Downey house (figs. 4 and 5), are examples of the latter type, incorporating a stone or brick lower story. The Davis house was briefly described in the *Salt Lake Tribune* in 1891: "Architect Hale has plans for...a $12,000 stone and frame residence for a Mrs. Davis, south of Perkins' addition..."[1]

This house and the Downey house, built in 1893 at a cost of $11,000, were two of the homes recommended by Hale in his letter ad in the *Excelsior Address Book*. Besides the stone and brick lower stories, the two have other features of the Shingle style in common, including an asymmetrical facade with an integrated tower on the right and front and side gables with the attic windows set in recessed arches.

The Bidwell house of 1894 (figs. 4 and 6) at 866 South Temple is a smaller and less expensive version of the same style. It, too, features the shingled upper story, the tower and broad gable and has, in addition, a recessed second-story porch, also one of the hallmarks of the Shingle style.

The Markland house (figs. 4 and 7), built in 1895 at 1205 East South Temple, is probably the best example of the Shingle style in Salt Lake City. All the significant attributes of the style are featured: exterior completely covered with wood shingles, broad gable, upper story recessed porch, multi-light sashed windows, and circular bay with a conical roofed tower. A few classical touches, such as the Palladian window in the gable and the semicircular portico at the front entrance, originally balustraded (see fig. 4), add a note of elegance to what is ordinarily a more informal style.

The last known Shingle style house designed by Hale is the F. B. Stephens house at 169 Thirteenth East (fig. 8, left). It was constructed in 1899 and was the second house Hale had designed for attorney Stephens. The first, built in 1891 and mentioned in Hale's letter ad, stood next door at 117 Thirteenth East. Both residences were illustrated in Hale's promotional brochure (fig. 8).

The Shingle style houses are illustrative of Hale's interest in current architectural styles and his ability to keep up with the contemporary developments of his time. The Shingle style was much more popular in the East than in the West. Since Hale was in Denver and Salt Lake when most of the eastern examples were being built, he

---

[1]*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 17, 1891, p. 6.
Fig. 8. The F. B. Stephens houses, 169 and 177 Thirteenth East. From Architecture of Fred A. Hale.

Fig. 9. The Neldon house, 1172 East First South. National Register.
probably gained his knowledge of the type from architectural periodicals that contained pictures, designs, and comments on the popular styles of the day. Inasmuch as Hale's shingle houses were being built at the same time that the style peaked in popularity in the East, he can be considered a local developer of the style rather than one who simply imitated a popular style imported from the East.

At the same time as the Shingle style houses were being built, Hale was also designing in the Neoclassical and Georgian Revival styles. The earliest of these, the William A. Nelden residence (fig. 9) of 1894 at 1172 East First South, is a fine example of the neoclassical aspect of the Georgian Revival style. Attributes of the style seen in this house are the strictly symmetrical facade framed by delicately detailed pilasters, the bracketed cornice, the hipped roof, the gables with their broken swan's neck pediments, the double-hung sashed windows, and the semicircular portico with flanking rectangular extensions. The portico has a classically detailed cornice and is supported by columns with Ionic capitals. Identical rectangular porticos on either side of the house are connected to the main portico by balustraded walkways, thus preserving the absolute symmetricality of the facade. Originally, balustrades on the upper porches
matched those on the lower story, but they were removed along with the window shutters when the original clapboard siding was covered with asbestos in 1951.

Another of Hale's neoclassical residences is the mansion designed for O. J. Salisbury (fig. 10) at 574 East First South. It was built in 1897 at a cost of $22,000 from stone quarried in East Canyon. The symmetrical facade is dominated by the classical portico supported with Ionic columns and topped with a monumental pediment. A unique feature of the building is that the columns, the boxed cornice, the frieze and brackets, the door casings, and other ornamental work are all made of metal.\textsuperscript{12}

The plan of the residence is rectangular. The central entry hall is flanked by two parlors and the dining room on the east and the reception room, library, kitchen, and butler's pantry on the west. The second floor originally contained the family bedrooms and bath; and the third story had several servants' rooms, servants' bath, and a full attic.

The woodwork and decoration throughout the interior remain faithful to the exterior design. The window and door frames are fluted and have a shell motif at each corner. The niche in the entry hall has the same shell motif, the moldings throughout are the classical egg-and-dart and dentil pattern, and the alcove in the reception room containing the window seats is defined by Corinthian columns. The graceful, curved staircase in the reception room is ornamented with carved festoons and shell and ribbon motifs. These decorative elements are repeated on the fireplace mantel in that room as well as in the two parlors and the dining room.

In 1934 the house was sold to Clyde Early, who established the Evans and Early Mortuary. When a chapel was added to the east side of the building in 1937, extreme care was taken to match the original in both the interior and exterior features. Some of the original stone was reused along with new stone from the same East Canyon quarry. In 1972 a large addition was built on the west and rear, designed by architect Von I. White. Care was again taken to match the exterior design, but the interior rooms are decorated in a contemporary style. The bookcases from the original library and the stone removed

\textsuperscript{12}O. J. Salisbury house file, Historic Preservation Office, Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City.
Figs. 12-16. The David Keith mansion, 529 East South Temple, with HABS drawing of first floor, detail of octagon and skylight, carriage house, and F Street facade. USHS collections and author. National Register.
during the remodeling were carefully stored so that the building could be completely restored to its original shape if a future owner so desired.

The David Keith mansion at 529 East South Temple (fig. 12), begun the year after the Salisbury in 1898, was undoubtedly Hale’s crowning achievement in residential architecture. The Salt Lake building permit records state simply that the house was to be “basement and two story cut stone,” hardly giving an idea of its scope. The cost, however, $35,000, indicated that this was to be a mansion. A carriage house (fig. 13), matching in style, was designed by Hale a year later than the house and cost $4,000, twice as much as the average house of the period.

David Keith had made his fortune in mining as a partner in the fabulous Silver King Mine of Park City, and he had invested this wealth in a variety of enterprises, including banking, railroading, the Salt Lake Tribune, and the Keith-O’Brien Co. The Tribune, on September 4, 1898, described the plans for the new mansion in a long column under the heading “Handsome New Homes.” The article briefly described the exterior and mentioned the oval dining room, the types of wood used in the interior, and the fact that two bathrooms were provided for. The main emphasis, however, was reserved for the novel interior plan featuring a central octagonal rotunda capped by a domed skylight of stained glass (figs. 14 and 15). Plans of the house drawn in 1975 under the aegis of the Historic American Buildings Survey illustrate the arrangement of the octagonal hall and show how convenient the plan was for providing access to the main floor rooms, the second floor, and the outside in such a large dwelling. The plan also shows the design of the oval dining room and the convenient arrangement of the butler’s pantry and the refrigerator (fig. 14).

Some innovative features in the house were not mentioned in the newspaper. For example, the butler’s pantry between the dining room and the kitchen had a warming table heated by circulated hot water, and the kitchen featured a walk-in refrigerator cooled by one ton of ice. A unique clothes dryer in the basement consisted of pull-out units in which clothes could be hung and dried with hot air circulated by a blower.

The exterior of the mansion creates an immediate impression of restrained elegance. The South Temple facade is classically symmetrical, defined by engaged pilasters at each corner and dominated
Fig. 17. The George H. Davis house, 361 Seventh Avenue.

by a monumental pedimented portico supported by massive Tuscan columns. The portico element is repeated around the house in smaller and less formal variants; the F Street facade has a lighter double portico (fig. 16), topped with a smaller pediment, and the garden entry has a single story balustraded porch with a pediment used only to define the slightly protruding bay that houses the interior staircase.

The Keith mansion, besides being an architectural gem in its own right, gives the present generation an insight into the life-style of the wealthy businessmen of America’s Gilded Age. It has been recognized for its architectural and historical value as well as for its association with one of Salt Lake City’s most prominent figures.

Three later residences illustrative of Hale’s versatility in different styles and of his adaptability to changes in popular taste include the George Davis house built in 1905 at 361 Seventh Avenue, the J. T. Keith-T. G. Griffen house built in 1910 at 34-35 Haxton Place, and the Grant Hampton house built in 1916 at 370 A Street.

The Davis house (fig. 17) is one of the Box style or four-square
type houses that became popular around the turn of the century. The house is listed in the building permit records as a “modern two-story brick,” an indication that this design was considered an up-to-date style of that time. The house has the front central dormer and wide front porch characteristic of the style, but Hale added some of his classical touches in the form of a balustrade on top of the front porch (since removed) and the brick quoins at the corners which culminate in Ionic capitals and give the effect of engaged pilasters. These elements in the design create an elegant and decorative effect in what is ordinarily a rather plain style.
The first building for Haxton Place (fig. 18), on South Temple between Ninth and Tenth East, was designed as a double dwelling for the developers, Dr. James T. Keith and Thomas G. Griffen. They had bought the plot in 1909 and planned a development to imitate a similar square in London. The charming stucco cottage, designed with reference to the Arts and Crafts movement, is situated as a focal point at the end of the square. It is, in reality, two separate structures, joined by the facade for a more harmonious effect.

The last large residence known to have been designed by Hale is the Grant Hampton house at 370 A Street (fig. 19). It was built in 1916 and is also a stucco building, this time with reference to the Spanish Colonial style. The Hampton house features a tile roof, small balconies with iron railings at the upper story windows, and sun rooms at either side of the house with matching iron railings on the roofs, all of which add the Spanish feeling to the classically symmetrical facade.

Unlike the residential buildings, few of Hale’s commercial and institutional buildings remain. The Salt Lake City building permit records and notices from Salt Lake newspapers indicate that in the twenty-two years between 1892 and 1914 he designed at least thirty-four commercial or institutional buildings. Most of these were situated in downtown Salt Lake; quite literally, one could not have walked a block in that area without seeing a building by Hale.

Unfortunately, only eight of them still exist, and three of these are minor structures not representative of his more creative work. The major structures include the Alta Club, 1897, 100 East South Temple; the David Keith Building, 1902, 242-256 South Main; the First Methodist Church, 1905, 203 South Second East; the American Linen Supply (Steiner Corporation), 1909-10, 33 East Sixth South; and the Eagles Club, 1916, 404 South West Temple. The smaller examples remaining are the Sterling Building, 1902, 37 West Third South; the Whitmore Garage (Domus Co.), 1910, 450 South Temple; and the Model Laundry, 1914, 244 West Second North.

The Alta Club was the first of Hale’s four clubhouses. It is not surprising that the members chose Hale as the architect when they planned their new building, since by 1897 he had already won nine commercial commissions from club members and had designed homes for ten of them. The Alta Club building (fig. 21) was done in the Italian Renaissance style popular with men’s clubs in the eastern United States. Characteristics of the style seen in this building are a
Fig. 20. The Salt Lake Country Club (Forest Dale), 2375 South Ninth East. USFIS collections.

Fig. 21. The Alta Club, 100 East South Temple. USHS collections. National Register.

Fig. 22. The David Keith Building, 242-256 South Main. USHS collections. National Register.
horizontal emphasis in the design, the different articulations of each of the three stories, a molded belt course between the first and second floors, the arched doorways and windows, and the recessed and arcaded balconies.

The interior decoration was developed to harmonize with the exterior style of the building and featured lavish use of woodwork, paneling, wainscoting, and classical dentil moldings. Other elements included stained glass, marble sinks, a massive oak bar, and great oak fireplaces.

The original building cost $40,000 and was constructed of an oolite stone quarried in Montana. The quarry owners were just developing their business and, as an advertisement of their product, offered to furnish the stone free if the club would pay the transportation. Naturally the offer was accepted. Construction was completed in less than a year, and the new clubhouse was formally opened on June 1, 1898.

An east wing added in 1910 almost doubled the size of the original building. For unknown reasons, the stone could not be matched, so both salvage stone and new stone from a different quarry were used in the addition. At that time the original main entrance on State Street became the ladies’ entrance, a courtesy so that the ladies would not have to pass through a room where the gentlemen were smoking or drinking. The new entrance on South Temple became the main entrance as it is today.

The Alta Club was considered even at the time as one of Salt Lake’s most notable buildings. It was featured with descriptions and photographs in several guidebooks of the period. Two examples are H. V. Fohlin’s Salt Lake City Past and Present, 1908, and Souvenir of Salt Lake, the City Beautiful, published by the Deseret News Press at about the same time.

The David Keith Building (fig. 22) is the only one of Hale’s business blocks to survive to the present. In 1902 he had been commissioned by Keith, for whom he had designed the magnificent home on South Temple, to construct a store and office building for the Keith-O’Brien Company which sold general dry goods, shoes, millinery, and carpets. The Keith-O’Brien store was later advertised in Polk’s Salt Lake City Directory as “the most beautiful store in all the west.”

13Polk’s Salt Lake City Directory, 1906, p. 514.
The David Keith Building is a three-story structure with a smooth, cut-stone facade that remains completely intact on the upper stories. The style is simpler and more restrained than Hale’s earlier commercial designs. The facade is quite flat and divided into three sections, strongly articulated at the roof line. Though the form of the building related it to the Commercial style, the detailing is neo-classical. There are small pediments suggested on the parapets of the side sections containing cartouches with the letter K, and a shell and ribbon motif appears under each arch. The words “David Keith” on the frieze of the center section are flanked by foliated motifs, and a band of egg-and-dart molding appears above it. Hale had made use of classical ornamentation in many of his earlier buildings, but another reason for its use here may have been to relate the decor to the neoclassical ornamentation of the adjoining Lollin Building, designed in 1894 by Richard Kletting.

In 1905 the Methodist congregation in Salt Lake City sold its old building at 33 East Third South and bought new property on the southwest corner of Second South and Second East. In August of the same year a building permit was issued to the Methodists for a brick and stone church building on that site to cost $52,000 and with the architect listed as Fred Hale. Fortunately his name was recorded in the permit books and he included a photograph of the church in his architecture booklet (fig. 23), for these are the only two sources that mention his name in connection with his only church in Salt Lake.

The design of the church is extremely interesting. The sanctuary is octagonal, a plan that allows for an easy flow of traffic entering and exiting from three sides. The ceiling is pierced by dormers that square off the octagon and provide a flat wall and gable for the stained-glass windows. An octagonal hipped roof over the area contains an eight-webbed umbrella dome of stained glass, thus repeating the octagonal motif utilized earlier on a smaller scale in the Keith mansion.

A taller tower on the northwest and a shorter one on the northeast provide entries and contain the stairways to the balcony, which curves from the northeast side of the octagon to the southwest, covering five sides. Of the sides not encompassed by the balcony, the east contains the choir area and the organ console, the southeast is the chancel area and contains the organ pipes, and on the south side huge oak paneled doors once opened to the back wing which contained the offices and the Sunday school rooms.

The south wing has been extensively remodeled, and there has
also been some modernization in the sanctuary. The southwest entry and stairway to the balcony remain in original condition as do the interiors of the two entry towers on the northeast and northwest, with their handsome wooden staircases and leaded windows. The gracefully curved balcony has not been altered, nor have the wood and iron auditorium seats. The curved wooden pews on the main floor are also original, but the choir and chancel areas have been greatly remodeled. When the church needed more room in the 1950s, the massive oak doors on the south were removed and replaced with a solid wall in order to make more rooms on the second floor of the south wing. At the same time, the paneling in front of the choir and the organ pipes was replaced with smooth blond wood. A graceful low balustrade separating the chancel was removed and the organ pipes were covered with a fabric screen and backlighted with flourescent lights.

The exterior of the building (figs. 23 and 24) remains relatively unaltered except for the neon sign on the northwest tower, a stairway and a porch on the same tower entry, and a ramp and porch on the northeast tower entry to provide access for the handicapped. The form and decoration of the exterior give the building an exotic, rather eastern look. Though the doorways are in reality round arches, the extended voussoirs and the stone molding of the surrounds are done in an ogee curve which gives the whole entrance the appearance of an ogee arch. The same arch is repeated in the capping of the stained-glass windows on the three gables, the capping of the windows on the shorter tower, and the top windows of the taller one. The ogee curve is repeated again on the shaped gables and utilized for the four-webbed domical roofs that top both towers. Though this curve was used in Gothic architecture, it is most associated with Moorish and Oriental architecture. Its decorative use in this church gives the building its picturesque and rather exotic flavor.

One of Hale’s last commercial buildings was the American Linen Supply building (fig. 26). Constructed in 1910, it is still being used by the original company, though the name has been changed to the Steiner Corporation in honor of the founder, George A. Steiner, a friend of Hale and a fellow Alta Club member. Hale’s original building for the company was a two-story concrete structure costing $40,000. Older employees of the company believed it to be the first reinforced concrete building in Salt Lake City, but the McIntyre Building on Main Street designed by Richard Kletting was con-
Figs. 26 and 27. American Linen Supply building (right), 33 West Sixth South, USHS collections, and Steiner Corporation (above), 1979.

Fig. 28. The Eagles Club (Equitable Life) building, 404 South West Temple.
structed of reinforced concrete almost a year earlier. Besides being one of the earliest reinforced concrete buildings, the American Linen Supply featured its own steam-powered generator for electricity. Since power was less dependable in those days, the boilers for the laundry also ran a direct-current generator that was still in use up to 1959 or 1960.

The design of the building is slightly reminiscent of the David Keith Building with its rather flat, symmetrical facade and the suggestion of towers at each side. When an east wing was added in 1928-29 (fig. 27), the tower on that side was built to match the one on the west, and the old design of the east tower was used on the central tower built to house the elevator shaft. The rather playful, castlelike effect of the original building was thus retained in the remodeling.

There were also several additions to the back, but these did not detract from the facade. The livery stable has logically been converted to a garage, but gardens that once surrounded the building for the relaxation of employees have given way to parking lots, a more unfortunate result of the automobile age. The main building, however, remains one of Salt Lake’s more appealing commercial structures and looks as unique today as it did in 1910.

In 1915-16 Hale designed the fourth and last of his clubhouses, this time for the Fraternal Order of Eagles (fig. 28). Built for Aerie No. 67 as a clubhouse and social center, it was used by the Eagles until 1937 when it was sold to the Utah Savings and Trust Company which leased it to the American Legion. In 1958 it was sold to the Equitable Life and Casualty Insurance Company.

The Eagles building is the smallest of Hale’s clubhouses and is more ornamental and less sculptural in feeling than the Alta Club. It is a two-story brick structure with a raised main floor allowing for a full basement. The Renaissance Revival style is achieved more from the surface decoration than from the structure of the building. There are a variety of decorative motifs, including pineapples and heavy brackets on the porch piers, and, of course, an eagle in the central second-story window. The columns on the recessed front porch are octagonal, and a molded belt course defines the second story. Three arched windows on the second story are set in rectangular recesses ornamented with circles and narrow moldings, and the pattern of windows is repeated on the north side. The arched upper sections of the windows have been painted over but were originally clear glass.

Roger Bailey, former head of the University of Utah School of
Architecture, described Fred Hale's work as having "a classic air in a Victorian period." This is certainly true in a literal sense for some of his major works in Salt Lake City, notably the Keith, Salisbury, and Nelden residences and the Alta Club and David Keith buildings. It might also be a more subjective judgment, referring to the sense of balance and harmony in Hale's buildings, even those not designed with direct classical references. Hale's designs can be defined by good taste and sense of proportion, elegance, and restraint. Even in the most "Victorian" of his residences such as the Downey house, his creativity did not overpower his fine sense of design. As the designer of some of Salt Lake's most beautiful homes and, in connection with the wealthy businessmen of his era, a major contributor to the growth of downtown Salt Lake City, Fred Hale must be considered one of the most notable of the city's early professional architects.
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The "Unrivalled Perkins' Addition": Portrait of a Streetcar Subdivision

BY ROGER V. ROPER

In November 1890 Gilbert L. Chamberlin, a Denver real estate developer, arrived in Salt Lake City and announced his ambitious plans for a new residential subdivision, to be known as Perkins' Addition. Chamberlin stated that over one million dollars would be invested in the subdivision to "improve the property handsomely" and to construct three hundred "first class residences." The "un-
rivalled Perkins’ Addition,” he claimed, would be “the most con­
veni ent, the most beautiful, the most sought after” addition in Salt
Lake City.³

Although Chamberlin’s claims proved to be exaggerated, Per­
kins’ Addition did emerge as one of the most notable streetcar
subdivisions of its time. It attained a distinct identity in Salt Lake
City as a neighborhood of impressive brick homes and as the
residence of relatively prominent non-Mormon families. Today,
passers-by may notice some of these “nice old homes” only because
they are large and attractive, but their importance is more than just
superficial beauty. A careful examination of the houses in Perkins’
Addition, and of the people and events associated with them, reveals
much about Salt Lake City’s real estate boom of the 1880s and ‘90s,
in particular, the dominant role of non-Mormon, out-of-state
developers and the profound impact of the new electric streetcar
system on the expansion of the city.

The development of streetcar subdivisions such as Perkins’
Addition was a story that was being repeated hundreds of times over
in cities across the country during the 1890s. The electric streetcar,
which was introduced in 1888, provided the fast and efficient
transportation link with city centers that made possible the large­
scale development of residential neighborhoods in outlying areas. In
Salt Lake City, the influence of the streetcar suburb movement
brought about a dilution of the city’s distinctive Mormon village
appearance, setting it more in line with national patterns of
development.

Gilbert L. Chamberlin’s announcement of Perkins’ Addition
stirred up considerable excitement in the Salt Lake real estate
community. Comments in the Salt Lake Tribune were upbeat and
favorable: “The recent purchase by the Chamberlin syndicate of
Denver of thirty-three acres of land in the southeastern suburbs is an
investment of more significance to Salt Lake than the ordinary
speculative purchases.... The gentlemen who have bought it are full
of that push and vim that have made a great city of Denver.”⁴ A
prominent local real estate developer, H.F. Kennedy,⁵ was called on
to give his assessment of the project. He replied that Chamberlin “not

⁴Ibid., November 30, 1890, p. 6.
⁵H. F. Kennedy was a partner in the real estate firm Beck & Kennedy, which was active in the Salt
Lake real estate market for several years around 1890.
only talks but acts, and when he says that his firm proposes to expend $1,000,000 on Perkins' Addition, you can bank on the assertion. . . . The firm of Chamberlin & Company are enterprising and progressive, and having been active participants in the development of Denver they bring to this city the experience of years."

A seasoned promoter, Chamberlin well understood the importance of early and repeated advertising. Even before ground had been broken at the site, he had large, enthusiastic advertisements for Perkins' Addition appearing in the local newspapers (fig. 1). The first ones came out on December 21, 1890, in both the Salt Lake Tribune and the Salt Lake Herald. Advertisements continued regularly in the Sunday edition of those newspapers throughout the winter and spring, usually prominently displayed on the back page of the issue. They extolled the virtues of the site, the quality of the homes, the security and profitability of the investment, and numerous other features of the proposed subdivision. Perhaps equally as important as the advertisements were the almost daily announcements of Chamberlin regarding activities at the Perkins property—the sale of lots, arrival of patrons, purchasing of materials, and so forth. These appeared regularly in the real estate columns of the newspapers, reinforcing the legitimacy of the project to potential investors.

The property chosen by Chamberlin and his associates needed little in the way of hard-sell advertising to convince people of its desirability. Located at 900 East and 1700 South, it was situated in the heart of the southeastern suburbs, an area favored for home sites by the “salaried classes.” Advertisements for the property described some of the site’s natural advantages: “High, dry and sightly, with sufficient elevation to overlook the city, [but] without any perceptible climb”; its “Pure, healthful, invigorating” atmosphere; “No smoke, dust of miasmatic germs”; “Unobstructed [views] in every direction, keeping in sight constantly the everlasting peaks and that mysterious dead sea—Salt Lake.” Chief among its attractions, however, was its location on the new Ninth East electric streetcar line, just a five-cent fare and a twelve-minute ride from the city center.

*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 18, 1891, p. 6.

*Ibid.*, December 26, 1890, p. 3. It was noted at that time that “the West side is destined more for the homes of workingmen...while the East side is pre-empted, as it were, by the salaried classes.”

Fig. 1. Large newspaper advertisements for Perkins' Addition appeared regularly in the Sunday newspapers in early 1891. Note that Chamberlin's first name is incorrectly given as George in the first advertisement for the subdivision. The stone house shown was never constructed.
In purchasing the property for Perkins' Addition, Chamberlin found that such prime subdivision land did not come cheaply. In January 1891 he paid Sarah Gibson, a widow, $2,500 per acre for her five-acre tract of farmland, land that "would have been considered dear at $250 per acre" only a few years before. Reselling it as part of Perkins' Addition, however, he stood to profit handsomely. Divided into 98 lots, which would likely sell for at least $400 per lot, the property could possibly net him over $5,000 per acre. However optimistic the outlook, he managed to sell only a few lots from that particular parcel.

After paying such inflated prices for the Perkins' Addition land, and considering the improvements that were to be made there as part of the development, Chamberlin was unwilling to discount the price of the subdivision's lots. Some of his competitors did use price as a selling attraction, offering their land as a cheap deal. Chamberlin's only discussion of price was a simple, succinct statement: "Don't buy suburban lots believing they are cheap. They are not."

Despite the impending winter, Chamberlin & Company began developing Perkins' Addition soon after it was first announced. A crew of up to fifty men were said to be working at the site in January, grading streets and cutting stone. Plans were announced for the installation of sidewalks, the planting of shade trees, and the drilling of wells once the weather improved. Chamberlin proposed erecting an electric light tower in the subdivision, the kind that was being used in Denver which "gives beautiful light and can be seen for 50 miles." He also talked about constructing an electrical generating plant nearby to supply power to the Perkins and other surrounding additions. Although it is certain that the light tower and the generating plant were not erected, it is not known whether the other improvements were actually made as planned.

As the project got underway Chamberlin made it clear that his intent was not simply to sell lots in Perkins' Addition but actually to construct houses in the subdivision. His company was organized...
specifically to do just that. It included an architect, John Vaughan, a contractor, Morris S. Burhaus, and a crew of thirty to forty carpenters, masons, and laborers. 

"Remember we furnish the material, the labor, the knowledge and the plans, and all you have to do is give us about what you are giving the owner of the house you are living in every month," one advertisement stated. 

"You select your lot or lots in Perkins' Addition, then make your choice of architectural design for your house and we will build it for you at once." 

Conscious of the Victorian home buyers' preference for individualized designs, Chamberlin & Company assured its clients that new designs would be used on every house in Perkins' Addition. They offered two hundred different styles of houses to choose from, each "the result of experienced Architects' study." If none of these plans was suitable, clients were encouraged to "make your own plans, or let us make them and continue to make them until you are wholly satisfied. Let us confer with each other... and with the combination of suggestions and ripe knowledge the result can only be something close to perfect." 

Though Chamberlin was seemingly willing to accommodate any and all of his clients' requests, he did impose certain building restrictions in Perkins' Addition. "We... insist that every house erected in Perkins' shall be attractive in exterior appearance, shall be of modern design and in keeping with residences already erected." 

There was also a price level to maintain: "No poor shanties will be allowed as we sell only to those who have us build for them or who guarantee to put up buildings to cost not less than $2,500." No wooden structures would be allowed in the subdivision, only residences of pressed brick. Neither commercial nor industrial buildings would be tolerated for "Perkins' must be recognized always as it is known now, distinctively a home spot." Chamberlin's

16 John Vaughan and Morris S. Burhaus worked together in the construction of a number of houses in the Denver area before coming to Salt Lake City. Burhaus was never listed in the Salt Lake directories, and Vaughan showed up only in the 1892-93 directory. At that time he was apparently living in one of the Perkins' Addition houses that has since been demolished, located at the NW corner of 900 East 1700 South. Nothing is known about Burhaus and Vaughan after they left Salt Lake City.

17 Salt Lake Tribune, April 5, 1891, p. 16.
18 Ibid., December 21, 1890, p. 12.
19 Ibid., February 8, 1891, p. 16.
20 Ibid., February 22, 1891, p. 16.
21 Ibid.
22 Salt Lake Herald, February 8, 1891, p. 9; May 3, 1891, p. 16.
23 Salt Lake Tribune, December 27, 1890, p. 6.
24 Ibid., February 22, 1891, p. 16.
emphasis of this last point displays his awareness of the preference of middle-class homeowners for neighborhoods of single-family houses over areas of mixed use.\textsuperscript{25} Developer-imposed building restrictions such as these were the forerunners of the first municipal zoning ordinances which came along over thirty years later. Unlike the later zoning regulations, the restrictive covenants in Perkins' Addition were apparently not legally binding, since all were violated in later years by other builders.\textsuperscript{26}

As early as December 1890 Chamberlin began announcing the sale of lots in Perkins' Addition and the signing of contracts to have houses built there. One of the first customers was Charles Weeks, a real estate investor and businessman from South Dakota. He was followed by numerous others, including Frank L. Parker and David A. Depue, partners in Parker & Depue Lumber Company; Frank T. Hiatt, a developer; Alexander Mitchell, a railroad official; the Reverend William D. Mabry; and Gilbert L. Chamberlin himself.\textsuperscript{27}

By mid-January 1891 forty-one houses were reportedly contracted to be built.\textsuperscript{28} Most of those houses were never constructed, since a majority of the buyers proved to be simply land speculators with no real intention of having houses built. Serious buyers, those who actually wanted homes in Perkins' Addition, numbered only about a dozen. It is unclear how many of those serious buyers actually chose a house design for themselves, as Chamberlin had offered, or how many simply bought a house already under construction. The designs of several of the thirteen houses actually constructed in Perkins' Addition closely match those of the "sample houses" portrayed in advertisements for the subdivision, indicating that they were probably designed and built by Chamberlin & Company as part


\textsuperscript{26}Richard F. Babcock, \textit{The Zoning Game} (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), pp. 3-5. Unlike the building restrictions imposed in Perkins' Addition, those used in the Highland Park subdivision of 1910 were included in the legal documents for the property and were therefore more authoritative. The Highland Park restrictive covenants are among the first legally binding restrictions in the Salt Lake area.

\textsuperscript{27}Salt Lake Tribune, December 27, 1890, p. 6; December 28, 1890, p. 6; January 30, 1891, p. 6. Of those listed here, only Weeks, Mabry, and Mitchell show up in the city directories as having actually lived in their Perkins houses. The others either did not follow through with their transactions and did not have houses built, or they were simply short-term, speculative buyers who never lived in their houses. Since legal title to the Perkins properties was not officially transferred from the company to the purchasers until June 1891, it is difficult to determine whether the earlier transactions actually took place as announced in the newspaper by Chamberlin or whether the announcements were just promotional hyperbole.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., January 18, 1891, p. 6.
of its initial development of the subdivision (fig. 2).\textsuperscript{29}

As promised, the construction of houses was begun in Perkins' Addition during the winter of 1890-91.\textsuperscript{30} Chamberlin purchased 150,000 feet of "choice seasoned lumber" in late December 1890 for "immediate use in Perkins' Addition."\textsuperscript{31} Two weeks later a special

\textsuperscript{29}Upon his arrival in Salt Lake City in November 1890 Chamberlin stated that as many as twenty-five houses would be constructed "at once," indicating that they were planning on building speculative houses in the subdivision and not just custom-built homes.

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., December 20, 1890, p. 6. The number of houses claimed to have been started that winter varies between seven and ten.

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., December 28, 1890, p. 6.
train arrived in Salt Lake City from Golden, Colorado, bearing 500,000 "ornamental pressed bricks" for use on the exterior of the Perkins' houses. Chamberlin had vowed that only the finest materials would be used on the Perkins' houses, and the famous Golden pressed brick was superior to any brick manufactured in Utah at that time. Superior foundation material, sandstone, was used on only one of the Perkins' houses; however, the others have brick foundations. The house with the sandstone foundation, located at 946 East 1700 South (fig. 3), was reportedly the model home of the subdivision and the first to be completed.

Chamberlin proclaimed that the houses constructed in Perkins' Addition would be "the most complete houses ever erected in any city," and that "in point of architectural beauty, convenience and comfort they stand without comparison." Recent technological advances made possible the installation of new features such as hot and cold running water, baths, electric lights, and furnaces. Other options for these "new-idea Cottages" included elaborate mantels, built-in china cabinets, sliding or folding doors, and "plain glass,

---

22Ibid., January 7, 1891, p. 6; January 13, 1891, p. 6.
23Ibid., April 5, 1891, p. 16.
24Threatened by this importation of Golden pressed brick into Utah, John P. Cahoon and his associates, local brick manufacturers, immediately left for St. Louis, where they purchased $85,000 worth of pressed brick manufacturing equipment. Soon after they incorporated the Salt Lake Pressed Brick Company (later known as Interstate Brick) and in March 1891 announced that their new machinery could manufacture higher quality bricks than those made in Golden, Colorado. See Salt Lake Tribune, January 25, 1891, p. 6; January 31, 1891, p. 6; February 14, 1891, p. 6; and March 28, 1891, p. 6.
26Salt Lake Tribune, December 28, 1890, p. 16. Despite Chamberlin's claims, the houses in Perkins' Addition were overshadowed in terms of scale and architectural exuberance by the houses in Darlington Place, a contemporary subdivision located near Second Avenue and P Street in the Avenues district.

---

Fig. 2. Several houses constructed in Perkins' Addition are very similar to the sample houses in the advertisement. They include (left to right) 946 East 1700 South, 935 East Logan Avenue, and 921 East 1700 South. All National Register. The ca. 1909 photograph of the Logan Avenue house shows that its second story open porch was replaced early on by the gable roof over the front vestibule and the door converted into a window. USHS collections and Preservation Office photographs.
stained glass, or memorial windows."

More basic, but perhaps an equally attractive feature of the houses, was their "modern" floor plan. The side-passage plan, which was the most popular Victorian floor plan both in Salt Lake City and throughout Utah, was used on all but perhaps one of the houses (figs. 3 and 4). Unlike the multi-purpose rooms of earlier, simpler house forms, the rooms in the side passage and other Victorian house plans were designed to accommodate specific domestic activities. The main floor plan had an entrance hall, a formal parlor, a dining room, a family or living room, and a kitchen at the rear, often with an accompanying pantry or cellar. The bedrooms were located exclusively upstairs.

Despite their basic similarities, the interiors of the Perkins' Addition houses vary, though not significantly, in the stairways, fireplaces, placement of closets, and in the shape and size of some of the rooms. The floor plan of the house at 946 East 1700 South, for example, is noticeably more compact than that of the house at 936 East 1700 South. Hattie Van Pelt discovered that fact, much to her dismay, as she walked through the smaller house for the first time after purchasing it in 1894. Thinking that it would be virtually the same as the house at 936 East 1700 South, which the Van Pels had rented for several months in 1891, she urged her husband to purchase it at a tax sale, sight unseen. Though unhappy with its smaller rooms, she and her husband lived in the house for over forty years.

The exterior of the houses express individuality, but they are also related as a group. The design of each of the houses employs its own combination of Victorian Eclectic elements, yet many of those elements are repeated from house to house. Features that betray the common design source of the houses include a prominent gable roof, projecting bays on the front and sides, two-story front porches, uncovered porches spanning the facade, bargeboards with a distinctive geometric pattern, and fish-scale or diamond pattern shingles in the gables. Chamberlin's associates, Burhaus and Vaughan, are known to have used the same styles on houses they built in the

---

37Ibid., February 22, 1891, p. 16.
38Several of the houses have been divided into apartments, so it is difficult to determine their original floor plans. Judging from the exterior, the Charles Weeks house at 935 East Logan Avenue is the only one that does not readily appear to have a side-passage plan.
40Nyman interview.
Fig. 3. Reportedly the model home for the subdivision, 946 East 1700 South is the best preserved of the remaining Perkins' Addition houses. It was purchased by the Reverend William D. Mabry in January 1891 for $5,800. Preservation Office photograph. National Register.

Whittier neighborhood of Denver in 1889. It is not known whether those styles were originated by them or whether they came from another source. The Perkins' houses are the only known examples in Salt Lake City of these transplanted Colorado styles.

After a busy winter of construction, Perkins' Addition emerged in the spring of 1891 as the most impressive new subdivision in the city. One of the leaders in the Salt Lake real estate market, William G.

---


42The designs for the houses may have come from house pattern books, a popular source of design at that time, though no clear match has yet been found in the available pattern books. The use of standard, familiar plans individualized by superficial design elements is a common feature of pattern book designs. See Dell Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860," Winterthur Portfolio 19 (Summer/Autumn 1984): 149-50.
Fig. 4. After changing hands several times during the 1890s, 950 East Logan Avenue was owned by William H. Tawney from 1904 until his death in 1959. Tawney was a commercial agent, rancher, and teacher. Preservation Office photograph. National Register.

Hubbard, conceded that fact in an advertisement for his Waterloo Addition, stating that "Waterloo will be the best improved addition on the market (except Perkins). . . ." Even before the houses in Perkins were completed, developers of adjacent properties were using their proximity to Perkins as a promotional tool for their subdivisions. Much as Gilbert Chamberlin had predicted, Perkins' Addition was, at least for a time, one of the most desirable and talked about subdivisions in Salt Lake City.

The most impressive house in Perkins' Addition is the two-and-one-half story house at 918 East Logan Avenue which has a large brick carriage house behind (fig. 5). Its first known owner/occupants were John W. and Eliza B. Judd, who purchased it in

---

\(^{43}\) *Salt Lake Tribune*, July 1, 1891, p. 8.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., December 22, 1890, p. 8; January 18, 1891, p. 6.
Fig. 5. The John W. Judd house at 918 East Logan Avenue. The large brick carriage house behind was the only one constructed in Perkins' Addition. Preservation Office photograph. National Register.

1892. Judd, a native of Tennessee and a veteran of the Confederate Army, brought his family to Utah in 1888 after being appointed to serve on the Territorial Supreme Court of Utah. After resigning that position in 1889, "Judge" Judd pursued his private law practice in Salt Lake City until returning to Nashville in 1898. There he continued his legal career and was later appointed to serve on the Tennessee Supreme Court. Despite their large home and their social standing, the Judds were best remembered in the neighborhood for
Fig. 6. Charles S. Bennett, like several others, apparently bought the house at 936 East 1700 South for speculative purposes. In July 1891, soon after its completion, he advertised it as the "finest finished house in Perkins" and offered "very easy terms." Byron Cummings, a University of Utah professor, was a long-time resident of the house. The photograph, probably taken at the turn of the century, is in the USHS collections. National Register.

their "exotic" nursemaid, a black woman named Charity. From 1898 to 1900 the house was owned by David Evans, a prominent attorney and mining man in Utah. John Sermon, a woolgrower, lived in the house from 1901 to 1904, then sold it to Lyman R. Martineau. Martineau had just moved to Salt Lake City from Logan, where he had served on the Logan City Council, as Cache County assessor and treasurer, as a trustee of Brigham Young College, and for twenty years as a high councilman in the LDS Cache Stake. In Salt Lake City, he was president of Margis Investment Company and ran unsuccessfully for a U.S. congressional seat in 1908. Lyman died in 1926, but his family continued to live in the house until 1945.

Perkins' Addition was an especially attractive home site for at least three of the early families who, for various reasons, lived in two

^Nyman interview.
or more of the homes in the neighborhood. Henry and Hattie Van Pelt, as previously mentioned, rented the house at 936 East 1700 South (fig. 6) in 1891, then purchased the house at 946 East 1700 South (fig. 3) in 1894. They remained there for the rest of their lives. Henry was an attorney, commissioner of the U.S. District Court in Utah, and a trustee of Westminster College. James B. Barton, president of Barton & Hoggan Meat & Grocery, lived in the house at 950 East Logan Avenue (fig. 4) from 1898 until 1904, then moved to the recently constructed house directly through the block at 951 East 1700 South. In 1907 he had the two-story brick house at 960 East Logan Avenue constructed, a house that generally resembles the original houses in the subdivision. Harper J. Dininny lived in three of the original Perkins houses between 1891 and 1900. Dininny, an attorney with the Chamberlin group, came to Salt Lake City in March 1891 and soon after moved into the house at 925 East Logan Avenue. He remained there until about 1894, then moved to 950 East Logan Avenue (1894-96) and 1630 South 900 East (1897-1900; now demolished). Since Dininny actually purchased only the first house, it appears that he simply occupied whichever of the houses was vacant and still owned by the Chamberlin group, either due to foreclosure or other circumstances. Dininny later served for twelve years as city attorney for Salt Lake.

Although Perkins’ Addition was intended to be a large, fully developed subdivision of over three hundred homes, it never grew beyond the original thirteen houses that were constructed in 1891. The final advertisement for the subdivision in July 1891 explained that “Just at present, while the weather is so warm and so many folks just a trifle indifferent, we will have to temporarily postpone our Sunday talks with you in THE TRIBUNE…. ” Those “talks” never resumed, and neither did construction activity in the subdivision.

Several factors that may have contributed to the Perkins’ Addition “failure” can be identified. The speculative nature of the real estate market at the time may not have been able to sustain investments such as Perkins, which required a more substantial commitment than did undeveloped property. Mismanagement of the company by Chamberlin or others may also have contributed to its demise. One indication of this was a major shake-up in the

---

\(^{46}\)Salt Lake Tribune, July 5, 1891, p. 16. This was the last Perkins advertisement in the Tribune, but advertisements continued in the Salt Lake Herald for several more weeks.
company's organization in March 1891, at which the company's name was changed to Metropolitan Investment Company and Chamberlin was replaced by Harper J. Dininny as spokesman. Paramount, however, was probably the major economic downturn that resulted in the nationwide depression of 1893. The actual decline in the local real estate market appears to have begun as early as mid-1891, just as the first phase of Perkins' Addition was being completed. None of the local subdivisions of the 1880s and '90s were fully developed before the depression halted virtually all real estate activity. Not until about 1910 did subdivision development once again gather momentum in Salt Lake City.

Though exceptional in some respects, Perkins' Addition was in many ways typical of the numerous subdivisions of its time. It was one of the dozens of subdivisions platted in the "southeastern suburbs" of Salt Lake City after the introduction of the electric streetcar in 1890. These subdivisions were popular because they offered the fresh air and uncrowded conditions of country living, yet, with their streetcar access, they were only a short ride from the city center.

The electric streetcar was the major influence behind the transformation of the land south of the city from agricultural to residential use. The real estate potential that the streetcar lines created in that area motivated men such as Gilbert L. Chamberlin to pay inflated prices for what had previously been cheap agricultural land. Without the fast and convenient service of the electric streetcar, there would have been little demand for building lots in the southeastern suburbs, and the land there would likely have remained farmland much longer.

Streetcar suburbs not only altered the use of the land, they also established a new pattern for laying out streets and blocks in Salt Lake City. The system of narrow, rectangular blocks used in Perkins' Addition and other Salt Lake City subdivisions was probably the most common subdivision grid throughout the country at that time. It was popular because of its simple layout, its efficient use of the land by eliminating "wasted" property in the interior of blocks, and

---

47 *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 12, 1891, p. 6. Another prominent figure in the company who emerged at that time was G. W. E. Griffith. Griffith was the one responsible for transferring legal title for the Perkins' Addition property to its respective owners in June 1891.

48 Some of the largest subdivisions in Salt Lake City were developed during the 1910s, including Highland Park, Federal Heights, and Gilmer Park.
because it provided street frontage to every lot on the block. Subdivision blocks were a major departure from the large, square, ten-acre blocks of the original city plat, which was based on LDS church founder Joseph Smith’s “Plat of the City of Zion.” Although most of the streetcar subdivisions were not appreciably developed at the time of their introduction, the pattern of development they established has persisted to the present in the southeastern section of the city.

Though much celebrated as a modern convenience at the time of its introduction, the electric streetcar system was not without its flaws, especially in the early years. Its unreliable service provoked at
least one Perkins' Addition resident to move back into town. Henry Van Pelt, an attorney, found it impossible to carry on his practice properly because of delays and breakdowns of the streetcar system. After renting a house in Perkins' Addition for several months in 1891, he moved his family back into the central city area. They remained there only a couple of years, however, before returning to Perkins' Addition in 1894, apparently after the streetcar system had proved more reliable.51

The development of streetcar subdivisions was widespread, despite the disapproval of LDS church leaders. According to LDS church historian Andrew Jenson, "Up to that time it had been one of the fundamental policies of the Latter-day Saints to hold on to their 'inheritances in Zion,' but now since there was an opportunity to get fabulous prices for their land holdings, the temptation to gain wealth gained the upper hand...." LDS church leaders were disturbed by "the love of money and gain" that seemed to take possession of the members as "brethren who ought to have known better were selling out their property to land sharks as fast as they could." The April 1889 session of the church's general conference was devoted almost entirely to preaching against real estate speculation and the love of money.52 But who could blame an elderly widow such as Sarah Gibson for making several thousand dollars off the sale of her farmland to a wealthy "capitalist" such as Chamberlin?

Although Mormons were eager to sell their land in the peak years of subdivision development, they were not as willing to buy. One real estate broker in 1890 noted that "Mormons are sellers, not purchasers. They seem ever ready to sell, but in eighteen months our firm has been in business here, we have not made a single sale to a Mormon."53 That held true for Perkins property as well. None of the original residents there were Mormon, and even in later years surprisingly few Mormons purchased Perkins' Addition houses.

The early concentration of non-Mormons in the southeastern suburbs can be attributed to two major factors. First, since the majority of non-Mormons were newly arrived opportunity seekers, it seems only natural that they would invest in the booming suburban real estate market. The southeastern suburbs, in particular, were

51Nyman interview.
53Salt Lake Tribune, December 24, 1890, p. 6.
noted for being built up by non-Mormon, out-of-state developers. Many of them built homes in their subdivisions and lived there, at least for a time, to help promote the legitimacy of their projects. Two of Chamberlin’s associates are known to have lived in houses at Perkins’ Addition, Harper J. Dininny and John Vaughan. Second, due to the tightly knit society of the LDS wards in the central city area, non-Mormons were more inclined to settle in the suburbs where the church’s influence was less pervasive. In general, however, they did not bring their own churches and institutions with them into the suburbs. St. John’s Episcopal Church, built in Perkins’ Addition c.1895, was one of the few exceptions.

Chamberlin and his associates were among the scores of out-of-state developers who were attracted to Salt Lake City during the boom years of the 1880s and ’90s. Indicative of that boom is the growth in the number of real estate firms. Only six or seven such businesses existed in 1887, but the number had blossomed to seventy-five by 1888, and all were “as busy as they can be.” The first real estate speculators came to Utah from Colorado and Iowa in 1887, then “new men and new money came from all directions” as the boom continued into the 1890s. Most of the real estate investors, however, continued to come from Denver and other Colorado towns, believing that “Salt Lake is destined to become another Denver.”

Denver’s boom of the 1880s served as both an inspiration and a model for developers in Salt Lake City. Gilbert L. Chamberlin, in the development of Perkins’ Addition, was especially reliant on Colorado sources. He used Colorado designs and materials for the houses, and he used reputable subdivisions in Denver, specifically Wyman’s Addition and Capitol Hill, as the standards to which he compared Perkins.

Despite being only partially completed, Perkins’ Addition proved to be an attractive home site for some of the upper-middle-class residents of the city. Most of the early homeowners in Perkins were business or professional men—attorneys, educators, entre-

---

55 Ibid., p. 57.
58 Salt Lake Tribune, January 4, 1891, p. 6.
59 Ibid., December 21, 1890, p. 12; January 17, 1891, p. 6.
preneurs, publishers, politicians. These early residents, as well as the houses themselves, gave Perkins' Addition a distinct identity that other, less substantial subdivisions never achieved.

The local impression of the neighborhood was not always favorable though. George Arbuckle, a Mormon bishop who lived near Perkins' Addition for many years, had a somewhat bitter recollection:

[In 1890] a number of non-Mormons came from the East...built houses which still remain. It was called the Perkins addition. These people were very anxious, I remember, to have us within the city limits. This was in the country, and of course, we escaped city taxes. This clique was anxious to get in the city, and they appealed to get us in. We were taken into the city, but we did not get fire or police protection, though we paid taxes, and it remained that way for many years.60

As Arbuckle noted, the early occupants of the houses in Perkins’ Addition were not only non-Mormon, they were also out-of-staters. They came to Salt Lake City with the boom of the late 1880s, and most of them left within a few years after the depression of 1893. Henry Luce, proprietor of Luce & Berryman’s Mint Saloon, was the first of the Perkins’ Addition homeowners to come to Salt Lake City, arriving in 1883 from Helena, Montana. The others came from midwestern and eastern states, most just a year or two before purchasing their homes in Perkins’ Addition. They were among the thousands of non-Mormons who came to Utah in the 1880s and ’90s, lured by the robust mining industry and by other business and investment opportunities. Charles H. Weeks, for example, was drawn to Utah by one of the thousands of promotional pamphlets distributed in eastern cities under the direction of the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce. Weeks brought his family to Salt Lake City in December 1890, purchased three lots in Perkins’ Addition, and by spring was living in the house at 935 East Logan Avenue (fig. 2).61

Some of these opportunity seekers established successful careers and remained in Utah the rest of their lives, but most stayed for only a few years, until the boom went bust. That pattern of short-term residency held true for the early residents of Perkins’ Addition as well. Seventy percent of the first owners remained in the Perkins houses for

60Francis W. Kirkman and Harold Lundstrom, eds., Tales of a Triumphant People (Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1947), p. 201. Arbuckle’s house was at 717 East 1700 South, one and a half blocks west of Perkins’ Addition.

61Salt Lake Tribune, December 21, 1890, p. 6. Western Investment Company of Chicago was hired by the Chamber of Commerce to distribute promotional pamphlets on Salt Lake in over 200 eastern cities. Thirty thousand such pamphlets were reportedly distributed per month.
three years or less, and most of those left the state soon after moving out of Perkins' Addition. Subsequent owners of the houses generally remained much longer. Some, such as the Van Pelt, Frobes, Prosser, Tawney, and Martineau families, remained in their houses for several decades.

Today, over ninety years after its development, Perkins' Addition is still recognizable as a distinct neighborhood. The ten remaining houses of the original Perkins' Addition are the most visible reminder in Salt Lake City's "southeastern suburbs" of the nationwide streetcar subdivision movement of the 1890s and the local characteristics of that period's real estate boom. Because of their historical importance, nine of the ten houses were listed in the National Register of Historic Places on October 18, 1983.62

62The house at 955 East 1700 South was not listed in the National Register because its exterior appearance is significantly altered by a bungalow-type roof that replaced the original gable roof after a c. 1915 fire.
William Allen, Architect-Builder, and His Contribution to the Built Environment of Davis County

BY PETER L. GOSS

William Allen was a prolific designer and builder of brick masonry residences, churches, civic buildings, and commercial structures in Davis County. His career as an architect-builder began in the 1880s and continued for four decades. He is still remembered in the Davis County communities of Kaysville and Layton not only for his architecture, a great deal of which still survives, but also for his irascible personality. After a brief review of Allen's life, including his professional career, this essay will focus upon a series of high-style houses designed and built by Allen between 1890 and the early 1900s for a group of distinguished citizens of Kaysville and Layton.

This is a revised version of a paper delivered in November 1982 at the Symposium on Utah Architecture.
Allen began his career as a brick mason but soon became a contractor who eventually expanded this profession to include the design of buildings. His designs varied in size, scale, and complexity and displayed a familiarity with the literature of architecture, particularly builders’ handbooks, stylebooks, and periodicals of the building trade.

The tradition of the architect-builder in America was well established by the late nineteenth century. Notable architect-builders of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries include Richard Munday of Newport, Rhode Island, and Samuel McIntire, of Salem, Massachusetts, woodcarver. Such persons rose from their various trades, such as carpenters, joiners, brick or stone masons, to become builders and designers. Utah’s most well known nineteenth-century architect-builders include men like Truman Angell and William Folsom, both associated with the early architecture of the LDS church.

Whether they referred to themselves as builders or architects, they usually worked in close association with their clients in both the design and construction phases of the project. In describing an architect-builder from North Carolina, historian Catherine Bishir states that the architect-builder’s creativity “lay not so much in exploring new concepts as in finding workable syntheses of popular and traditional elements that expressed their communities’ accommodation to these forces.” Bishir goes on to say that the abilities of these builders “lay behind the regional variations on national themes that form the great body of mid-level American architecture.” As we shall see, this is true of William Allen and his contribution to the built environment of Davis County.

Like many of Kaysville’s residents, William Robert Allen was of English descent. He was born in London on New Year’s Day in 1850 and lived in England until the age of twelve. He migrated to Utah and was first employed in Davis County as a farm hand. At the age of sixteen he began to learn his father’s masonry trade. In the 1870 U.S. Census, he was listed as a brick mason boarding with the Booth family in Kaysville. He joined the Kaysville Brass Band at sixteen and played the cornet (fig. 1). He later played the violin and wrote musical compositions for this instrument. In 1876 at the age of

twenty-six he married Mary Simms, also a native of England.\(^2\)

Four years after his marriage, at the age of thirty, he was affected by deafness and was unemployed for half of that year, according to the 1880 U.S. Census.\(^3\) It is not known whether his physical handicap impaired his musical avocation; however, Allen was known for his quick temper, irascible personality, and pronounced nasal twang. Sometime during the decade of the 1880s he took up architectural drafting in addition to his work as a mason and contractor. His formal education in architecture occurred in 1895 when he was enrolled in the International Correspondence Schools architectural curriculum. He completed nineteen of the twenty-five courses in the “complete architecture” program but did not receive a diploma.\(^4\)

In the 1890s Allen listed himself as both an architect and contractor in several commercial directories and even took large advertisements illustrated with an engraving or photograph of his larger works. The 1900 U.S. Census lists Allen as an “architect” living with a wife and seven children—four daughters and three sons. An inactive member of the Mormon church and a staunch Republican, he lived in a house of his own design in Kaysville until 1928 when he died at the age of seventy-eight.

Allen’s advertisements in various commercial directories during the 1890s indicate he was the only “architect” in the county.\(^5\) As a result, people principally from the small communities of Kaysville, Farmington, and Layton relied upon his design skills for projects ranging from simple cottages and bungalows to large, high-style residences for some of the county’s noteworthy and affluent families as well as for civic and religious buildings.

His career as an architect-builder spanned the late 1880s to the middle of the 1920s. His oversized business card (fig. 2), dating from the first decade of this century, advertised some of his services and indicated that he was a “licensed architect.” A list of some of his

---


\(^4\)*Register of International Correspondence Schools*, 3rd ed. (Scranton, Pa., 1908), p. 345.

\(^5\)In a letter to his daughter Minnie, February 3, 1919, Allen boasted that he was the only registered architect in Davis County “under the laws of the State of Utah.” He was among a group of the first licensed architects in Utah who were recorded as receiving their licenses on June 21, 1911, and was granted license number 9. State of Utah, Department of Registrations, *Register of Licenses and Certificates to 1929.* Utah State Archives, Salt Lake City.
William Allen, Architect-Builder

Fig. 2. William Allen's oversize business card, the verso of which listed his major architectural commissions. William Allen Collection, Layton Heritage Museum.

Fig. 3. Presbyterian church, Center Street, Kaysville, 1888. Photograph by author.
accomplishments on the verso of his card shows that he had also
designed buildings in Downey, Idaho, mostly public schools and
churches, and one school in Arizona.6

One of his earliest designs, the Presbyterian church of 1888 (fig. 3), is still standing on Center Street, one block east of Kaysville's Main Street and only two blocks from the architect's residence. A simple gabled form of common bond brick masonry with a side tower and spire, it incorporates Gothic design motifs in the brick masonry as well as the woodwork of the spire. The careful attention to detail common to Allen’s brick masonry can be seen in the stepped corbeling of the gable, the buttress and pinnacle of the righthand corner of the facade, and the raised Gothic pointed arch unifying the arches of the facade’s two windows.7

Brick was a popular building material in nineteenth-century Utah, and brick industries were established in Wasatch Front communities by the beginning of the third quarter of the century. Kaysville’s earliest brickmaker was Samuel Ward who produced building brick from 1875 until the first decade of this century. His competitors included the Kaysville Brick and Tile Company, begun in 1890, and later the Kaysville Brick Company formed in the 1900s by Simon Bamberger. Bamberger’s railroad ran from Salt Lake City to Ogden, and by 1910 his firm employed as many as one hundred men during the summer months. Kaysville’s largest nonagricultural industry at this time was brickmaking. Kaysville brick was used for numerous large building projects in local communities and several of Salt Lake City’s largest buildings.8

Perhaps the grandest design of Allen’s early career was the Davis County Courthouse (fig. 4) in Farmington. Commissioned in 1889, it was under construction in 1890. Allen was undoubtedly proud of the building since it appeared in several of his advertisements in commercial directories, complete with mention of the $12,500 building cost. More picturesque than earlier classically inspired courthouses found in other Utah county seats, this design is eclectic in its origin. It is highlighted by a series of round arched openings on each level and by similar motifs in the highly articulated tower.

---

6A copy of Allen’s business card, photographs of his work and tools, and a collection of over 250 ink-on-linen drawings are now housed at the Layton Heritage Museum, Layton, Utah.


Fig. 4. Davis County Courthouse designed in 1889 by William Allen. USHS collections.

Fig. 5. Barnes Block, Main Street, Kaysville, 1910. Photograph by author.

Fig. 6. Kaysville Tabernacle, Center Street, Kaysville, 1912. Photograph by author.
Again, the fine craftsmanship of Allen’s trade is apparent in the building’s common bond brick masonry and brick arch openings accented by the use of light-colored stone.

The Barnes Block of 1910 (fig. 5) remains one of the dominant commercial structures on Kaysville’s Main Street. The Barnes family was one of Allen’s best clients and eventually he built two homes for them. The Barnes Block originally housed the Barnes Banking Company in the southern half and the Kaysville Cooperative Mercantile Institution in the northern half. The design of this two-story brick structure is simple and straightforward and not unlike a great deal of commercial architecture in small Utah towns at the turn of the century. In fact, the design is similar in general appearance to Allen’s Farmers’ Union Building built in Layton in 1890. However, this earlier design has a more intricate and decorative angled entry characteristic of the picturesque styles of the late nineteenth century. In contrast, the neoclassically inspired Barnes Block has an angled entry on the southeast corner of the building separating the Main Street elevation, with its open window bays used for displays, from the more closed side elevation facing First North Street. This architectural feature functioned not only as the main entry to the Barnes Banking Company, i.e., through its pedimented door frame, but also as the billboard for the building’s name. The structure is uniformly capped by a simple brick parapet above a projecting pressed metal cornice.

Allen’s finest and largest ecclesiastical commission, the Kaysville Tabernacle (fig. 6), was constructed in 1912 and dedicated in 1914. Built two years after the nearby Barnes Block, the design hints more strongly of the then-popular Neoclassical style. This is evident in the building’s raised basement, creating the need for a formal stairway to the projecting entry porch. The porch itself consists of Tuscan columns in antis supporting an entablature and pediment. Roman arched windows, containing stained and leaded glass, flank the entry porch and sides of the building. Those windows flanking the entry are original and were constructed by Bennett’s Paint and Glass in Salt Lake City. The tabernacle is one of Allen’s finest works; thirty-three ink-on-linen drawings attest to the meticu-

---

*The Farmer’s Union Building has recently been rehabilitated and now serves as the offices of the Layton First National Bank.

Fig. 7. Watercolor rendering for a cottage built in Kaysville (see cover of this issue). William Allen Collection, Layton Heritage Museum.

lous detailing found in the design. Allen's other designs for the Mormon church include a Gothic Revival wardhouse for South Bountiful and a meetinghouse each for Centerville and Clearfield, Utah.

In addition to his public school buildings in Downey, Idaho, and Pima, Arizona, Allen designed a number of schools in Davis County. A partial list includes elementary schools for Centerville (1915) and Kaysville (1914). Both high school designs were done in association with J. L. Chesebro, an architect from Salt Lake City who is credited with the design of East High School.

Like most of his professional contemporaries, Allen derived most of his income from commissioned residences. The exact number of houses he designed is not known; however, twenty-seven have been identified in the communities of Layton and Kaysville.\footnote{These sites have been identified by Carol Morgan and Oma Wilcox and described in a brochure for a Utah Heritage Foundation tour of Allen’s buildings, May 1979. Allen did design residences in other Davis County communities.} Drawings of seventeen residences are found in the William Allen Collection of architectural drawings; eight are located in either Kaysville or Layton and one each in the Davis County communities of Syracuse and Farmington. Allen’s residential designs span a range of architectural styles and house types. In a number of his smaller houses or cottages during the late 1880s and into the following decade he employed the popular Queen Anne and Victorian Eclectic styles (fig. 7), some with Eastlake porches. Near the turn of the century the designs included houses with neoclassical porches in the Victorian Eclectic style (figs. 8 and 9). During the teens and twenties his designs
followed the fashion with examples of Arts and Crafts houses, the Bungalow, and the Prairie School bungalow.\textsuperscript{12}

Of particular interest architecturally and historically are his larger two-story, high-style, residential designs. A group of eight such houses (of which seven still stand) were designed and built between the 1890s and the early 1900s for his more affluent and locally prominent clients. These houses, representing some of Allen’s most imaginative work, were designed in the Victorian Eclectic style. They have both similarities and differences in their style and spatial arrangements and are indicative of this architect-builder’s craftsmanship, the variety of his architectural motifs, and his repetitive use of those motifs.

\textsuperscript{12}It should be noted that the quality and character of draftsmanship in Allen’s ink-on-linen drawings vary, and it is quite likely that not all the drawings were drafted by him.
The clients of these seven houses shared a common British origin, with one exception; they were sons of British immigrants and sons of Utah pioneers. Their occupations involved some aspect of agribusiness, including farming, banking, ranching, and irrigation canal companies. A number of them were related by marriage. The residences located in Kaysville and Layton were all constructed of stretcher bond brick masonry and built during a period of growth economy for both the county and the state. The background of these clients (some of whom gained statewide recognition) and their relationship to Davis County are discussed in an accompanying article by Glen Leonard.

Five of these houses were designed and constructed in the 1890s and are based on a building type known as the cross-wing. Cross-wing designs were published in popular nineteenth-century stylebooks of architecture. Architectural historian Del Upton has noted a special form of the cross-wing that incorporates a tower. The tower is located in the corner formed by the main block and the cross-wing. At least seven cross-wing houses are known to have been designed by William Allen, of which five incorporate a towerlike projection at the angle of the main block and the cross-wing, including Allen’s own house (fig. 10) in Kaysville. The style of Allen’s towered cross-wing houses varied from the early published designs. However, this

---

is not true of his plans that repeat the basic plan type: a central passage separating two public rooms that open on to one another from another public room such as the dining room and kitchen.

The first two residences to be examined belonged to two sons of Davis County pioneer Christopher Layton for whom the city of Layton was named. John Henry Layton was the eldest son of Christopher's fifth wife, while his brother George Willard Layton was the first child of Christopher's seventh wife and eight years younger than his brother. The John Henry Layton house (fig. 11) is located at 683 West Gentile Street in West Layton, and the George Willard Layton house (fig. 12) is located some twenty blocks to the west at 2767 West Gentile Street. The Layton brothers homesteaded land...
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Figs. 13 and 14. Floor plans of the John Henry Layton house (left) and George Willard Layton house (right). Drawn by author.

deeded to them by their father, and both became successful bankers and ranchers. John H. Layton was considered one of the wealthiest farmers in Davis County at the time of his death. He was a director of the National Bank of Layton, while his brother George W. was bank president and a stockholder in the Ellison Ranching Company. The brothers’ Victorian Eclectic, high-style dwellings appear similar in massing and in the asymmetry of their cross-wing plans. The second-story porch tower located directly above the main entry is covered by a portion of a pyramidal roof which projects above the ridge of the main roof reinforcing the picturesque quality of irregularity common to the style and relating the visual image of the house to the cross-wing and tower type.

The plans of the Layton houses are similar but not identical, for one is the mirror image of the other. In the John Henry Layton house plan (fig. 13) a central passage or hallway containing a staircase separates the dining room and kitchen located in the cross-wing from the parlor and sitting room, or possibly a bedroom, of the main block. A separate brick summer kitchen is now attached to the house.

\[15\text{Deseret News, February 3, 1920, p. 8.}\]
via a wooden stud wall; the rear porch (at the rear of the main block) was enclosed between 1910 and 1920. In the George W. Layton house plan (fig. 14) the kitchen is found in the lean-to at the rear of the cross-wing, and the room behind the parlor in the main block continues to function as a bedroom.

Although similar in plan type and visual image, the two houses, upon closer examination, exhibit a number of differences in architectural detailing. Allen, the master brick mason, utilized polychromy in both instances to highlight the red brick stretcher bond masonry wall of both buildings. Yellow brick is seen at the water table, stringcourses, and around the arched lintels of the windows of the John H. Layton house. Gray stone is used in the water table and gray brick in the stringcourses and to outline the horseshoe and round arched openings in the George W. Layton house. A brick stringcourse on the elevations of Allen's buildings (most often appearing on the main elevation) was a common motif; however, it appears on both floors of the Layton house elevations.

The other major difference between the two buildings is the architectural character of the exterior woodwork. In combination with the skillfully crafted brick masonry the woodwork further enhances the picturesque character of the style. Its location in these residences is identical, i.e., on the gables, the porch and porch tower, the window frames, and the gable of the dormer. Here again there is a difference: the John H. Layton house woodwork is characterized by a flat, two-dimensional wooden detail, with the exception of the porch columns, while the George W. Layton house contains a combination of flat, jig-sawn patterns (also seen in the former residence) with three-dimensional, lathe-turned spindle work common to the Eastlake style. One wooden architectural motif often seen in the exterior woodwork of Allen's designs is the use of a half or engaged column resembling the Tuscan order applied to the surface of the wooden mullion separating two double-hung windows. This appears on the bay of the first floor of the John H. Layton house and on the second floor of the bay on the George W. Layton house. In both instances a transom window caps this motif. The transom window of the John H. Layton house is a decorative, round arch window of colorful art glass.

The interior woodwork of both houses is similar, in contrast to the buildings' exterior, but not unlike the woodwork found in many late Victorian houses in Utah. Simple window and door casings of
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pine were built of plain moulding profiles as were the baseboards. Head blocks and corner blocks were decorated with a bull’s-eye motif, and the entire assemblage was hand grained to imitate various hardwoods.

The Layton residences are notable examples of cross-wing and tower designs in the Victorian Eclectic style in Davis County, a style that was quite popular in Utah in the late nineteenth century and coincided with the growth economy and building boom along the Wasatch Front. These exuberant dwellings are also the finest examples of William Allen’s designs for large two-story houses in this style. Their picturesque character and fine craftsmanship in both brick masonry and woodworking is in contrast to the designer’s restrained but equally well crafted additional examples of Victorian Eclecticism.

The largest cross-wing and tower design by William Allen is the John George Moroni Barnes house (fig. 15), 42 North 100 West, Kaysville. The client, a merchant and the son of John R. Barnes, was described in his obituary in the Deseret News as an “outstanding industrialist, banker, merchant and agriculturalist.” At the time of his death in 1932 he was either an officer or on the board of a number of businesses in Davis County.

**Figs. 15 and 16. Ink-on-linen elevation and floor plan of the John George Moroni Barnes house, 42 North 100 West, Kaysville. William Allen Collection, Layton Heritage Museum. National Register.**

---

16*Utah: Her Cities, Towns, and Resources* (Chicago: Manly & Litteral, 1891), pp. 40-44.
Allen's use of brick in the Barnes house is more conservative and lacks the polychromy present in the Layton residences. Changes over the years have obscured or obliterated a number of the details in the architectural fabric. This is apparent when one examines the facade rendering (fig. 15), one of ten ink-on-linen drawings by Allen for this impressive residence. The use of lathe-turned woodwork on the porch and porch tower is similar to but heavier than that used on the George W. Layton house. The more unusual features in the design of this residence include the bell-cast roof with a steep, gabled dormer containing a round arch window atop the octagonal bay projecting from the main block. The cresting atop the bell-cast roof and the ridge line has not been retained. Additional alterations that have had a negative affect upon the original design include removing wooden posts and balustrades of the porch and porch tower in the 1920s and replacing them with square brick piers and the more recent addition of an asphalt shingle roof over the original cut cedar shingles.

As in the Layton residences the plan (fig. 16) has a long narrow central passage containing the main staircase and separating the parlor in the main block from the dining room in the cross-wing. The parlor opens into a rear bedroom via sliding doors, and behind it is a bathroom and laundry. The kitchen and pantry are adjacent to the dining room; the kitchen is accessible from the central passage. The size and number of the rooms are greater than in the Layton houses, and the inclusion of a pantry, a glazed conservatory (west elevation), and a fireplace in both the dining room and the parlor indicate that a grander house was envisioned. The interior woodwork of the house, as in a number of Allen's designs, consists of a common plain or beaded moulding profile, window and door casings with baseboards, and head blocks all of pine and all grained to imitate hardwoods.

Allen again used the cross-wing house type, but without a tower and internally without a central passage, in the Thomas J. Smith house (fig. 17), 427 North Main Street, Kaysville, and the John R. Barnes house (fig. 18), 10 South 100 West, Kaysville. Both designs are more restrained in massing and decorative detailing than either of the previously discussed residences. Smith was a farmer and stockman who later began harvesting fruit on his farm located directly behind his house. John R. Barnes, a Kaysville pioneer, attempted farming and teaching but found merchandising more to his liking. He was a brother-in-law to Henry H. Blood (also a client of Allen) as well as a
Fig. 17. The Thomas J. Smith house (right), 472 North Main, Kaysville. Photograph by author.

Fig. 18. The John R. Barnes house (left), 10 South 100 West, Kaysville. Photograph by author. National Register.

Fig. 19. Floor plan of the John R. Barnes house. Drawn by author.

Fig. 20. South elevation of the Thomas J. Smith house, Kaysville. Photograph by author.
brother-in-law to Christopher Layton. His residence consists of an earlier house (1870s) built to face 100 West and to which William Allen added the western portion, possibly as early as 1891, facing Center Street.

The Barnes house (fig. 18), the earlier of the two designs, is also the more restrained, perhaps due to the fact that it was an addition. A hip roof dormer with two double-hung windows projects from the roof of the cross-wing portion of the elevation. Two major differences seen in this design when compared with the Layton residences are a neoclassical porch rather than an Eastlake porch and a hipped roof over the bay of the main block in place of the decorative gable. This substantial addition is essentially the same visual arrangement, although a mirror image, of the Smith house facade (compare figs. 17 and 18). Identical engaged Tuscan columns separate the double windows in the dormers of these two designs. Similar stained and leaded art glass windows are also found in both designs above the central plate glass windows of the half octagonal bay. Absent from these two designs is the brick stringcourse of contrasting color incorporated into the Layton residences.

In plan (fig. 19), the Barnes addition lacks a central staircase separating the public spaces of the cross-wing from those of the main block. Instead, the main entry, located in the cross-wing, opens into a nearly square dining room at the rear of which is the kitchen. To the right of the dining room in the main block is the parlor with its bay window. The enclosed staircase is situated in the main block and separates the parlor from the narrow rectangular bathroom.
Drawings of the Thomas J. Smith residence indicate the house was completed as designed. Well constructed in the usual stretcher bond, this cross-wing design appears to contain two cross-wing facade elevations—the west elevation facing North Main Street (fig. 17) and the south elevation (fig. 20). It is the west elevation that is the mirror image of the Barnes residence, with the exception of the curved south end of the neoclassical porch. The south end of the cross-wing of this facade becomes the bay of the main block of the south elevation. Allen repeated the central window motif of the facade bay, complete with identical art glass windows, and covered the bay with an unusual roof. In place of the hipped roof seen on the bay of the west elevation Allen has eliminated the side windows in the second story and pitched the roof downward, thus framing the two sides of the central fixed glass window. The effect created by the projecting second-story window is one of a tower in the center of the bay. Below the overhanging decorative edge of the cornice, on either side of the central window, Allen inserted his only decorative brick motif in the design—an “X” pattern of rock-faced orange brick.

In plan (fig. 21), this cross-wing house exhibits a few changes in comparison with the plans of the Barnes house. As in the John G. M. Barnes house, the front door opens into a small vestibule. This small space contains two doors, one to the right, leading into the parlor, and one straight ahead, leading into the large dining room. The arrangement of the dining room in one cross-wing abutting the

Fig. 22. The Henry H. Blood house (left), 95 South 300 West, Kaysville. Photograph by author. National Register.

Fig. 23. South elevation of the Hyrum Stewart house (right), North 300 West, Kaysville. Photograph by author.
parlor in the main block is not unlike the plan of the John R. Barnes house. However, the placement of the staircase in the Smith residence creates an awkward L-shaped parlor. Both the parlor and the dining room are well illuminated by their windowed bays. The interior woodwork of these residences is similar in design and finish to that of the Layton and Barnes houses.

Two Kaysville residences not of the cross-wing type are the Henry H. Blood house (fig. 22), 95 South 300 West, and the larger Hyrum Stewart house (fig. 23) at 111 North 200 West. Blood, a noted businessman, was an officer and board member of a number of Utah companies. He served in various public offices in Davis County from 1897 to 1918, and then in state positions from 1918 to 1925. A two-term governor of Utah during the 1930s, he was also the first state executive to occupy the Kearns mansion in Salt Lake City. An active member of the Mormon church, he served as president of the California Mission after completing his second term as governor.\(^{18}\)

The Blood house is a picturesque one-and-one-half-story Victorian Eclectic design that in its original form was cottage-like in scale and based on a side-passage plan. The facade is narrow and asymmetrical. This asymmetricality is reinforced by the irregular roof silhouette created by a series of hip roof dormers, hip projections off the main pyramidal roof, the octagonal corner tower of brick masonry and wooden Queen Anne decorative motifs, and the recessed entry preceded by a decorative wooden porch. The original side-passage lobby-entry plan (fig. 24) contained only four spaces. To the left of the entry hall and staircase is the parlor with its corner nook (created by the tower); and behind it, separated by sliding doors, is the living room (possibly doubling as the dining room) and also referred to as the music room. The door at the rear of the entry hall leads to the original kitchen. The interior woodwork in the three public spaces—entry hall, parlor, and living room—is more decorative than the previously discussed residences, although it follows a similar format. The square newel post, decorated with half spheres and oversized bull’s eyes, and the balustrade of the staircase are more unusual. In 1915 a skillfully integrated addition extended the dwelling, providing a new kitchen and bath on the main floor and additional bedrooms on the second floor. Allen carefully matched the brick in

the addition as well as the decorative woodwork to the original.

Hyrum Stewart began his career in merchandising at the age of eighteen, eventually owning his own business as well as a farm in Davis County. He was the son of pioneer shoemaker William Stewart and the brother of Emily Stewart Barnes, third wife of John R. Barnes. Larger than the Blood house, the Stewart house (fig. 23) is similarly sited on a corner lot.

One of Allen’s largest residential designs, it is comparable in scale to the John G. M. Barnes house. A full two-story house based on a rectangular plan, it is built, as were most of Allen’s houses, upon a rock foundation capped by a cut stone water table and walls of stretcher bond brick masonry. Like the Blood residence, this is an

---

eclectic design. It includes two entries, a neoclassical porch, a corner tower with a conical roof, and the usual two-story bay. Most of the decorative features are found on the south and east elevations and are a curious combination of picturesque and neoclassical elements.

The asymmetrical south elevation (fig. 23) contains an oddly angled wooden porch squeezed between the projecting wall on the left and the corner tower to the right. This neoclassical porch, which includes an entablature with a cornice and dentils and an oversized pediment containing a sculpted wreath of carved and painted wood, contrasts with the rock-faced red brick masonry of the tower and rock-faced gray stone of the lintels and sills of the windows. Additional neoclassical decoration includes the elliptical window framed in brick and highlighted by rock-faced stone keystones and engaged Tuscan columns of wood in the second story of the tower. These support a wood frieze of garlands and dentiled cornice. The remaining decorative feature of this elevation is the double window capped by a fanlight of stained and leaded art glass framed by an elliptical arch of rock-faced stone with an accented keystone. At the rear of the building, or the left side of the south elevation, there is a projecting gable roof wing nearly identical to the laundry wing of the John G. M. Barnes house.

The asymmetrical east elevation (fig. 25) contains a central entry with fanlight and sidelights preceded by a gable roof porch (possibly a later addition) supported by Doric, half-fluted columns. The entry is framed by the rock-faced brick corner tower on the left and the angled bay on the right. Gray stone rock-faced headers and sills are also utilized in the window openings. The frieze of garlands seen on the corner tower is repeated on the angled wall surfaces of the bay, and the cornice with dentils stretches the full width of the facade.

Heretofore there had always been a consistency in the style and materials in Allen’s designs; his justification for such an awkward combination of architectural features in so large a commission is unknown. To what extent the client may have interacted in the design process of the house is open to speculation. Drawings of Allen’s designs and the existing buildings indicate that such a departure was certainly a rare occurrence.

As an architect-builder William Allen fulfilled a vital role in the design and construction of buildings in Davis County. His advertisements indicate he was the only architect in the county in the 1890s and early 1900s. People in the small Davis County communities of
Kaysville, Layton, and Farmington relied upon his skills as both a designer and builder for projects ranging from simple cottages and later bungalows to large, high-style residences as well as civic, commercial, and religious buildings. Very likely such commissions would not have attracted design talent from Utah’s urban centers of Salt Lake City and Ogden. Allen was therefore able to make his living as an architect-builder primarily from commissions close to his own doorstep. His clients included average citizens as well as wealthy and prominent county figures. Certain families, including some discussed here, utilized his skills exclusively for a variety of projects ranging from commercial and industrial buildings to their residences.

If one were to compare Allen’s work with the designs of his contemporaries in other parts of the country one would note that he was a competent designer and builder and that his work was simple and straightforward, but not necessarily imaginative. This is evident in the wide range of his work encompassing public, commercial, religious, and residential buildings and in various artifacts including his drawings and buildings. It is apparent that he tried to keep abreast of fashion throughout his career, although there was little experimentation with building materials. It is difficult to determine whether this reflects a lack of imagination on his part, the sophistication of his client, or simply the lack of variety and availability of building materials. With some exceptions there is a lack of imaginative brick masonry in comparable Queen Anne and Neoclassical style buildings throughout the state despite the popularity of brick as a building material.

Today the artifacts of Allen’s architectural legacy attest to his competence and craftsmanship as a respected member of the community. An inactive Mormon, he was still chosen by his religious peers to design the community’s most notable religious building, the Kaysville Tabernacle. The seven residential examples analyzed above are just as noteworthy today in the villages of Layton and Kaysville and in the rapidly disappearing rural landscapes of Davis County as they were at the turn of the century. They are, to paraphrase Bishir, regional examples of national themes that constitute a portion of the body of mid-level American architecture.
William Allen’s Clients: A Socio-economic Inquiry

BY GLEN M. LEONARD

In the 1890s Architect-Builder William Allen designed and built several handsome high-style brick homes for clients in central Davis County. Peter Goss introduces the clients in his study of seven of the surviving homes and their architect in this issue of the Quarterly.\textsuperscript{1} His architectural analysis opens the door to further inquiry into the socio-economic environment of the seven clients who commissioned these late Victorian, high-style brick homes in Kaysville and Layton, Utah.

Goss identified three avenues to the study of the client families. These include (1) their common British origin, (2) numerous, close kinship ties, and (3) a common involvement in local agribusiness,

\textsuperscript{1}Peter L. Goss, “William Allen, Architect-BUILDER, and His Contribution to the Built Environment of Davis County,” pp. 52-73.
commerce, and community and religious affairs. These elements are consistent threads in the life stories of clients John R. Barnes, John G. M. Barnes, Henry H. Blood, George W. Layton, John H. Layton, Thomas J. Smith, and Hyrum Stewart. In the context of local history these commonalities reveal a fascinating picture of the families who commissioned Allen to build some of central Davis County's finest late nineteenth-century houses.

THE BRITISH CONNECTION

The seven clients shared an English background, mostly as the sons of British immigrants. John R. Barnes and the parents of the other clients chose to settle near other British Latter-day Saints in Kaysville, a community soon dominated by converts of recent English origin. If not residents of the same English county or shipmates en route to America, they had become friends in Mormon gathering places near Nauvoo. Friendships were further cemented by marriages, in the Old World or the New. They had left England by choice in response to religious motivations. Common origins, friendships, family ties, and shared experiences brought them together in a "little England" in northern Utah.

Known as Kay's Ward (later Kaysville) after its English founding father, William Kay, the community where the seven client families lived had evolved by the end of the century into two separate cities. The division was a process begun by the incorporation of Kaysville in 1868 and completed in 1889 when Layton was incorporated.²

In its early years Kaysville (including Layton) was predominately British, unlike Utah Territory as a whole. In the 1850 census 38.5 percent of Kaysville residents identified England as their birthplace. In Utah Territory in 1850 only 9.5 percent of the population was of English origin. When only heads of household are considered, the British impact is made clearer. Among Kaysville's adult population of sixty-two persons, British immigrants accounted for thirty-three people, or just over 53 percent.³

All of the client families can be counted among Kaysville's pioneer settlers. With one exception, all were established by the end

²Carol Ivins Collett, Kaysville—Our Town: A History (Kaysville, Ut.: Kaysville City, 1976), pp. 8, 102, 109-10.
of the first decade, enjoying whatever advantage that might have
given them socially and economically. Only Henry Blood’s ancestors
were resident in Kaysville for the 1850 census, but other client
families arrived shortly afterward. Hyrum Stewart’s father was
included in the bishop’s December 1852 report of members (as was
William Booth, who took in William Allen as a boarder when he
arrived in 1863). Client John R. Barnes (whose client-son John G. M.
was born in Kaysville) was among the immigrants of 1853, while
Christopher Layton (father of clients John and George) arrived in
Kaysville in 1857. Thomas J. Smith emigrated about 1867-68, the last
to relocate from England.4

Available information on the client families shows that acquain­
tanceships developed through common British origins and shared
Mormon migration experiences often had a bearing upon the choice
of Kaysville as a settlement site. Once in Kaysville, these families
reinforced their relationships through continuing friendships, new
interfamily marriages, business partnerships, or church assign­
ments. The resulting interwoven social fabric of friendship and
kinship established a backdrop for financial opportunities and the
accumulation of the wealth that made possible Allen’s commissions
for the fine brick homes in the 1890s.

A number of early Kaysville residents were among the English
converts of Elder Wilford Woodruff in the spring of 1840 in
Staffordshire and Herefordshire. Three of Woodruff’s United
Brethren converts—Edward Phillips, John Hyrum Green, and
William Kay—reached Kaysville in 1850, the first arrivals after
founding fathers Hector C. Haight and Samuel O. Holmes.

A second settlement trio to arrive in Kaysville in 1850 (in
September) included Englishmen Henry Woolley (step-grandfather
of client Henry Blood), William Lauder Payne, and William B.
Smith (whose ties with Christopher Layton will be explored shortly).
Woolley, Payne, and Smith had known William Kay at an English
Mormon community nine miles east of Nauvoo called Big Mound.
Other residents of that British waystation were John Marriott
(ancestor of the J. Willard Marriotts of Hot Shoppe and hotel fame)
and Robert W. Burton. Marriott, Burton, and William Stewart
(father of client Hyrum Stewart) reached Kaysville together. This

4"Registry of the Names of Persons Residing in the Various Wards, etc., as to Bishops’ Reports,
Census 1850, Davis County, Utah,” typescript, Genealogical Society, Salt Lake City.

William Kay was released as bishop, and Brigham Young later called him to help establish Mormon settlements in Carson Valley, Nevada, in 1856. He was there associated with Christopher Layton, who was not yet a Kaysville resident. Layton has reached Utah in 1852 and lived in several locations in Salt Lake City and then in Grantsville before responding to the call to help settle western Nevada. When called back to Utah the following November, the Carson Valley pioneers stopped over in Kaysville. Christopher Layton stayed with William B. Smith, friend, brother-in-law, and former neighbor at LaHarpe, near Big Mound. Layton then purchased the home of David Day, one of the English tenant boarders of the 1851 census, and became a permanent resident of the community.\footnote{Myron W. McIntyre and Noel R. Barton, eds., *Christopher Layton* (Layton, Ut.: Christopher Layton Family Organization, 1966), 81-89, 95, 101.}

Layton’s attraction to Davis County may well have been influenced by the availability of good farm land. But his acquaintanceships with William Kay, William B. Smith, John Marriott, John R. Barnes, and William Stewart should not be ignored. Layton and his new bride were immigrants to Nauvoo in 1842. For three years, he and John Marriott, who preceded him to Kaysville, were involved in well-digging, house-building, and hay-cutting in the Nauvoo area and farming in LaHarpe and Big Mound on the prairies east of the Mormon capital. After his wife’s death in September 1845 Christopher entrusted their year-old daughter to the childless William B. Smiths who raised her to adulthood. In the exodus from Nauvoo, Layton joined the Mormon Battalion in its march to California; then, after two years as a ranch hand, he sailed by way of Cape Horn for Liverpool.

Once again in his native England, Layton returned to the neighborhood of his youth. At Bedfordshire he married Sarah Martin and arranged passage to America for a company of sixty-six English Saints. Among the party were his widowed father, Samuel, who lived out his life in Kaysville; two nephews, Charles and Abraham Layton; his wife’s parents and eight other members of the Martin family; his wife’s friend Sarah Barnes (a sister of John R. Barnes), whom Layton married in 1852 as a plural wife; and the William Stewart and
William Foxley families. The Martins, Stewarts, and Foxleys spent a year and a half in the St. Louis area before heading for Salt Lake City in 1852.7

This recital of Christopher Layton’s travels illustrates the point that friendships and family ties established prior to settlement in Utah influenced the selection of a locality for settlement. Many of the English settlers preserved their unity in Kaysville. In selecting city lots they chose to congregate along west Center Street. William Allen’s own home occupied a lot just off Center Street, but at 300 East, on the opposite side of Main Street from his English compatriots.8 The English connection of Allen’s clients—and their friends—persisted throughout their lives and helps explain the geography of settlement in Kaysville.

**Kinship Ties**

Prior association based upon a shared national origin is but one factor toward an understanding of the William Allen high-style house clients. A second influence in their lives may tell even more about their social prominence and financial success. That factor is kinship. Several relationships by marriage, blood, and adoption have already been identified.

The actual extent of relationships among the clients is surprising. All but one of them can claim blood or marriage ties to one or more of the others. This web of interrelationships is summarized in fig. 1. The relationships center around client John R. Barnes. He is the father of a second client, John G. M. Barnes; father-in-law to a third, Henry H. Blood, who married John R.’s daughter Minnie; and brother-in-law to a fourth: John R. Barnes’s third wife, Emily Stewart Barnes (Minnie Blood’s mother), who was sister to client Hyrum Stewart. John R. Barnes was an uncle to a fifth and sixth client through his sister, Sarah Barnes, who was the fourth wife of Christopher Layton. Layton’s sons (by other wives) included John H. Layton and George W. Layton.

The seventh client, Thomas J. Smith, remained outside the Barnes-Blood-Stewart-Layton network. His parents, William A. and Nancy Anne Turner Smith, were not the Smiths who raised Christopher Layton’s oldest surviving child, Elizabeth Layton.

---

7Ibid., pp. 5-7, 11-13, 21-22, 33-34, 76, 79-82; Ivy Hooper Blood Hill, William Blood; His Posterity and Biographies of Their Progenitors (Logan, Ut.: J.P. Smith and Son, 1961), pp. 16, 19.

8See Joseph Barton’s 1872 map, “Kays Ward or Kaysville as it was Oct. 27, 1862,” and “Kaysville Historical Map,” both in Collett, Kaysville, pp. 42-43, 193-202.
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Galbraith. Layton’s Big Mound friends were William B. and Ann Barnes Smith (sister to client John R. Barnes and Sarah Barnes Layton).9

Just as John R. Barnes served as a pivot point in the kinship network of the clients, so did the Marriott name provide a second reference point in relationships (fig. 1). John Marriott (b. 1817) married into both the Stewart and Burton families, which tied the Marriotts to the Barnes and Blood families.

The relationships of the clients and their kin is summarized in fig. 1, where each family is referenced to every other family through blood lines or marriage (or both). The chart merely serves to summarize in general form the point that these families formed a complex network of kinship ties.

**Agritbusiness and Commerce**

Membership within one of these immigrant client families carried with it certain economic advantages and apparently some civic obligations or opportunities. The financial well-being of the families appears to stem from the successes, initially, of the first-generation immigrant, that is—except in one instance—the client’s father. The fathers often set the example in community service as well, both civic and ecclesiastical.

The stories of the founding fathers of these families read like those of entrepreneurs elsewhere. Making the most of opportunities in a new land and new community, through hard work, individual initiative, and creative enterprise, they built successful businesses. Mostly, these men engaged in commerce and in agriculture. They did not hesitate to employ others, both to assist the employee and to enlarge their own profits. Income not needed to support their extended families enlarged their agribusiness holdings.

Christopher Layton, once again, serves to illustrate. His biographers chronicle his life of enterprise in varied geographical settings. In his native England he worked first as a plowboy on a neighbor’s farm, then as a foreman on a larger farm. In Nauvoo, now married, Christopher joined John Marriott in several successful efforts.10

---

9 Relationships compiled from various Family Group Sheets in the LDS Genealogical Society. Also see Claude T. Barnes, *Toward the Eternal; or, The Life of John R. Barnes* (Salt Lake City: Ralton Co., 1954), pp. 20, 26-30.

10 McIntyre and Barton, *Christopher Layton*, pp. 5-13.
**Figure 1**

**Relationship of Client Families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Barnes</th>
<th>Blood</th>
<th>Stewart</th>
<th>Layton</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Burton</th>
<th>Marriott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>- x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Client Families

Note: A mark in the column indicates that the client, his wife, or his parents have a relative with the surname indicated. These relationships are generally close—a mother, sister, in-law, uncle/aunt, cousin, nephew/niece, or grandparent. For clients George and John Layton, the ties charted are through their father’s fourth wife (not their mother), and thus are removed by a step not usually encountered in genealogical tables outside Mormonism. The ties for John G. M. Barnes are not distinguished from those of his father, John Barnes; obviously they would be the same, but one step removed.

From this financial base Layton multiplied business involvements after he reached the Salt Lake Valley. As a resident first in Salt Lake’s Fifteenth Ward, he put men to work threshing grain. During the next two years he built and operated two butcher shops, selling to emigrants and turning the fat and tallow into soap and candles.
Layton traded his businesses for a farm in Grantsville in 1855, then traded that for cash and cattle to pioneer in Carson Valley. Back in Kaysville, he built up a large herd of sheep. With merchant William Jennings (a friend from Carson Valley days) he fattened and sold worn-out freight oxen. He also set up a butcher shop. When Brigham Young encouraged the establishment of local co-ops, Layton invested in the enterprise and became one of its directors. He served one term as a director of ZCMI. He and Jennings built a gristmill later sold to son-in-law William W. Galbraith.

As he was able to do so, Layton increased his holdings of farmland. He purchased one of the first reapers in Utah and was a pioneer in establishing alfalfa in the state. He expanded his dry-farming operation to a thousand acres and purchased a thresher and three headers. In addition, by 1874 he was operating two hundred acres of irrigated farmland and grazing two thousand head of sheep. Wool from his herd was traded to the Brigham City Cooperative Woolen Factory for flannel, linsey, and yarn, which his wives turned into dresses, jeans, sheets, and stockings for the family. In 1874 he began raising, buying, and selling thoroughbred horses. Mules purchased in St. Louis were used on the dry farms or hitched to freight wagons filled with oats for army teams at Fort Bridger or flour for Montana.

Layton was involved in other efforts that helped develop Utah, including construction of the telegraph and wagon roads through Kaysville and Weber Canyon. When developers organized the Utah Central Railroad and, later, the Utah Southern Railroad Companies, Layton contracted to furnish timber for bridges and trestles.

In the 1860s and '70s Layton established an independent Kaysville mercantile store, operated a flour mill at Payson, became a major stockholder in the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company, and helped organize a mercantile business in Layton known as the Farmers' Union.

Through this extensive business empire Christopher Layton supported his families from nine marriages and offered employment for many of his descendants and others in central Davis County. His sons John Henry and George Willard, clients of architect William Allen, were beneficiaries of that effort. John was a prominent farmer.
in west Layton, where he raised cattle, sheep, and hogs and produced barley, hay, and sugar beets. He was an organizer and director of the First National Bank of Layton (an outgrowth of the Farmers' Union), a director in the Ellison Ranching Company, and a stockholder in Farmers' Union, Layton Sugar Company, Davis and Weber Counties Canal Companies, and Kays Creek Irrigation Company. George’s eighty-two acre farm in west Layton provided the base for his livestock and grain operation. Like his half-brother, George was a key stockholder in Layton Sugar Company and Ellison Ranches. He served as president of the First National Bank of Layton.

John R. Barnes began with fewer resources than Layton and built his financial base through agriculture, commerce, industry, and banking. To supplement his income as a young farmer and part-time schoolteacher, Barnes helped his wife braid straw for hats that she made and sold. One of his students, Emily Stewart, became his third wife. He sold shoes for Emily’s father, shoemaker William Stewart, and then joined in a partnership with Stewart in a tannery. Known as Barnes and Stewart, the enterprise continued in operation until 1869. He also operated the post office for six years in the mid-1860s. When the Kaysville cooperative was organized he merged his store with three other merchants (one of them Henry H. Blood’s father, William). Barnes became ZCMI store superintendent, secretary, and treasurer. His brother-in-law, Christopher Layton, was president. When the cooperative was discontinued Barnes acquired the store and involved his son in its operation.

From this financial base Barnes expanded his investment. He was a partner with Christopher Layton, E. P. Ellison, and others in the Davis and Weber Counties Canal in 1881; founded Barnes Banking company in 1902 (with his son John G. M. as manager); and was associated with the Kaysville Milling Company, organized two years later. The Barnes Block commercial-office complex designed by William Allen and built on the corner of Main and Center streets in Kaysville in 1909-10 housed the mercantile store, post office, and Barnes Bank. His financial prowess won Barnes an appointment from LDS church president Lorenzo Snow to serve with George Romney, L. S. Hills, and David Eccles as a committee to advise solutions to church financial problems: they suggested the issuance

---

15 Ibid., January 12, 1944.
of bonds, which was done. Barnes served at various times as a director of the Deseret National Bank, ZCMI, and Home Fire Insurance—all companies owned by the church.16

Beneficiaries of the Barnes inheritance included both his son John and son-in-law Henry H. Blood. John G. M. Barnes began, as did his father, on the farm; he helped develop the family's dry-farm. He became a store worker in his father's mercantile business at age fourteen. In his early forties John G. M. assisted his father in establishing canning and milling companies. He was president of the Utah Canning Association and served as a director of the National Canning Association. He helped organize an irrigation company, was involved in the family banking business, and served as vice-president of the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company. Barnes founded the short-lived Utah Fruit Juice Company in an effort to produce grapes and cherries on dry-farms. About 1890 he helped organize the Kaysville Brick and Tile Company, then sold his interest to others. At his death Barnes was vice-president of the family bank and director of John R. Barnes Company, Kaysville Canning Company, Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company, and Home Fire Insurance Company. His business interests built directly upon the base established by his father.17

It was Henry H. Blood's marriage to Minnie A. Barnes in 1896 that eventually introduced him into the local business community. Blood, the Kaysville farm boy who became Utah's seventh governor, was for a time—like his father-in-law John R. Barnes—a teacher. Blood taught at the Brigham Young College in Logan in 1904. He returned to Kaysville the following year for a job at his in-laws' newly organized Kaysville Milling Company. Henry served as secretary, treasurer, and manager, and eventually became the firm's president. He was also a director in the John R. Barnes Corporation, Layton Sugar Company, ZCMI, and Barnes Bank. He was a vice-president in the bank and in Ellison Ranches. In 1912 he joined with John R. Barnes and John R. Gailey in purchasing the year-old Weekly Reflex to prevent the newspaper's founder from moving it from the community. Ownership remained in Kaysville for fifty-three years.18

The other two clients fit a similar pattern of agriculture and commerce. Hyrum Stewart, son of shoemaker William Stewart and

16Collett, Kaysville, pp. 32-33, 55, 94-98, 108, 110-12, 388; Barnes, Life of John R. Barnes, pp. 31, 38, 44-48, 52, 64-65; Deseret News, January 22, 1919.
17Collett, Kaysville, p. 113; Deseret News, July 27, 1932.
William Allen's Clients

brother-in-law of John R. Barnes, was both a farmer and merchant. He worked on his father's farm and got involved in the mercantile business at age eighteen, when the cooperative movement was beginning in Utah. He and his brother Charles T. Stewart bought out Christopher Layton's independent mercantile store, and after Charles's death, Hyrum took on other partners to keep the enterprise going until the 1930s, a decade after Stewart's death. Stewart operated the Kaysville post office in his store, serving as postmaster between 1879 and 1890. At one time he also owned the Kaysville grist mill established by Christopher Layton and William Jennings.19

Thomas J. Smith was a lifelong farmer, stockman, and orchardist, retiring just five years before his death in 1927. He arrived in Kaysville in the late 1860s, a youth of about ten. This relatively late arrival, together with his dissimilar English roots—he was born in Liverpool—and his marriage to a North Carolina-born wife, all isolated him from other client families. Nonetheless, he served as a director of the Kaysville Irrigation Company and of the First National Bank of Layton.20

COMMUNITY SERVICE

A measurement of civic involvement reveals among the client families an equally impressive contribution. The names Barnes, Blood, Stewart, and Layton dominate Kaysville City political office. During Kaysville's first seventy-two years, representatives of one or more of these families (including in-laws) were participating in city government in 80 percent of the administrations.

Among the clients themselves, four served on the city council and three of those as mayor. John R. Barnes sat on the first city council in 1868 and continuously for five terms through 1882. His term as mayor came during 1916-18, shortly before his death. John G. M. Barnes served four years on the council in the 1890s, two terms as mayor at the turn of the century, and another three terms as mayor from 1922 to 1928. Henry H. Blood sat on the council during John G. M. Barnes's first mayorship and was a councilman again during 1910-12. (His father, William Blood, had served as the first city treasurer, later as a justice of the peace.) Hyrum Stewart moved from one term on the city council during 1886-88 to three as mayor, then returned for a final term on the council in 1908. It was during

Stewart's years as mayor, 1888-96, that William Allen was hired to design a city hall, built at 362 North 300 West.21

Although the Layton family clients did not serve in local government, the family was represented on the Kaysville City Council through 1940 by family members Christopher Layton, Jr., William L. Galbraith, George Swan, Frank L. Layton, and R. Ole Layton. These men served a combined total of twenty-one years on the council and Swan one year as mayor. In the Blood family, additional council representatives during this same period were William H. Blood, John H. Blood, George H. Blood, and Ernest C. Blood, who together contributed twenty years of service. Richard W. Barnes, George W. Barnes, and Herbert J. Barnes together served a dozen years on the council, Richard a partial term as mayor, and George a full term.22

Political service beyond city hall was concentrated in the Barnes and Blood families. John R. Barnes participated in the Utah Constitutional Convention of 1895 and served in the first state senate. His son, John G. M. Barnes, active in Democratic party politics, was a delegate to that party's national convention in 1900 and again in 1924. He served in the Utah State Senate from 1901 to 1903.23 Democrat Henry H. Blood, a member of the Kaysville School Board, was one of four leaders in the school consolidation movement in Davis County. He served as first president of the new Davis County Board of Education organized in 1911. Between then and his election as Utah's seventh governor in 1932, he served two terms as Davis County treasurer, as clerk of the state senate, a member of the State Utilities Commission, and chairman of the State Road Commission. As governor of Utah from 1933 to 1940, he was known for his conservative fiscal policy while expediting federal New Deal programs. He was chairman of the executive committee of the Western Governors' Conference and involved in Colorado River projects.24 Christopher Layton also served in the legislature.

Those clients who gave time to public service were the ones most likely to be invited to provide leadership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The combined service of Christopher Layton, John R. Barnes, and Henry H. Blood in the Kaysville

21Compiled from information in Collett, Kaysville, pp. 83, 109, 214-16.
22Ibid., pp. 214-16.
23Ibid., p. 100.
24Ibid., pp. 100, 139, 155.
bishopric spanned a half-century. Layton was called as bishop of the Kaysville Ward in 1862. When he accepted a calling in the presidency of the newly organized Davis Stake in 1877, his replacement was Peter Barton, who chose John R. Barnes as his first counselor. This bishopric remained in office for thirty years. In 1907 Henry H. Blood replaced Barton as bishop. When the stake was divided in 1915, Blood left the bishopric to become president of the North Davis Stake. He served until 1937, through his first term as governor. At the end of his gubernatorial service in 1941 Blood accepted an appointment as president of the LDS California mission but died in 1942.

Layton supervised completion of the first meetinghouse in 1863, an adobe building designed by Truman O. Angell. Blood was bishop when the decision was made in 1911 to build the Kaysville Tabernacle. William Allen designed the structure; John R. Barnes donated $6,000 toward the $30,000 local share; and bricks were purchased from Simon Bamberger’s Kaysville Brick Company organized three years earlier. Blood and Barnes were involved together in another church building during 1917-19 when Blood presided over the North Davis Stake. The John R. Barnes Seminary, built adjacent to Davis High School, was funded equally by the Barnes family and the two stakes whose students attended the school. It was built as a memorial to Barnes, who died six months before the construction began.

The names of the other clients do not appear as leaders in local church rosters. Some of them, Hyrum Stewart and George W. Layton, held positions in the ward. John H. Layton, John G. M. Barnes, and Thomas J. Smith apparently did not participate actively in local church leadership positions.

Taken as a whole, the client families compiled an impressive record of service to their church and community. They contributed substantially to the area’s economic development and left a numerous posterity who continue as active participants in Kaysville’s and Layton’s social, political, religious, and economic life. The British origin of these families has been forgotten by their neighbors, but the impressive homes built for them by William Allen stand as reminders of their accomplishments.

---

25Barton's high-style home, one mile southwest of Kaysville, was designed by Allen. It was built in 1883 and razed about 1983.

Standing before his newly completed house in Mount Pleasant, John Henry Seely could well be proud of his accomplishments during the preceding decade. Starting with little more than his own initiative, he had built up a thriving livestock business, and now, in the summer of 1890, he found himself one of the community's most wealthy and influential citizens. Realizing that the key to success in the rapidly expanding sheep industry lay in improving the wool yield of his herds, Seely had journeyed to California in the early 1880s...
Rebuilding the Sanpete Valley

to purchase several purebred Rambouillet rams. Through selective breeding and careful management he developed well-graded herds that earned him a reputation well beyond his Sanpete Valley home. In 1887, with his enterprise flourishing, he had begun work on a fashionable new house for his family—a house whose scale and appointments would be commensurate with his rising social and economic expectations.

Finished three years later, the house represented the extensive remodeling of a dwelling that Seely had purchased from Jens Meilnig, owner of the Mount Pleasant brickyard (fig. 1). Meilnig had constructed the original house between 1870 and 1875, and its gable roof, restrained Greek Revival decoration, and geometrical composition were typical features of Sanpete Valley architecture at the time. Confronting his own building task, Seely rejected the prevailing style and turned instead for inspiration to newer Victorian designs he had become acquainted with during visits to Salt Lake City and through the ever-growing number of magazines and pattern books devoted to cultivating architectural taste in the general American public. The result was an essentially new house (fig. 2), and one with a low-pitched roof, a Renaissance Revival corner tower, and a fancy two-story neoclassical entrance portico, all contained within an irregular and highly ornamented format. The contrast between Seely’s completed house and the one he purchased from Meilnig—and, for that matter, most of the other houses in Mount Pleasant in 1890—is significant, for it signals an important turning point in the architectural history of the Sanpete Valley.

The John H. Seely house, for all its apparent modishness, must be understood as but a small trickle in what would become a flood tide of new building in the valley after 1890. This massive rebuilding effort, fueled to a great extent by a boom in the local livestock industry, found Victorian-era styles like Queen Anne, Eastlake, and Romanesque Revival (often employed in a highly eclectic fashion)


2 There is some likelihood that the Provo architect Richard Watkins could have been involved in designing the Seely house. Watkins is known to have worked in Mount Pleasant during the 1880s and 1890s and is known for his eclectic designs. Most Victorian buildings south of Provo are attributed to Watkins. Much research remains to be done in assessing the contribution of the architectural profession to late nineteenth-century Utah architecture.

3 The Sanpete Valley was surveyed by the author during the winter of 1978-79. A windshield inventory yielded a total of 2,900 houses in eleven towns. Of this number, 836 were folk houses dating to the pre-1890 period and representing the initial building of the valley; 654, or about 22 percent, were constructed during the Victorian rebuilding of the valley between the years 1890-1910; the remaining houses, about 1,290, were built after 1910.
being used to replace and remodel an existing architecture firmly established in mid-century classicism. New styles had been seen in the valley before, particularly the Gothic Revival during the mid-1870s, but nothing could match the developments of the turn-of-the-century period. The movement of Victorian stylistic elements into the Sanpete builders' repertory was swift and complete; after 1890 few houses were built that did not betray the influence of the new aesthetic. Increased economic prosperity in the Sanpete Valley during the closing years of the century provided the impetus for a major surge in local building activity. Families had more money to put into house construction, and when they chose to build or remodel, they increasingly preferred Victorian designs over older traditional forms.

Despite its obvious proportions, the Victorian rebuilding of the Sanpete Valley—and rural Utah as a whole—has attracted little
attention from architectural historians. Most researchers have concentrated on the state's pioneer buildings and have treated the arrival of the Victorian styles with only passing interest. The sweeping changes of the late nineteenth century are nonetheless a fact of architectural life in Utah and need to be recognized not only for their own sake but for the light they may shed on earlier building practices as well. This essay, then, as an initial foray into the world of Utah Victorian architecture, has two objectives: first, to describe in detail the nature of architectural change in the Sanpete Valley during the years 1890 to 1910; and second, to place this change in architectural thinking within the larger context of Utah and Mormon history at the turn of the century. Why, that is, these particular buildings at this time? Neither task is without its own problems.

Because there is little scholarly precedent for the detailed study of Victorian architecture in Utah, and none at all for late nineteenth-century vernacular buildings, a considerable amount of new ground must be covered, particularly in the area of house types. It should be mentioned, however, that whenever possible, existing terminology has been employed and no attempt has been made to create a specialized local vocabulary. If architecture has been understudied, the turn-of-the-century period in the study of Utah history is plagued with the opposite problem—there has been considerable scholarly attention and consequently too much is taken for granted.

Marking as it does the end of Mormon isolation and independence, the year 1890 has customarily been viewed as a watershed date in Utah historiography. Before this time it is felt that life in Utah was determined by a set of Mormon communitarian values antithetical to those of the larger American culture. After 1890, if one accepts this argument, the Saints were forced by the United States government to abandon their own culture and to adopt the conventions of the mainstream society. Slowly, then, from about 1890 to 1920, Mormon Utah was "Americanized," and much of the history of the period has been written from the perspective of this "Americanization" paradigm. In looking at the Victorian rebuilding, it is tempting to follow this widely accepted form of explanation. Victorian style, after all, may be interpreted as the consummate expression of late nineteenth-

---

1. Major studies of Utah architecture deal almost exclusively with the early vernacular architecture of the state. The best treatment of Victorian-era buildings is found in Karl T. Haglund and Philip F. Notarianni, *The Avenues of Salt Lake City* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Historical Society, 1980).

century American materialism and its appearance as signaling the "rise of a national domestic architecture in Utah." However attractive such an explanation may be, it is nevertheless problematic for it ignores much of the historical evidence.

Whether it be in the study of Mormon farming or building, there is a tendency for historians to overstate both the actual distinctiveness of nineteenth-century Latter-day Saint culture and the degree to which this culture remained isolated from outside influences in the years before 1890. The anthropologist Michael Raber, in a fine if illusive study of agricultural production in the Sanpete town of Spring City during the nineteenth century, has demonstrated that the local farm economy was based upon the workings of the individual family farm, and not, as might be expected, on central planning and cooperative organization. In this case, there was nothing particularly "Mormon" about the way people farmed, and consequently, no need or room for accommodation after 1890. Raber’s work, among other things, suggests that Mormon society in the nineteenth century may indeed be more complex than previously thought and that any attempt to explain the Victorian rebuilding of Sanpete Valley between 1890 and 1900 as a simple shift from Mormon to American values may be both naive and specious. It is important to remember at the outset that the study of architectural history must begin in the study of the buildings themselves, for only after seeing what was actually built can one venture safely into the uncertain waters of historical explanation.

BUILDING AND REBUILDING

From the time of the first Mormon occupation in 1849, house building in the Sanpete Valley reflected the diversity of its incoming immigrant population. Early settlers in the valley clung tenaciously to the house types and construction techniques they had known in their previous homelands. There was nevertheless in evidence a degree of architectural consistency, for these immigrants, whether they came from Denmark, Rhode Island, or North Carolina, shared a basic design philosophy rooted in the revival of classical architectural concepts during the Renaissance. Slowly moving through

---

England during the seventeenth century, the American colonies during the late eighteenth century, and Scandinavia by the early nineteenth century, the classical aesthetic, characterized by formal composition, symmetry, and Greek decorative elements, had by the middle years of the nineteenth century become firmly established in western tradition, both at elite and folk levels of society. The cornerstone of the classical tradition was the free-standing detached house, a house composed of a self-contained geometric block that could have a variety of floor plan arrangements and facade treatments but was invariably symmetrical (fig. 3). The most common early house type in Sanpete Valley, and in Utah generally, was the hall-parlor type (fig. 4), a folk housing form consisting of two unequally sized rooms that is found widely through the British Isles and eastern United States. In Sanpete these houses had low-pitched gable roofs, and decorative flourishes were infrequent and generally in the Greek Revival style.

Such houses had been built by the Mormons in their eastern cities, and there has been some willingness on the part of architectural historians to see these structures—often called "Nauvoo-style"
houses—as distinctively Mormon. This argument is based on the idea that the settlement of Utah by the Mormons must be viewed as a rejection of American values—architectural and otherwise; and, therefore, once the Latter-day Saints reached the Great Basin they chose to “separate” themselves from the gentile world. This they did architecturally, not by creating a fundamentally new architecture (as did, for instance, the Shakers) but, rather, by simply retaining older mid-nineteenth-century Federal and Greek Revival styles and folk housing forms that harkened back to their midwestern experience and came, in time, in their conservativism and straightforward design, to symbolize such Mormon ideals as simplicity, practicality, and self-denial. A Mormon architectural “style” was fashioned, not of new forms, but by holding on to older ones.12

A casual survey of late nineteenth-century American architecture, however, clearly shows that classicism, forming as it did the backbone of the folk design aesthetic, persisted into the 1880s and 1890s, not just in Utah but in most rural areas of the United States, making it evident that there is nothing particularly unusual about finding these symmetrical houses in LDS western communities.13 Additionally, recent studies suggest that in Salt Lake City, the largest and most cosmopolitan of Mormon cities, post-Civil War Picturesque styles like the Second Empire, Italianate, and Gothic Revival were indeed popular; and a close inspection of rural Utah indicates that progressive architectural ideas and tastes were neither unknown nor avoided.14 By the late 1860s and early 1870s Sanpete Valley builders, like their counterparts in other Mormon communities, were becoming increasingly interested in the ornate irregularity of the emerging “picturesque.”

New ideas about building style filtered into the Sanpete Valley area both through first-hand experience and the architectural literature of the day. English and Welsh immigrants would have known something of the Gothic Revival from their homelands,15 and Sanpete residents frequently traveled to Salt Lake City where they

could have seen new houses being constructed in the Second Empire and Italianate styles. Increasingly important as a source for design ideas were stylebooks like Andrew Jackson Downing’s *The Architecture of Country Houses*, Gervase Wheeler’s *Rural Homes*, and William Ranlett’s *The Architect*. The stylebooks were not mail-order catalogs in the sense that prospective home builders could order complete sets of blueprints, but instead they consisted of general treatises on the nature of architectural taste and renderings of typical houses and house plans in the picturesque mode. While the stylebooks contained a variety of actual styles, all shared a basic commitment to the overthrow of what was perceived as the blandness of classicism.

A typical anticlassical diatribe is found in Henry W. Cleaveland’s 1856 *Village and Farm Cottages*.

Unfortunately the first impulses of ambition in building took a Greek direction. For a time in the earlier part of this century it was thought that almost every public structure must be Doric, Ionic, or Corinthian. Accordingly we have Grecian courthouses, custom houses, Grecian banks and churches, Grecian taverns and colleges and capitol. Nor was the rage confined to edifices of this description. Both city and country dwelling houses rose with huge columns at the end, largely consumptive of wood and paint. There is reason to believe that this folly has had its day.

To take the place of Grecian designs, stylebook writers proposed a new architecture based upon the studied application of medieval principles. If classical architecture was symmetrical, geometric, plain, and smooth, the picturesque was asymmetrical, irregular, ornate, and rough. Several styles, already mentioned above, were associated with the picturesque movement: the Gothic Revival, the Italianate, and the Second Empire. Houses in the Gothic Revival style were characterized by pointed arches, projecting wall dormers,
and applied scroll-cut wood decoration; those in the Italianate style had low-pitched hipped roofs, bracketed eaves, and encircling verandas; and Second Empire houses had “curvilinear” or mansard roofs and central pavilions. Picturesque styles surfaced in the Sanpete Valley by the early 1870s (fig. 5), a fact made evident by the appearance at that time of the cross-wing house, a popular dwelling form in the stylebook literature.

The cross-wing house consists of two intersecting wings placed in either a “T” or “L” configuration. One wing projects forward with its narrow end to the street, and the other stands off to the side and contains the main entrance. Decorative features are generally confined to the windows, raking cornice of the front-facade wing, and on the ubiquitous porch running along the face of the indented side wing. The cross-wing house was an English medieval vernacular type resurrected by the stylebook writers of the 1830s and 1840s. It was a convenient house for the period, for like the picturesque movement itself, it symbolized change but not radical change. Picturesque writers, however much they despised classicism, were hardly ready to accept visual chaos and in many instances merely dressed up older symmetrical house forms in new, fashionable clothes. Andrew Jackson Downing argued in his influential Cottage Residences not for irregularity and complexity for their own sake but for a design unified by an artistic balance between “two
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22The best treatment of the cross-wing house is found in Upton, “Pattern Books and Professionalism,” pp. 144-49. Because the American cross-wing differs from the English medieval form, Upton has chosen to call it the “bent” house.


irregular parts. The cross-wing house, composed as it was of two sections, exhibited the internal tension desired by picturesque writers while at the same time retaining a degree of geometric order and constraint. It was, that is, a new house, but it was comfortably new. The Peter Greaves house in Ephraim is a good example of the cross-wing house in Sanpete Valley.

Peter Greaves was born in Patterson, New Jersey, in 1837. His family moved west into Ohio and in the 1840s joined the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. After journeying to Utah in 1852 they lived in Provo until finally settling in Ephraim in 1856. Greaves was a carpenter and farmer but soon ventured into freighting produce to the mines in Nevada. By the 1870s he was actively engaged as a "buyer and shipper of wools, hides, and grain." He later became president of Andrews and Company, a shipping firm based in nearby Nephi. Between 1874 and 1875 he built a fashionable new house of local oolite limestone on Ephraim's main street (fig. 6). The house was unusually large, being two-and-one-half stories high, and had a typical cross-wing plan (fig. 7). Gothic Revival stylistic elements were employed on the outside. These included a steeply pitched gable roof, wall dormers, turned finials, and fancy scroll-cut bargeboards along the raking eaves. Although the Greaves house was one of a
number of cross-wing houses built in the valley before 1880, the new house form did not achieve widespread popularity until after 1890. Nevertheless, picturesque ideas made a significant contribution to the local building traditions.

From the late 1860s on, Sanpete Valley architecture is marked by a high degree of stylistic eclecticism. House builders, that is, continued to build folk forms—the hall-parlor house in particular—within the symmetrical compositional format, but they were more inclined at this time to mix decorative elements drawn from the Picturesque as well as the Classical styles. In this way, elements of the Gothic Revival and Italianate styles (the Second Empire was never locally popular) found their way into the builder's repertoire as details simply and rather inconspicuously incorporated into the prevailing symmetrical aesthetic. The building process was then one of mixing stylistic elements within an existing structure, an eclectic approach to design that is visible in the Behunnin-Beck house in Spring City.

In 1883 Isaac Behunnin, an early Sanpete Valley settler, constructed a large two-and-one-half-story stone house (fig. 8) in Spring City. Simon Beck, a successful woolgrower and prominent Spring City resident, purchased the house from Behunnin in 1887 for $1,200. The house is an interesting blend of old and new ideas. It has a traditional hall-parlor plan, and there is a T-extension to the rear which contained the original dining room, kitchen, and an office. The overall composition is classical in its symmetry, but features of several styles are found on the exterior. The distinctive wall dormers are traceable to Gothic Revival influences, as are the pronounced quoins at the corners. There are Italianate-inspired paired brackets along the cornice, and there remains a strong Greek Revival component in the entablature and cornice returns. The Behunnin-Beck house is certainly a composite design, but it is not an unconsidered or unfashionable one. It is, rather, a good example of the conservative articulation of style, a blending of the old—the house form and the Greek Revival decoration—with the new—the Gothic Revival and Italianate features.

27For other examples of the cross-wing type in the Sanpete Valley, see Carter, "Building Zion," pp. 173-82.
29National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form.
During the period from about 1875 to 1890, the Sanpete Valley experienced a healthy degree of architectural fluidity as builders experimented with picturesque decorative details and house forms. The cross-wing house, Gothic Revival dormers, and Italianate brackets are all signs of changing fashion in the valley in the years before 1890. The changes are subtle and inherently timid but are typical of the picturesque movement in general, for they follow the example of the stylebooks which were, for all their protestations to the contrary, relatively conservative documents. After 1890 the pattern of architectural experimentation continued in the valley but with far more dramatic results. The changes begun during the picturesque period were to reach fruition in the Victorian houses of the turn of the century.

The term "Victorian" is not meant here to refer to a single architectural style but rather to a time roughly between 1870 and 1910 when certain aesthetic concepts dominated in American architecture. Victorian thinking, representing an extension and elaboration of earlier picturesque ideas, placed great emphasis on irregularity,

---

complexity, variety, and ornamentation. Victorian houses were to be asymmetrical; they were to be composed of a number of complex and often disparate elements; they were to have highly textured and intricate wall surfaces and, above all, they were to be extravagantly decorated. The Queen Anne and Eastlake are the best known of the Victorian styles, although the Romanesque Revival and Neoclassical styles are also prominent during this period. The overriding emphasis on ornamentation for its own sake often caused stylistic purity to be sacrificed in the name of visual complexity. Consequently, the Victorian aesthetic was highly eclectic, with houses often betraying the influence of more than one style.

The Victorian styles were beginning to be seen in Salt Lake City by the early 1880s but generally did not make their presence felt in the rural areas of the state until after 1890. In the Sanpete Valley two houses were constructed between 1888 and 1890 that signal the arrival of the new architecture. One, the John H. Seely house in Mount Pleasant, has been discussed earlier; the other, built by James Crawford in Manti, followed closely on the heels of the Seely house and helped define the course that future house building would take in the valley.

In his 1898 biographical history of Sanpete County, W. H. Lever recorded that James Crawford, “one of Manti’s most reliable and enterprising citizens, has built for himself one of the finest modern residences in the City.” The Crawford house (fig. 9), built in 1890 at a cost of approximately $6,500, was located prominently on Main Street. It was designed by Kirkwood Cross, an architect from Provo about whom little is known. Cross’s concern for detail is evident in the precise building specifications for the house. “All works,” Cross noted, were “to be executed in the best most thorough and workman-like manner; according to the true intent and meaning of the drawings.” Furthermore, he warned that “all work, without exception, is to be delivered in a perfect and undamaged condition,” and the materials employed must be the “best of their kind and grade.”

The design itself was typically Victorian in its eclecticism.

---

32Gowans, Images of American Living, p. 399.
33W. H. Lever, History of Sanpete and Emery Counties (Ogden, Ut.: W. H. Lever, 1898).
34Kirkwood Cross’s specifications for the Crawford house are used courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. Morgan Dyreng, Manti.
Constructed of locally manufactured brick, the Crawford house successfully integrates both Queen Anne and neoclassical elements within a basically asymmetrical design. The house is perceived not as a single self-contained unit but as a number of visual planes beginning with the prominent front gable and receding to the rear in a series of porches, projecting bays, and roof lines. The house has a broad hipped roof interrupted by gables to the front and sides. Above the window in the front gable is found decorative fish-scale shingle siding, and there are heavy Romanesque lintels over the windows. The pedimented and columned front porch is essentially classical and contributes to the rich variety of the overall design. Like Seely in Mount Pleasant, James Crawford used the new Victorian architecture to underscore his prominence in the community. The house was set off from the community in size and also in its basic form and appointments. The Crawford house would remain the biggest house in Manti, but it was soon just one of a growing number of Victorian dwellings. The arrival of the new architecture was recorded in the appearance of hipped roofs, fish-scale shingled gables, leaded windows, and fancy milled porches and in the ascendency of the cross-wing house as the principal type of dwelling in the valley.

One of the earliest and finest examples of the Victorian cross-wing house was built in Mount Pleasant by N. S. Nielson, a Swedish immigrant who became a prosperous local merchant and woolgrower. The house (figs. 10 and 11) was built in two stages. The first
section was completed around 1890 and consisted of a simple cross-wing house with a minimum of ornament. By 1892, however, Nielson had finished remodeling the house, creatively combining various stylistic components within the basic cross-wing plan. Anchored firmly in the angle where the wings meet is a two-story square tower with a bell-cast mansard roof. This centrally located tower projects out from the plane of the wall and creates a small pavilion that contains the front entrance hall. The mansard roof displays a gently curving ogee profile and is topped by wrought-iron cresting. The tower gives the Nielson house a vaguely Second Empire flavor, yet so many other styles were incorporated into the final product that no single one dominates. The front porch, for instance, exhibits an interesting collection of neoclassical details, and there is a pedimented portico that projects out over the front entrance. At the corner is a circular Queen Anne porch with a conical roof supported by stylized Tuscan columns. The tympanum and frieze are enriched with applied decoration consisting of garlands on the frieze and a floral design within the closed pediment. There are also fine stained-glass windows as is typical of the Victorian period. Combining Queen Anne, Second Empire, and neoclassical elements against the unbalanced facade of the cross-wing, the Nielson house is an excellent example of the new aesthetic operating in the valley, an aesthetic that was carried over onto smaller, less pretentious houses.

Smaller versions of the cross-wing house were constructed in every Sanpete town during the turn-of-the-century period. These houses, often called “T-cottages” after the shape of their floor plan, replaced the small hall-parlor form as the most common dwelling for the middle-income population. The Enoch Jorgensen house in Ephraim (figs. 12 and 13), probably built sometime between 1893 and 1895, is a typical Sanpete T-cottage. The house has the basic cross-wing plan, and decorative features are confined to the forward facing gable wing and the flanking side porch. In this case, fish-scale shingling and a half-round window are found in the principal gable; there is a small bell-cast hood over the small front window and a spindled Eastlake porch along the facade.

At least as popular as the cross-wing was a house form that is characterized by a roughly square floor plan contained under a
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36 See Upton, “Pattern Books and Professionalism,” p. 149.
37 It is difficult to date this house precisely. Enoch Jorgensen purchased the lot in 1893 for $100.00 and sold it two years later to Charles Stevens for $500.00; the jump in value suggests that this small house may have been erected between 1893 and 1895.
pyramid or slighted hipped roof with projecting gables. This dwelling type—-noted earlier in the Crawford house—is invariably asymmetrical, with the front door placed to one side of a forward projecting bay. This house form is found in a variety of sizes and floor plans and simply for convenience is here called the pyramid house,
after its basic shape and roof type. The history of this house type is obscure, but in its various configurations it is highly visible in the architectural pattern books of the late nineteenth century. The greatest number of the larger pyramid houses have a side-passage or lobby-entry floor plan, an example of which is the John Dorius, Jr., house in Ephraim.

John Dorius, Jr., was a successful merchant and entrepreneur who in 1897 completed a fine Queen Anne style home in Ephraim (figs. 14 and 15). The plan of the house reveals four rooms—the parlor, dining room, study, and entrance lobby—contained under the main pyramidal roof and a kitchen wing housed beneath a rear gable extension. The house is a full two stories. The steeply pitched roof is punctuated at the top by an octagonal cupola, at the front by a projecting gable, and at the corner by a conical porch tower. There is shingle decoration in the gable, and the porch is a mixture of Eastlake spindling and neoclassical details.

Another pyramidal-type house with lobby-entry plan is the Andrew Christensen house in Fairview (figs. 16 and 17). Constructed around 1900 for Christensen, a mining entrepreneur and wool grower, the house has a small entry containing the stairs, and again,
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40 Biographical information on Andrew Christensen supplied by Mr. Sherrill Anderson, Fairview.
the parlor is located directly to the side. The house is one-and-one-half stories high and has an extremely steep pyramid roof and side-projecting gables. The design is highly eclectic, with the classical cornice and pedimented returns contrasting with (but also complementing) such Victorian elements as the round, rusticated vestibule window, the heavy rusticated arched windows on the main gable windows, the bell-cast porch with bracketed and dentiled frieze, and the exotic eyebrow dormer in the roof. The Christensen house is strongly reminiscent of a group of houses built during the same period in Utah Valley, and it could have been designed by a yet-to-be-identified Provo architect.41

Most pyramidal-type dwellings were of the smaller cottage variety, as seen in the Lawrence Tuttle house in Manti (figs. 18 and 19). Lawrence Tuttle was the son of Luther Tuttle, a wealthy Manti merchant. The house, built around 1907, was most likely inspired by a house pattern book, because several similarly constructed houses were built in the valley during this time.42 The house is one-and-one-half stories high and has a pyramid roof with side-projecting gables. The forward-projecting section consists of an octagonal bay with octagonal roof and heavy rusticated lintels over the windows.

41Approximately 40 similar houses have been identified in Utah, Sanpete, and Sevier counties by Roger Roper, historian in the preservation research section of the Utah State Historical Society.
42Biographical information on Luther Tuttle was supplied by Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Tuttle, Manti.
One interesting variant of the pyramid house form lacks a formal entrance lobby. The direct-entry subtype is represented by the Archibald Livingston house in Manti (figs. 20 and 21). Livingston, originally from Salt Lake City, worked as a miner in Park City and Eureka before buying a farm and settling down in Manti in 1902. In 1911 he built a new house for his family. It had a slightly hipped roof, projecting bays, and neoclassical trim. Instead of entering through a small lobby, or vestibule, access to the house was directly into the front dining room. This direct-entry type of pyramid house was popular in Sanpete Valley during the late nineteenth century and is usually associated with smaller, less pretentious dwellings.

In addition to the many new houses put up at this time, evidence of the magnitude of the Victorian rebuilding is visible in the sharp rise in the number of older houses that were remodeled. The greatest number of remodelings took the form of adding a cross-wing section to an existing rectangular-plan house. The most spectacular Victorian addition is found on the Jacob Johnson house in Spring City (fig. 22). Johnson was born in 1847 in Aalborg, Denmark. His parents joined the Mormon church and emigrated to Utah in 1854, living first in the city of Ogden. As a young man in the 1860s Johnson traveled to California to study law and lived in various Nevada

---

Footnotes:
43 County Plat records indicate that Livingston purchased the lot in 1911.
44 For an example see Carter, "Building Zion," p. 179.
45 National Register of Historic Places Inventory Form, June 1978.
mining towns before moving back to Utah in 1872 to establish a law practice in Spring City. At that time he built the original section of the house, a two-story, hall-parlor dwelling with Greek Revival trim. Johnson’s career advanced in the 1880s; he became a county attorney, a banker, a merchant, a woolgrower, and in 1895 district judge. In 1892 he built a large Queen Anne style addition to his 1872 house. It dwarfed the original house. Though its true identity is partially concealed by its proximity to the older section, it is essentially a lobby-entrance pyramidal form. The new section is a study in contrast to the original house. Its prominent Queen Anne tower has a conical roof and a band of decorative fish-scale shingling. Also, there is a distinctive bell-cast roof dormer and an elaborate neoclassical porch. The house was built of stone and plastered to resemble smooth-coursed ashlar.

The changes recorded here in the valley’s architecture were indeed sweeping, but they were certainly not complete. The older folk housing tradition lingered on, albeit with the inclusion of more modern decorative elements. The Graham house in Fairview is ill-
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lustrative of such an up-dated older house type (figs. 23 and 24). Built around 1900, the house consists of a hall parlor plan attached to what may be the original single-cell section at the rear. At the corner, and integral to the 1900 design, is a fine Queen Anne tower with a flared conical roof and bands of shingling and rusticated stone. The unusual circular window is similar to that found on the Albert Christensen house and may indicate a common design source.

**THE REBUILDING AND LOCAL HISTORY**

Several conclusions about the architectural development of the Sanpete Valley may be drawn from this survey of late nineteenth-century housing styles and types. First, since domestic building practices here closely approximate those found in other rural areas of the United States, it is evident that no particular “Mormon” style emerged in local house design. In fact, quite the reverse was true, and
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47 This house appears to have been built about 1900 by George W. Graham. Plat records indicated that Graham received the lot in 1897 from his father’s estate and probably built the house shortly thereafter.

*Figs. 23 and 24. The George W. Graham house, ca. 1900, Fairview. Photograph by Peter L. Goss. The hall-parlor plan included a Queen Anne corner turret. The shaded portion denotes the original one-room with a lean-to house (8/28/84).*
Sanpete architecture was characterized during the 1870s and 1880s by a wide variety of immigrant building forms and post-Civil War decorative styles. There were exceptions—some houses were designed to accommodate plural wives and thus become distinctively Mormon contributions to the landscape; and a certain time lag existed—often styles took some time in getting from the cultural centers of the East out to the Sanpete Valley. Yet, on the whole, valley carpenters were not unaware of fashion and worked hard to create functional and pleasing houses within the bounds of an essentially conservative designing tradition.

Second, the survey demonstrates that after 1890 changes in architectural style came more quickly and became more substantive. The initial architectural complexion of the valley was firmly established in folk housing forms and the Greek Revival style. Picturesque ideas were in circulation by the late 1860s and early 1870s as isolated instances of the cross-wing house and more generally as Gothic Revival and Italianate stylistic trim applied to essentially symmetrical houses. By the late 1880s, however, a truly radical attack on existing practice was taking shape; and soon intricate, asymmetrical, and highly ornate Queen Anne, Eastlake, and Victorian Eclectic houses were springing up throughout the valley. During the period from 1890 to 1910 the architectural landscape created by the first settlers was dramatically and irrevocably altered. The valley was for all intents and purposes rebuilt during these years.

Description allows the historian to see what was done, but description is not explanation. It is not enough to know that the architecture of Sanpete Valley changed significantly at the turn of the century and that certain building styles and types were replaced by certain other styles and types. The important question remains unanswered: why this change? It is possible to interpret the Victorian rebuilding as but another facet of the larger Americanization of Mormon society—the change in architectural style, that is, symbolizing the Mormon acceptance of secular American values and housing forms. Yet the artifactual evidence does not support this explanation. Beyond building, as their leaders directed, “substantial houses” of brick and stone, there is no indication that Sanpete Saints demonstrated an interest in piecing together an architectural identity based on shared stylistic principles. Collective energies were directed elsewhere—for example, toward erecting the monumental temples...
that could more effectively serve as symbols of the Mormon western kingdom.

Another available explanation for the architectural changes of the late nineteenth century is found in the end of isolation. The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad pushed its tracks through Thistle Canyon into the Sanpete Valley in 1891. In 1893 the Sanpete Valley Railroad, a narrow gauge line that had been originally constructed in 1881 to connect the coal fields at Wales with Nephi, was changed to standard gauge and extended to Manti.\(^{48}\) W. H. Lever, in his 1898 history of the county, noted with a touch of hyperbole that “the railroads opened the dormant channels of trade, established new telegraphic service and express delivery, and placed every colony [town] of the county on the great highway of commercial prosperity.”\(^{49}\) Certainly the arrival of the railroads served to stimulate the economy and bring valley residents closer to the outside world. Yet, without discounting its influence, it is important to remember that even before the coming of the railroad, mobility within the Mormon region was high. Freighting between Sanpete and Nevada and Salt Lake City had been a fact of local life since the 1860s, and imported goods and services were certainly not unknown. Before the completion of the Manti Temple in 1888 the Saints had traveled regularly to Salt Lake City to perform certain services and rituals important in the religion, undoubtedly bringing back news of the latest fashions. Before 1890 the valley was not completely cut off from the rest of the state; people there were indeed aware of developments in home economy and architecture. Although inherently conservative, Sanpete builders nevertheless demonstrated a willingness to experiment with the cross-wing house and the Gothic Revival style, and it seems likely that the railroad, rather than initiating a dialogue with the outside, stimulated and intensified a relationship that had been going on since the first days of settlement.

The symbolic end of Mormon kingdom-building and the actual arrival of the railroad are factors that must be taken into account in any explanation of the Victorian rebuilding. It is impossible to deny that in 1890 the Sanpete Valley was ripe for change. However, one ingredient in the process, which may be seen as the catalyst for change, has consistently been ignored, and, rather simply, this was money. After 1890 Sanpete Valley residents were wealthy enough not
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\(^{48}\) Lever, History of Sanpete and Emery Counties, pp. 42-44.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p. 36.
merely to contemplate change but to actually effect it. The money that financed the rebuilding came from a major upturn in the local economy precipitated by a boom in the sheep industry.

The first Utah sheep herds were trailed west with the Mormon pioneers in 1847. Though the LDS church leaders encouraged the development of an indigenous woolen industry as part of a program of self-sufficiency and home production, the industry lagged behind expectations because herds remained small and of marginal breeding quality. After 1870 several factors contributed to the rapid expansion of sheep ranching in Utah. First, it was discovered that the state’s climate and geography were ideal for establishing a summer-winter system of range management. During the summer herds could graze on the high mountain grasses and then, when winter snows arrived, the sheep could be moved down to the lower desert country. This system, coupled with the availability of vast tracts of public grazing land, made a significant increase in herd size possible. Second, in 1869 the Utah Territorial Legislature acted to aid the flagging sheep industry by abolishing taxes on sheep and appropriating public funds for the improvement of breeds. Third, the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 opened up eastern markets to Utah wool and mutton. And finally, the general ending of Indian hostilities in 1870 opened up sizeable new sections of land for grazing. The take-off year for the industry was about 1870, but it was not until the late 1880s and 1890s that the full effects of the boom were felt in Utah communities.

A sense of how rapidly the livestock business expanded may be grasped from the figures for the size of Utah sheep herds. In 1885 there were about one million head of sheep in the state. By 1900 this number had jumped to 3,818,000. The increase was particularly evident in the Sanpete Valley. W. H. Lever wrote in 1898, “In the production of wool and mutton this county leads, not only in Utah, but in the entire United States, no other county having so many as a half-million sheep.” The impact of the livestock boom on the valley’s economy and life-style was significant, as Charles Peterson and Linda Speth have noted in their history of the Wasatch-Cache National Forest: “It is apparent that growth in the sheep industry
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52Lever, History of Sanpete and Emery Counties, p. 36.
after 1890 was in many respects a matter of internal development. One way or another, this development touched the lives of thousands of Utahns and became a major source of wealth among them.\footnote{Peterson and Speth, "A History of the Wasatch-Cache National Forest," pp. 183-84.}

The Victorian rebuilding of the Sanpete Valley, then, must be viewed against the larger backdrop of social and economic change in the area during the turn-of-the-century period. As new wealth was injected in the Sanpete communities, residents channeled a portion of their incomes into house building. Because there was a long tradition of architectural experimentation in the valley, it was natural that contemporary Victorian styles—the popular styles of the day—were used for both new houses and remodeling of older ones. These styles symbolized financial success and an awareness of fashion just as surely as earlier classical and picturesque designs had done in their own time. Such evidence suggests that rebuilding, despite its proportions, may in fact represent more of a change in style than in content. That is, it is possible to see the rebuilding as part and parcel of an existing cultural tradition, rather than the product of a new and foreign set of values. Victorian housing became popular in the Sanpete Valley for many of the same reasons it was accepted in other parts of the country. It was new, it was aesthetically satisfying, and it presented the family with comfortable, specialized internal living spaces.

In short, the architectural changes that engulfed rural Utah during the late nineteenth century must be understood first of all in terms of specifically local economic conditions and, second, as part of a broadly changing pattern in the way Americans viewed the house as a functioning home. The study of Victorian architecture in Utah is just beginning, but if researchers are willing to probe beneath the level of style and avoid facile explanation, the results of this work should make a significant contribution to the collective understanding of life in Utah at the turn of the century.
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