

Cottonwood Heights
Salt Lake County, Utah

**Selective/Standard Reconnaissance Level Survey
2024
Historic Subdivisions/Neighborhoods**



Final Report & Appendices

June 26, 2024

prepared for the
Cottonwood Heights Historic Committee

prepared by
Korral Broschinsky
Preservation Documentation Resource

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
SURVEY OBJECTIVES	3
SURVEY BOUNDARIES & STREET DESCRIPTIONS	4
Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision	4
Steffensen Heights Subdivision	4
Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons and Bradford Ranchos Subdivisions	5
Greenfield Village Subdivision	6
SURVEY METHODOLOGY	7
HISTORIC CONTEXTS FOR COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS' EARLY SUBDIVISIONS	9
Pre-Settlement Period	9
Fort and Canyon Settlement Period, 1848-1872	9
Mining, Industry and Homesteading Period, 1873-1895	10
Farms, Orchards and Summer Homes Period, 1896-1929	11
Depression Economy to Post-War Growth, 1930-1952	11
Subdivision Development and Growth, 1953-1982	12
Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision (1953-1965)	13
Steffensen Heights Subdivision, (1953-1976)	14
Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons, & Bradford Ranchos Subdivisions (1953-1964)	14
Greenfield Village Subdivision Phases (1953-1963)	15
Interstate Freeway, Commercial Nodes, & Luxury Homes Period, 1983 to Incorporation & Beyond	16
SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS & SUBDIVISION RECOMMENDATIONS	17
General Findings	17
Findings and Recommendations by Contextual Period & Subdivision/Neighborhood	17
Farms, Orchards and Summer Homes Period, 1896-1929	17
Depression Economy to Post-War Growth, 1930-1952	18
Subdivision Development and Growth, 1953-1982	18
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS	22
Further Reconnaissance Level Survey Work	22
Local Historic Landmark and Site Registers	22
National Register of Historic Places Nominations	23
<i>NRHP Historic District Nominations</i>	24
<i>Multiple Property NRHP Submission</i>	25
Intensive Level Surveys	25
Public Education & Community Outreach	26
SUMMARY	26
SELECTED RESOURCES	27
APPENDICES	28

INTRODUCTION

This Reconnaissance Level Survey (RLS) was conducted at the request of the Cottonwood Heights Historic Committee (CHHC). Korral Broschinsky with Preservation Documentation Resource performed the survey. Ms. Broschinsky is a qualified architectural historian under federal regulations 36 CFR Part 61, as required by the Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Cottonwood Heights was incorporated in January 2005. This RLS is the second large survey conducted within the municipal boundaries. The first survey was conducted in 2016 as a selective survey of all historic resources within the city limits built before 1953. That year the first subdivisions were platted in parts of unincorporated Salt Lake County that would later be included within the boundaries of Cottonwood Heights.

This second survey is based on one of the recommendations of the first survey: to prioritize historic subdivisions and include them in a future survey as resources became available. This 2024 survey uses a combination of selective and standard survey techniques. The CHHC selected the four earliest subdivisions in the city to be surveyed. A standard survey was conducted within each non-contiguous subdivision/neighborhood. This survey was conducted in accordance with the Utah SHPO's Standard Operating Procedures for Reconnaissance Level Surveys (Revised July 2023), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Bulletin 15, and federal regulations 36 CFR 60.

SURVEY OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this survey was to identify and evaluate historic resources for NRHP eligibility within the four earliest subdivision/neighborhoods in the City of Cottonwood Heights. The resources were primarily buildings as defined by the NRHP Bulletin 15 and the Utah SHPO. The secondary objectives of the survey were as follows:

- To identify candidate neighborhoods for a potential historic district listing on the National Register of Historic Places
- To identify candidate properties for further research, such as Intensive Level Surveys, to represent the subdivision/neighborhoods in a district nomination
- To continue to identify, evaluate, and enter historic properties into the Utah SHPO database of historic resources, following the recommendations of the 2016 survey, including gathering information for a potential Multiple Property Submission (MPS)
- To update records in the Utah SHPO database of historic resources previously entered within the Cottonwood Heights area that may overlap with the selected subdivision boundaries
- To provide information on historic resources as a preservation planning tool for zoning or building ordinances, economic development, state and federal tax credits for rehabilitation, etc.
- To contribute to the understanding of the history of the Cottonwood Heights area and to provide information on historic resources as an educational tool (e.g., historic walking or driving tours, markers, school programs, promotional material, etc.)

In order to stay within the budget of its Certified Local Government (CLG) grant, the CHHC four selected subdivisions and subsequent phases were platted between 1953 and 1962. They were identified using plat maps and other resources from Salt Lake County records. The vast majority of resources are residences built between 1953 and 1962. The current cutoff for NRHP eligibility is 1974; however the cut-off for NRHP eligibility in this survey was extended to 1979, in order to provide a buffer for buildings that will be 50-years old within a few years, as recommended by the Utah SHPO.

SURVEY BOUNDARIES & STREET DESCRIPTIONS

The City of Cottonwood Heights was incorporated on January 4, 2005. Prior to this time, the area within the municipal boundaries was part of a southeast bench section of unincorporated Salt Lake County. Cottonwood Heights has been nicknamed the “City between the Canyons” because the east boundary is between the Big Cottonwood and Little Cottonwood Creeks that flow from the namesake canyons. Map #1 shows the municipal boundaries and neighboring cities [see Appendix A, Maps]. The four selected subdivisions are within Cottonwood Heights municipal boundaries [Maps #1 & #2].¹ Because the subdivisions are being evaluated as potential NRHP historic districts, each non-contiguous subdivision/neighborhood was analyzed as a separate standard reconnaissance level survey. The boundaries for the four neighborhoods are presented in order of number of resources.

Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision

The Cottonwood Ridge subdivision was platted in 1953. It is the smallest of the four neighborhoods with only 34 parcels on approximately 8.9 acres. The parcels are arranged on both sides of Virginia Hills Drive (2715 East), which runs south to north near the intersection of Fort Union Boulevard (aka 7000 South) and 2700 East [Map #3]. This area was historically called the Butler Hill neighborhood as described in the historic contextual periods below. Three parcels have addresses on Fort Union Boulevard. The rest have addresses on Virginia Hills Drive, which features a chicane (traffic slowing jog) as it enters the subdivision from Fort Union Boulevard.

Virginia Hills Drive ends to the north in a cul-de-sac where two recent homes have been built. Halfway along Virginia Hills Drive is a side street, Pine View Drive (6895 South), that leads east to a 1990s subdivision. North of Pine View Drive is the soccer field of Mill Hollow Park, which is owned by the city of Cottonwood Heights. Behind the parcels on the west side of Virginia Hills Drive is the eponymous “ridge.” A meetinghouse of the Butler Hill Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS or Mormon Church) has frontage on Fort Union Boulevard. North of the rear church parking lot is undeveloped land [Map #3]. Building footprints and evaluations are shown on Map #4.

Steffensen Heights Subdivision

Steffensen Heights Subdivision was platted in 1953. It is a roughly square-shaped subdivision of approximately 37 acres originally divided into 96 parcels by four curvilinear streets. The south boundary street is an old street, now a main transportation corridor known as Bengal Boulevard (after the mascot for the high school to the west). On the 1953 plat map, Bengal Boulevard was labeled 7800 South. The historic name was Will Dyer’s Road. As a wide busy street, Bengal Boulevard provides a distinct southern boundary to the neighborhood.

¹ For a complete description of the municipal boundaries, see Survey Boundaries in the 2016 RLS report.

The straight east and west boundaries of the subdivision follow the rear property lines of the parcels on the curving roads, creating mostly irregular parcels. The north boundary of the subdivision is mostly straight at the rear of properties, but angles slightly north at the northwest corner, apparently following an existing drainage easement in 1953 [Map #5]. Some adjustments appear to have been made for the parcels in the northwest corner that differ slightly from the 1953 plat. Because the Steffensen Heights Subdivision is on the foothills of the nearby mountains. The topography slopes upward from the southwest to the northeast. The Steffensen Heights curvilinear streets are particularly distinct as each includes a knuckle or an eyebrow expansion of the street producing fan-like parcels.

There are eight addresses with frontage on Bengal Boulevard. South to north running Steffensen Drive enters the subdivision at 2730 East. After passing two side streets, Pamela Drive (7745 South within the subdivision), and 7715 South (Towne Drive, leading west to a later subdivision from the 1970s), Steffensen Drive angles to the northeast until it reaches the north boundary. There are 27 addresses on Steffensen Drive. West to east running Carole Drive (7630 South) begins in a *cul-de-sac* and intersects Steffensen Drive, before curving southward to become Dell Road (2800 East). There are 21 addresses on Carol Drive and 19 addresses on Dell Road. Where they meet is Cardiff Road (7660 South on the 1953 plat map), which leads to a 1970s subdivision to the east. North of Carole Drive is a mix of residences built in the 1980s to the early 2000s. At the south end, there are 24 addresses on Pamela Drive, which runs west to east before turning south at 2865 East toward Bengal Boulevard. Building footprints and evaluations are shown on Map #6.

Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons and Bradford Ranchos Subdivisions

This neighborhood included three contiguous subdivisions platted between 1954 and 1956. Because the street names continue from one subdivision to another and the housing stock is similar, the CHHC requested a standard survey of the multi-subdivision neighborhood [Map #7]. The neighborhood is the most rectilinear of the four neighborhoods and all streets are numbered rather than named. The transportation corridor of Fort Union Boulevard (7000 South) is north boundary of all three subdivisions. A few homes on Fort Union Boulevard, located between the subdivision boundaries, were included in the standard survey of the neighborhood.

The Cottonwood Heights Subdivision is the largest subdivision in the neighborhood. It was platted in 1954 and originally divided into 199 parcels on approximately 37 acres. A second Cottonwood Heights Subdivision plat later amended the original plat to include 224 parcels. The subdivision features three main north-south roads and eight shorter intersecting roads. The main entrance to the neighborhood at 2955 East quickly branches into two streets: 2930 East and 2985 East (curving to become 2980 East in the south half of the subdivision). These streets have intersections at 7230 South and 7320 South. The southern most street is 7375 South, which features a knuckle where it intersects with 2825 East and abuts the Johnson Subdivision. To the west, 7175 South and 7350 South connect the Cottonwood Heights plat to other 1950s to 1960s subdivisions. To the east, 7110, 7145, and 7180 South are part of a more self-contained extension that terminates at the 3080 East [Map #7]. The west boundaries of the subdivision align with the Johnsons Subdivisions (see below). The east and south boundaries connect to later subdivisions with housing mostly from the 1970s and 1980s.

At the north end of the two phases of the Johnsons Subdivision included in this survey, two streets enters the neighborhood from Fort Union Boulevard: 2825 East is perfectly straight while 2870 East includes a gentle chicane. These streets are integrated into the south half of the Cottonwood Heights Subdivision. Johnsons Subdivision 3 along 2870 East is divided into 34 parcels. Johnsons Subdivision 4 along 2825 East has 33 parcels. Each phase includes approximately 9.5 acres of land. These subdivisions are not related to earlier Johnsons Subdivision plats 1 and 2.

The Bradford Ranchos Subdivision, platted in 1954, is located in the northeast corner of the neighborhood. This subdivision is approximately eight acres and is divided into 27 lots. The largest lot is the location of the original farmhouse for the area. Bradford Ranchos consists of four streets: Fort Union Boulevard, 7070 South, 3000 East and 3050 East. For many years, both 3000 East and 3050 East provided access from Fort Union Boulevard (with modest chicanes), but because 3000 East was only slightly offset from the busy 3000 East intersection to the north, it was blocked for pedestrian traffic only in 1998. Bradford Ranchos Subdivision borders the Cottonwood Heights Subdivision to the west and south. To the east, is a later subdivision from the 1990s. Building footprints and evaluations for this multi-subdivision neighborhood are shown on Maps #8, #8a, and #8b.

Greenfield Village Subdivision

The multiple phases of the Greenfield Village Subdivision makeup the largest neighborhood in this survey. The survey boundaries include six phases of the subdivision platted between 1953 and 1960. The neighborhood is approximately 205 acres divided into 371 parcels [Map #9]. Of the four subdivisions included in this survey, Greenfield Village has the most distinctive boundaries, which is why non-contiguous Greenfield Village phases were not included.² Building footprints and evaluations for this neighborhood are shown on Maps #10, #10a, #10b, and #10c.

The south boundary is Fort Union Boulevard (7000 South), the city's main east-west corridor. The south edge of Greenfield Village follows the slight northwest to south east angle of the preexisting Fort Union Boulevard. The east boundary is the main north-to-south corridor in the city, Highland Drive (2000 East). Decades before the first subdivision plat in 1953, the intersection of 7000 South and 2000 East was considered the busiest in the area. It was known historically as Colebrook Corner. The six contiguous phases of Greenfield Village created a roughly fan-shaped neighborhood. The bottom point of the fan is at the intersection, but not included in the subdivision phases. One large parcel with 7000 South frontage was designated for commercial use in the 1960 plat phase. The north boundary of the neighborhood was constrained by the historic path of the East Jordan Canal, which runs northeast to southwest, providing the curve of the top of the fan shape. While the canal provided a subtle boundary to the neighborhood, the route of Interstate 215, Salt Lake County's belt route, completed in 1987 solidified the neighborhood's north limits. A planned unit development (PUD) of several homes was built along Meadow Downs Way facing the freeway in the early 2000s and was not included in this survey. Beginning in 1956, the west boundary of Greenfield Village was the Mountainview Elementary School property. The school was demolished in 2011 and the acreage converted into Mount View Park. Fort Union Boulevard is located along a ridge in this area. The city park and most of the Greenfield Village neighborhood are located below the boulevard. The land slopes gently upward so the eastmost properties are level with Highland Drive.

Several of the longest streets in the neighborhood curve dramatically creating parcels with "East" and "South" addresses on the same street: Meadow Downs Way, Meadow Drive, Brookhill Drive, Village Green Road, and Village Green Road. Greenfield Way is one of the main streets through the entire neighborhood but features only "South" addresses. Cloverdale Road runs parallel to Fort Union Boulevard. Shorter streets include: Willow Way, Springbrook Way, Kim Way, Brook Way (no addresses), Greendale Road, 6850 South, and La Cresta Drive (a formerly private lane that predates the subdivision). It should be noted that during the creation of a freeway interchange at 2000 East in the late 1980s, Highland Drive was divided into two sections with the historic street with residential frontage separated from the busy thoroughfare.

² Five additional subdivision phases used the Greenfield Village name but are not within the distinctive boundaries of the contiguous neighborhood.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The methodology used to evaluate architectural resources within the survey areas for NRHP eligibility was based on requirements established by the Utah SHPO in its *Reconnaissance Level Survey: Standard Operating Procedures* (revised July 2023). This survey also uses the NRHP eligibility criteria outlined in the National Park Service Bulletin 15 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (NPS 1997). In general, a property that is eligible for the NRHP is at least 50-years old, retains its historic integrity, and meets t one of the NRHP's areas of significance. The NRHP Criteria for Evaluation and Significance are described as follows:

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

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

In addition, each primary architectural resource in the SHPO database has been classified by age, type, style, materials, height, and NRHP eligibility. Properties were evaluated for eligibility using the following criteria guidelines and ratings established by the Utah SHPO for surveys:³

Eligible/Contributing: built within the historic period and retains integrity; significant or representative example of a style or type.

Ineligible/Non-Contributing: built during the historic period but has had major alterations or additions; no longer retains integrity.

Out-of-Period: constructed outside of the historic period.

Demolished: demolished.

Undetermined: incomplete or undetermined address, or duplicate record.

The Salt Lake County Tax Assessor's website was used to determine construction dates for the surveyed resources. The tax assessor records are fairly accurate for initial construction dates in the 1950s and early 1960s. Subsequent substantial remodels are not noted in the tax records, and therefore most of the secondary dates are estimated based on style and materials. Some tax records feature construction year photographs or a series of photographs that helped date early and in-period modifications.

³ The SHPO changed the designations used in the database from A to **ES** (Eligible Significant), B to **EC**, C to **NC**, and D to **OP** to avoid confusion with the A-D criteria for NRHP significance. In 2022, the SHPO eliminated the **ES** (Eligible/Significant) category along with the abbreviations.

The first task of this survey was to cross-reference the subdivision boundaries for properties currently found in the Utah SHPO database of historic resources, including properties evaluated in the selective survey of Cottonwood Heights in 2016. There were no existing records for resources within the smaller subdivisions of Cottonwood Ridge and Steffensen Heights. Six records were found within the boundaries of Cottonwood Heights 1 & 2, Johnsons 3 & 4, and the Bradford Ranchos neighborhood. Three are older homes on Fort Union Boulevard and three are on 7230 South, which appear to be inaccurate older dates in the tax records. Within Greenfield Village, the database has six records for houses on Highland Drive (including three that were demolished since 2016). The others are an older home on La Cresta Drive (a pre-existing lane), and two at the west end of the subdivision, which appear to be errors in the tax records.

A careful look at building composition, massing, fenestration, materials, and landscaping helped to determine whether an older building was encased in newer materials and additions. If a building was substantially remodeled to appear new, but the tax assessor's record was not updated with a new building year, it was assumed that the older house had been remodeled. Although a building may be evaluated as Ineligible/Non-Contributing during this survey, the property may have historical importance and the CHHC may want to consider additional research, documentation, or preservation. The comments field of the database printout contains notes on the integrity of buildings, including resources that may require more in-depth research. A few properties have alternate addresses that are noted in a secondary field.

In terms of modifications, many of the frame houses have later aluminum or vinyl siding. Newer siding alone did not determine eligibility but was taken in the context of the original materials and later cumulative modifications. Likewise, a conversion of a carport to a garage or room, or a garage to a room, was typical for the ranch-house period and many examples occurred within the period of significance. These conversions were noted in the comments field to gauge the impact on the historic integrity of individual properties or the neighborhood as a whole. Another common modification is the change from a flat roof to a modest gable. Flat roofs on a California ranch house was a desirable aesthetic; however, less so on the snowy foothills of Cottonwood Heights. Many of the roof alterations were completed within the historic period and may be considered eligible. In essence, for the purposes of this survey NRHP eligibility asks the question: Does the current character of the resource resemble a mid-century ranch house?

The survey photographs were taken with a Nikon D-80 digital camera and recorded on memory cards in the field. The image files were downloaded and renamed using the property address. The image files are organized into folders by street name. If a property included one or more outbuildings, an attempt was made to include the garage or outbuilding in the photograph of the primary building. Additional photographs that were not printed in the report are included with the digital files.

A separate photographic report with information from the database entries of each neighborhood is included as Appendix D of the final report. The SHPO received all deliverable in a digital format. Cottonwood Heights will receive copies of the RLS materials in a three-ring binder as requested by the CHHC, in addition to the digital files.

GIS data for mapping was downloaded from the Utah Automated Geographical Reference Center (AGRC). Because the four neighborhoods are not contiguous, separate final RLS maps were generated for this survey. The main maps ArcGIS-generated with each primary resource marked with its evaluation. Alternative street names and addresses on the photo report sheets, but not on the maps in order to preserve the integrity of the GIS data.

HISTORIC CONTEXTS FOR COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS' EARLY SUBDIVISIONS

The following historic contexts include a condensed version of the outline history prepared for the 2016 survey's final report. All of the historic contextual periods identified in this section provide context for the earliest subdivision development in the city. The boundaries of Cottonwood Heights City, as incorporated in 2005, included a variety of early communities within parts of unincorporated Salt Lake County. Historic neighborhood names, chosen from a list of signs installed by the CHHC in 2013, were used for the neighborhood maps in 2016. These names are referenced to the subdivision areas where applicable.

Because of varied topography, transportation routes, and use of the nearby canyons in Cottonwood Heights, each historic community had its own unique development patterns. In this report, the narratives for contextual periods up to 1952 have been simplified to include information about topography, transportation, and history that directly impacted early subdivision development in the area. With few exceptions, the surveyed resources were built within the overall contextual period spanning 1953 to 1982. A separate historical context for each subdivision/neighborhood has been written for this survey report. Findings and recommendations are also organized separately by the four subdivision/neighborhoods in the Survey Results and Recommendations sections below.

The name Cottonwood was informally used for farmsteads along the Big Cottonwood Creek, south of the business district that became the city of Holladay. Union was the name of the community centered on an early settlement fort now part of east Midvale and for which Fort Union Boulevard was named. Butlerville (later simply Butler), the largest and most cohesive of the communities, extends east to the Big Cottonwood Canyon between the Big and Little Cottonwood Creeks. Butler was the name used for the local ecclesiastical ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS or Mormon Church). Danish Town was the name used for the farmsteads along today's Danish Town Road, which extends from Creek Road to the south boundary of the city. In 1953, the Cottonwood Heights Community Council was organized in the Butler area. The name Cottonwood Heights was later chosen for the newly incorporated city in 2005.

Pre-Settlement Period

For centuries before the arrival of the Mormon pioneers, the Ute, Goshute, Paiute and Shoshoni tribes of Native Americans had an informal truce concerning the Salt Lake Valley. These nomadic peoples hunted and camped along the banks of the creeks flowing from the Wasatch Mountain Range and the Jordan River. The Utes, in particular, made use of the riparian plant and animal life along the Big and Little Cottonwood Creeks in the southeast portion of the valley.

Fort and Canyon Settlement Period, 1848-1872

The early settlement of the Cottonwood Heights area began soon after the members of the LDS Church began arriving in the Salt Lake Valley in July 1847. Mormon pioneers quickly spread out from Salt Lake City in search of suitable agricultural and grazing land. The various communities of Cottonwood Heights developed from two distinct patterns: 1) agrarian farmsteads loosely tied to the Union Fort at the west end of the city, and 2) the use of the Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons at the east boundary of the city. Union Fort had been built further west in what is now east Midvale. Between 1849 and 1853, several families had settled along the banks of Little Cottonwood Creek.

After the twenty-three families of Little Cottonwood had moved their homes into the fort in 1854, Jehu Cox, who donated land for the fort, named the settlement Union after the unifying work on the fortification. Union grew into a thriving community with businesses, a school, and church meetinghouse. By the 1860s, numerous second-generation pioneers and newcomers alike homesteaded along Little Cottonwood Creek southeast of Union. As roads were improved some settlers chose to build farmsteads along the transportation corridors that connected the early settlements to the canyons.

The roads to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons were instrumental in the development of the Cottonwood Heights area. It is important to note that the canyons provided recreational opportunities for the early settlers. However, industry was the most important contributing factor. Soon after the “Mississippi Saints” arrived in 1848, they camped near the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and brought logs down from the canyon to build cabins. In the 1850s and 1860s, five sawmills were built in Big Cottonwood Canyons. The Big Cottonwood Lumber Company was established in 1854 around the same time the Big Cottonwood Canyon Road was completed. Until the railroad made it easier to ship wood products from outside Utah, the lumber industry was a significant source of income for settlers in the area.

Little Cottonwood Canyon also provided an early source of income. After it was determined the Salt Lake Temple would be built of granite, a quarry was established and roads were constructed for the four-day oxen trip to the temple site in Salt Lake City. The Union Fort was designated as a place to provide protection for quarry workers. One resting place for granite blocks traveling from Little Cottonwood Canyon was at 7000 South and 2000 East (Colebrook Corner). Butler Bench was settled around 1869 when land grant patents became available. In 1872, Andrew Hansen Sr., a Danish convert, received a 160-acre patent in the area of today’s Danish Road. Several Danish immigrants established farmsteads and the area became known as Danish Town. By 1873, a narrow gauge railroad was built into Little Cottonwood Canyon, aiding both the temple quarry and mines in transporting raw materials. After the railroad was completed the Jordan and Salt Lake City Canal was used for exclusively for irrigation.

Mining, Industry and Homesteading Period, 1873-1895

By the mid-1870s, the main transportation corridors had been established through Cottonwood Heights: Union Fort Road (Creek Road), Highland Drive and Wasatch Boulevard (both county roads), Danish Road, Butler Bench Road (modified later to Fort Union Boulevard), and Will Dyer’s Road (Bengal Boulevard), connecting the area to the canyons and to neighboring settlements.

Both mining and lumber remained important employers during this period, though it had less of an impact on population growth as the railroad from Little Cottonwood Canyon to Sandy bypassed the area. The majority of population growth in the area came from homestead established by second-generation settlers and newly arrived immigrants. Several geographic landmarks were named for the first settlers. For example, Butler Bench, and Butler Hill were named after the several members of the Butler family. The Butlerville community grew west of the mill site during this period with a steady stream of newcomers. Colebrook Corner at today’s 7000 South and Highland Drive was named for the earliest homestead on the corner. Brown’s Hill (2300 East) was named for the first family homesteading in 1885. Will Dyer’s Road was named for Will Dyer, a son of original settlers in Danish Town. Danish Road was a string of homesteads by the 1890s.

The Butler Bench grew quickly during this period with numerous farmsteads along Fort Union Boulevard, 2300 East and 2700 East, while the southern lands were more sparsely populated. The area was high and dry, but after the irrigation system was improved the area was known for its orchards. In Danish Town, many of the residents produced hay and alfalfa on their dry farms.

Farms, Orchards and Summer Homes Period, 1896-1929

One of the most important industrial buildings in Salt Lake County, the *Granite Hydroelectric Power Plant*, was constructed at the beginning of this period. Built in 1896, the Granite Power complex (later known as the Utah Power & Light Plant) was located at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. The *Granite Hydroelectric Power Plant* and several associated buildings were listed on the NRHP in 1989. There were a number of small commercial buildings throughout Cottonwood Heights during this period, but the majority of commercial activity was centered in Union. For example, the Butlerville Post Office closed in 1902, and postal delivery was made by wagon from Union. Later in 1920, an automobile was used to deliver mail.

There were no extant institutional buildings from this period. The LDS meetinghouse was replaced with a new building, as were both schools, but all were demolished later during the suburban building boom. In 1901, the Butler Ward was organized and the Granite-Butler meetinghouse was abandoned. The building materials were repurposed by local residents. A brick meetinghouse was built on the Butler Bench, closer to the center of the ward's population. In 1923, the schoolhouse and church exchanged properties. A few years later in 1929 a new chapel was added to the old building. In 1997, the bell from the demolished schoolhouse was incorporated into a monument at the Butler Ward meetinghouse at Fort Union Boulevard and 2700 East.

Improvements in irrigation drove much of the population growth during this period. In 1900 the Big Willow Irrigation Company was formed. Other irrigation projects included the Brown and Sanford Ditch, the Butler Ditch, and the Little Willow Irrigation Company. The East Jordan Canal provided water to Union and portions of west Cottonwood Heights. In 1913, water rights to McGhie Springs were sold to Murray City. Murray City built a power plant near the canyon in 1913 and a reservoir in 1920 (later upgraded in 1936). In turn, Murray City provided power for some homes in the Union and Butler areas. Murray City still owns two properties in Cottonwood Heights where water tanks are located.

Neighborhoods that had adequate irrigation, such the Butler Bench, were very popular as the old homestead claims were divided among offspring and sold off to newcomers. While some areas, such as Creek Road between Union and Highland Drive had a string of farmsteads, other areas were still mostly open. There were approximately a dozen families living on Danish Road during this period.

Depression Economy to Post-War Growth, 1930-1952

The area of today's Cottonwood Heights was similar to most rural communities in Utah with little population growth during the depression years. Both the 1930 and 1940 census enumerations put the population at around 600 persons. Although the population remained steady there were notable demographic and economic changes. For example, a number of Japanese families moved to the Willow Creek area in the 1930s to raise vegetables, strawberries, and pansies on truck farms. Isolated neighborhoods saw little growth. Only a handful of families built homes in Danish Town during this period, even after the road was improved with oil and gravel in 1950, and the rural postal service became more reliable.

As homesteads were divided, many of the large dry farms became smaller and more specialized. Hay and alfalfa were replaced by orchards and vegetables. The poultry industry grew as farmers with smaller holdings could make an income with chickens and eggs. Along Creek Road and other places a number of mink and fox farms were established in the 1930s and 1940s. There were also a few large dairies.

Utah benefited from depression-era programs that created work in rural Salt Lake County. In 1935, a CCC Camp was established at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon for men working on improvements in the canyon. Another public project of the 1930s was the Deer Creek aqueduct that brought water into the southeast quadrant of the county. In 1939, a sturdy new bridge across Little Cottonwood Creek at Highland Drive was built to provide better automobile access to the residents. The population began to grow after World War II and the Butler School was expanded to accommodate the new students. Many newcomers to the area at the end of this period were looking for the postwar suburban lifestyle, but with extra land for horses and other agricultural uses. A few homes were built in isolated natural settings on private lanes and near the canyon creeks.

The 2016 survey for this period identified period revival and World War II-era cottages, with few of the former and more of the latter. These properties were found along transportation corridors with and without associated detached garages and agricultural outbuildings. There are a few ornate English Tudor style cottages in the survey area. On Stone Road, three brick cottages were built in 1941 in the area's first tract development. Brick World War II-era cottages were popular farmhouse adaptations. Most frame examples of World War II-era cottages were later covered in aluminum or vinyl siding, and many had additions. There are a few commercial buildings along transportation corridors. There were no surviving institutional buildings.

Subdivision Development and Growth, 1953-1982

Due to budget constraints, historic resources from this contextual period were not included in the 2016 selective survey, although NRHP eligibility at the time extended to 1966. In the 2016 survey, this contextual period spanned 1953 to 1982. Because the cut-off for NRHP eligibility for this 2024 survey was 1974 but extended five years to 1979 in order to expand the usefulness of the survey data. The general narrative below was included in the 2016 final report. Information for the selected subdivisions and neighborhoods has been specifically generated for this 2024 report.

In the post World War-II period, Cottonwood Heights became more connected to Salt Lake City and the neighboring cities as the community began its transformation into a garden suburb. Between 1953 and 1956, the first subdivisions were platted within the future boundaries of Cottonwood Heights adding 5,000 new residents to the area in three years. The number of subdivisions increased steadily, bringing the number of residents to approximately 25,000 by the early 1980s. Some residential subdivisions were created out of pristine farmland, such as the many phases of the enormous Greenfield Village development, which began in the 1950s. In contrast, the suburban development of Poverty Flats, south of Fort Union Boulevard at 1700 east, began in the early 1960s with smaller subdivisions built around the existing farmhouses and lanes. Subdivision development during this period was mostly in the north half of the future city with access to the main arterials such as Highland Drive and Fort Union Boulevard. The southern half developed later with the first subdivision in Danish Town platted in 1970.

The Jordan School District responded to the unprecedented growth by building Brighton High School and the Butler Middle School in the 1960s. The original Butler Elementary School was expanded three times between 1953 and 1964. A new school was built on the property for the 2016-2017 school year. Other elementary schools built during this period include Cottonwood Heights, Mountain View, Ridgecrest, and Oakdale (just outside the boundaries of the city). In 1962, the Butler Stake of the LDS Church was organized with seven wards and 6,000 members. Within a few years, there were two stakes and thirteen wards. Growth was so rapid during this period that the *Salt Lake Tribune* published articles on a debate about zoning the Cottonwood Heights community and the tension between home developers and established farmers and fur farms.⁴

⁴ *Deseret News*, October 12, 1954: B1, B10.

During this period, the original Union Fort settlement area grew into a major regional shopping center. By the 1980s, the need for retail space began to extend east along Fort Union Boulevard and south along Highland Drive. Large tracts of agricultural land were transformed. For example, the Farnsworth Dairy became a golf course and the expansive Mountain View Memorial Cemetery was established on east Bengal Boulevard. Beginning in the 1970s, the local ski facilities in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons were transformed into ski resorts bringing in thousands of out-of-state visitors each season.

By 1967, as subdivisions began to fill in the spaces between the historic farming communities, many residents began using the name Cottonwood Heights. The area was known for its orchards, milk farms, and at least one large chicken ranch, but it had mostly transformed into a collection of solid middle-class suburban neighborhoods. It is important to note that unincorporated Salt Lake County did not require sidewalks in mid-century subdivision. All of the surveyed neighborhoods have gutters, but no sidewalks, except for where sidewalks were later added along the busy transportation corridors. The inclusive dates for the following histories are based on the historic development of each subdivision/neighborhood.

Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision (1953-1965)

The plat for the Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision was signed on June 24, 1953. After obtaining approvals from the Salt Lake Planning and County Commission, it was recorded on December 2, 1953. The relatively small subdivision of 34 lots is located at the top of Butler Hill, next to the Butler Ward LDS Church meetinghouse and across the street from Butler Elementary School. Prior to 1953, the intersection of 2700 East and Fort Union Boulevard (7000 South) had been the default center of community life in Butlerville since the 1880s. A brick school was built on the north side in 1893 with the church on the south side. Discussion began in the early 1920s between the Jordan School District and the local LDS Church to trade properties on 2700 East.⁵ The church-owned south property was larger and flatter, was more conducive to a larger school and playground, than the north property. A new school was completed in 1923 and the LDS Church's Butler Ward remodeled the old schoolhouse into a meetinghouse. In the local directories, the area was listed as Holladay.

Cottonwood Ridge was the first subdivision built on Butler Hill but was soon followed by other, even larger subdivisions, taking over land that was mostly occupied by orchards in the first half of the twentieth century. The Butler Elementary School was expanded three times between 1953 and 1964. In 1958, the LDS Church constructed a new meetinghouse to replace the old building. The Cottonwood Ridge subdivision was owned by Ormond S. and Mildred P. Coulam. On the 1950 census enumeration, the Coulam family was living on Wasatch Boulevard near 7000 South. Ormond Coulam worked as a salesman for Winder Dairy and Mildred Coulam was a candy dipper for the Glade Candy Company.

By 1956, all but eight lots were occupied by houses. The Coulams lived in the subdivision at 2725 E. Fort Union Boulevard. Many homes were occupied by commuter families; for example, Dale Hughes, a mechanic at Fort Douglas in Salt Lake City, and his wife, Beverly, who lived at 6835 S. Virginia Hills Drive. Others were small business owners, represented by Herbert and Margaret Bergan (Herb's TV Service). The brick home of Paul and Bonnie Danielson, at 6840 S. Virginia Hills Drive, was likely built by Paul's company, Danielson Construction.

⁵ Allen D. Roberts, *City Between the Canyons: A History of Cottonwood Heights, 1849-1953*, (Cottonwood Heights, Utah: Cottonwood Heights City, 2018: 269-270.

Steffensen Heights Subdivision, (1953-1976)

The Steffensen Heights Subdivision was platted on August 28, 1953, but not recorded until May 5, 1954. The 96-lot subdivision was developed by Delbert C. and Carole C. Steffensen, and also Alma W. and Thelma C. Farnsworth. Delbert Steffensen was a building contractor in Salt Lake City. Alma and Thelma Farnsworth owned and operated a silver fox farm at the north end of the subdivision plat. The hilly land was never used for agriculture and was accessible only by the narrow road that angled from the end of the south end of 2700 East to Bengal Boulevard (meeting the kink in the road around 7700 South). The only developed land in the area were the farmsteads along Danish Road south of Bengal Boulevard (7800 South).

Including Steffensen Drive, the roads in the subdivision were named for members of Delbert Steffensen's family: Carole Drive (wife); Pamela Drive (daughter), and Dell Road (father and son). Both the Steffensens and Farnsworths moved to California soon after the subdivision was mostly developed in 1956. In a nod to the population growth from the Steffensen Heights subdivision, in 1961 the LDS Church built another meetinghouse abutting the subdivision at 2925 E. Bengal Boulevard. Even though Steffensen Heights was further south, the neighborhood was still listed in the directories under Holladay. The last house from the historic period was built in 1976.

The first residents of Steffensen Heights included both commuters and local workers. Richard and Mary Holbrook lived at 2839 E. Pamela Drive, which was a long commute for Richard who was a social worker at the Veteran's Administration Hospital near the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. Allen Jacobsen, who lived at 7680 S. Dell Road with his wife Willa, worked for Smedley Fruit in downtown Salt Lake City. Wilford Inglesby was a purchasing agent for Armco Drainage and Metal Products, also in Salt Lake City. Wilford and Lois Inglesby lived at 2740 E. Carole Drive. A few residents had their own businesses. Two examples are Wesley and Venna Patterson who operated a restaurant supply business at their home address on 2772 E. Pamela Drive, and Philo Hendricksen, general contractor, who lived with his wife, Sylva, on 7706 S. Dell Road. The longest commute probably belonged to Royal Holter, who was a pilot, and lived with his wife, Dolores, at 2812 E. Pamela Drive.

Steffensen Heights Subdivision was advertised in the local newspapers with this glowing description: "All Houses in the 96-home subdivision will be built of face brick and have attached garages, large lots, beautiful view, 1½ baths."⁶ Down payments for the \$12,500 homes were not required for veterans. Delbert Steffensen's construction company built the homes, but apparently struggled to find skilled masons and advertised daily for bricklayers during the fall of 1954.

Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons, & Bradford Ranchos Subdivisions (1953-1964)

On March 18, 1954, the Cottonwood Heights Subdivision was the first subdivision platted in the neighborhood. The owners were part of the Kolob Investment Company (Fay C. and Lela B. Packard, Claude G. and Elizabeth H. Salisbury, Frank Salisbury) and the Cottonwood Development Company (Howard J. McKean, Richard F. McKean, and Grant MacFarlane). The 199 lots appeared on two sheets of paper, totaling nearly 53 acres. Cottonwood Heights Subdivision No. 2, platted on October 1, 1958, did not include additional land, but was an amendment for 18 acres, mostly between 2985 and 3080 East, which renumbered the lots up to 268. The owners' dedication for the amendment included the names Richard F. and Maurine G. McKean, Max C. and Joan D. Beesley, and John H. and Jacqueline H. Cordingley.

⁶ *Salt Lake Tribune*, August 29, 1954: 36.

Fay Packard, a banker, and his wife, Lela, lived in Springville, Utah. Claude and Elizabeth Salisbury lived in Salt Lake City. Frank Salisbury lived in Holladay. The McKeanes were a family of buildings in Salt Lake City. Grant MacFarlane was a Salt Lake attorney. Max Beesley was a field engineer for the Housing & Home Finance Agency. Max and Joan later lived in the subdivision at 7211 S. 2980 East. The Cordingleys lived in Salt Lake City, where John worked for the telephone company. The owner's dedication for the Bradford Ranchos Subdivision was signed on July 19, 1954. The last of the 27 lots was reserved for the original farmhouse for the land, the Carl and Rose Badger Summer House at 3010 E. Fort Union Boulevard, built in 1926. The Bradford Realty & Investment Company was partially owned by Fay and Lela Packard and Claude and Elizabeth Salisbury who were involved in the Cottonwood Heights Subdivision. R. Bradford signed as president and David Salisbury signed as secretary-treasurer.

The Johnsons Subdivision 3 was owned by Lars Walter and Valburg Johnson. Walter Johnson was a building contractor and owned a supply company in Salt Lake City. The 34-lot subdivision was plated on October 14, 1952, but not approved and recorded until July 1954. Walter and his wife, Valborg, plated a nearly identical subdivision of 33 lots on June 3, 1955. Approval for Johnson 4 was accomplished more quickly and the plat was recorded on August 10, 1953. Beginning in 1946, the local newspapers describe home-building in Cottonwood Heights area, mostly likely along the existing street of 2700 East and Fort Union Boulevard. Tract housing within the official subdivision plats do not appear before 1954.

The Cottonwood Heights Subdivision was described in newspapers in 1954 as "Country Living with City Conveniences" and potential buyers were urged to "Buy Your Home Where Your Children Will Have Room to Play."⁷ By 1959, the traffic was so busy on the subdivision streets that the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported neighborhood mothers would take turns watering their lawns, flag down speeding automobiles, and subsequently using the hose to douse the offending drivers.⁸

The Bradford Ranchos Subdivision did not start advertising in earnest until 1956-1957. The Veterans Special had a focused pitch: "If you are an ex-foot slogger, flyboy or gobble and you have \$375 then you can move into this three bedroom dandy in Bradford Rancho [sic] Subdivision."⁹ In contrast, the Johnson Subdivisions did not advertise beyond the classified section. The L. Walter Johnson & Sons had experience with their first Johnsons subdivision on Salt Lake City's east bench. The company did advertise an intriguing offer: "Your Present Home Can Be Traded In."¹⁰

Greenfield Village Subdivision Phases (1953-1963)

Greenfield Village was the largest and most photographed of the four historic subdivisions in this survey. A number of developers were involved in the six phases in this survey. The first plat, Plat A, was signed on January 7, 1953, and recorded on February 26, 1953, by officers of the Peak Improvement Company, Hamer S. Culp Jr, president, and Keith S. Webb. The land owners were Briant C. and Adah B. Perkins. Plat B was signed on June 4, 1953, by C. Taylor and Hilda H. Burton, and Hamer Culp Jr. representing the Peak Improvement Company. John and Nick Papanikolas signed as owners representing the Cannon-Papanikolas Construction Company for Plat C in July 1954. Plat D, signed on February 1, 1955, was a joint project by Cannon-Papanikolas and Papanikolas Brothers, and landowners C. Taylor and Hilda H. Burton.

⁷ *Salt Lake Tribune*, August 22, 1954: 33.

⁸ *Salt Lake Tribune*, August 3, 1959: 19.

⁹ *Salt Lake Tribune*, May 17, 1957: D10.

¹⁰ *Deseret News*, April 28, 1959: C9.

Plat E was signed on April 29, 1955, by Culp, Webb, the Perkins, and Diane and Rasband Rassmussen. In 1956, a new elementary school was built just west of the Greenfield Village Plat D. The first proposed name for the school was Greenfield Village Elementary, but the name was changed to Mountview Elementary before construction started. Greenfield Village Plat F (1959) and Plat G (1959, 1962) were located west of the school property and therefore not included in this survey. Plat H, platted in April 1960 was a relatively small 15-lot subdivision near the southeast corner of the fan-shaped neighborhood. The owners were R. C. and Viola Lassley. Jesse Brewer of Jesse Brewer Homes Inc., along with his wife, Grace, were the developers.

The name Greenfield Village probably came from the popular outdoor museum in Dearborn, Michigan, owned by Henry Ford, but the subdivision had all the advantages of a modern suburb. In addition to a brand new elementary school within walking distance, another LDS Church was built just north of the East Jordan Canal around 1957. Greenfield Village was the only subdivision to set aside a large lot for commercial development. By 1964, a strip mall was built on the lot. There were also two gas stations just outside the subdivision to serve the busy traffic on Fort Union Boulevard and Highland Drive.

In 1953, an article in the *Salt Lake Tribune* described Greenfield Village as a “\$1½ million project” that would eventually have 350 homes with “Architecture in a modern ranch style, conventional American and old colonial.”¹¹ In March 1957, a *Salt Lake Tribune* article discussing “Boomtime in the Rockies” used an aerial view of the mostly developed Greenfield Village. The various phases of the subdivision were advertised as “Quiet, Secluded, Beautiful” or “Quality, Personality, Charm” or simply “A Family Home” depending on the developer. Homes in the neighborhood were prominently featured during the 1956 Parade of Homes. Less attractive were the lots along Fort Union Boulevard, which were not developed until the 1970s and 1980s when a number of duplexes and two large office complexes were built on the ridge.

Interstate Freeway, Commercial Nodes, & Luxury Homes Period, 1983 to Incorporation & Beyond

Since the early 1980s, the character of Cottonwood Heights has subtly transformed into one of the most affluent suburbs in the Salt Lake Valley. The newest residents have looked for large lots for multi-story homes close to shopping centers and recreational opportunities in the nearby canyons. Large new subdivisions are located primarily in the south half of the city, while in the north half smaller tracts appear as infill. As the north suburbs have aged, the Mountainview Elementary was demolished and replaced with a park. Many of the historic homes included in this survey were updated during this period to larger, more modern homes. A few out-of-period resources from this period were included in the survey if they were on the same parcel as a historic resource.

The Interstate 215 belt route at the north boundary of Cottonwood Heights made the area even more accessible as a bedroom community for Salt Lake City and the Wasatch Front metropolitan area. The freeway arrived at Union Park in 1985, was extended to 6200 South in 1987, and finally connected to the north segment in 1989. As a result, the population of Cottonwood Heights is approximately 35,000 residents today. The City of Cottonwood Heights was incorporated in 2005. The Cottonwood Heights Historic Committee was established to help save the community’s most important historic resources in an era of rapid growth and development. In 2016, Cottonwood Heights constructed a new municipal building near the Cottonwood Heights Recreation Center.

¹¹ *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 15, 1953: G18.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS & SUBDIVISION RECOMMENDATIONS

General Findings

This 2024 selective survey of early subdivisions in Cottonwood Heights provided an evaluation for a total of 817 primary resources, all buildings. The number includes 12 records previously entered into the SHPO database and 805 new records. Out of the 12 existing records, four properties had been demolished since 2016. Of the total of 813 extant resources, 599 were evaluated as Eligible/Contributing resources (74 percent). The 218 ineligible resources (36 percent) were divided between 182 altered historic buildings (Ineligible/Non-Contributing) and 35 Out-of-Period buildings built after 1979.

The vast majority of buildings were single-family dwellings. Greenfield Village featured the only examples of other building types: 11 duplexes, six commercial buildings, four medical office buildings, one church and one private gym. Secondary resources (mostly garages and sheds) were evaluated as either contributing or non-contributing resources with the primary resource on the property. The total number of outbuildings evaluated was 503. Only 75 (15 percent) were contributing, mostly due to the high percentage of historic attached garages in the subdivisions. Of note, 174 outbuildings were substantial enough to appear as building footprints in the GIS data. These footprints were retained on the map, but without evaluation.

Findings and Recommendations by Contextual Period & Subdivision/Neighborhood

Farms, Orchards and Summer Homes Period, 1896-1929

Two houses on Fort Union Boulevard from this period survived the surrounding subdivision development in the early 1950s. The oldest home is located at 2882 E. Fort Union Boulevard. The Johnsons 3 Subdivision was platted with a niche at the northeast corner for this house. It is likely the original farmhouse for the property that became the Johnsons subdivisions. This contributing house has been remodeled at least twice (circa 1930s and 1990s) but retains a hall-parlor massing and the 1930s porch. The original owners are unknown. Merlin and Alice Butler owned the house during the early subdivision development period. Merlin was a custodian for the Jordan School District.

More is known about the history of the *Badger Summer Home*, built in 1926, at 3010 E. Fort Union Boulevard. The property was documented in a 2018 Intensive Level Survey. The house was originally built by Carl and Rose Badger. It is a rare example of a building designed to be a summer home that quickly transitioned into a large farm during the historic period from 1926 to 1954 before the farm was sold and subdivided. The Bradford Ranchos Subdivision included the house as Lot 27 on the subdivision plat. At its largest, the farm was 250 acres with fields and orchards south of the house. Most of the Cottonwood Heights Subdivision was also part of the Badger family farm prior to 1954. The *Badger Summer Home* is Dutch Colonial and Arts & Crafts in style and has excellent historic integrity. The property is a good candidate for an individual NRHP nomination.

Depression Economy to Post-War Growth, 1930-1952

In the Cottonwood Heights subdivision area there are two houses from this period. A split-level house at 2910 E. Fort Union Boulevard was built next to the Merlin and Alice Butler house in 1950. The owners in the 1950s were Ludwig and Freda Bohland. Ludwig was a painter. The house is eligible with minor modifications. The second house is within the subdivision at 2886 E. 7230 South. According to the tax records, this house was built in 1952. It has good integrity and is similar to other houses in the subdivision. The date may be a typographical error or this house may have been the model home for the subdivision.

In the Greenfield Village area, there are three extant houses that predate the subdivision. Three other houses, all on Highland Drive, were demolished since the 2016 survey. The remaining house at 6662 S. Highland Drive was built in 1945. The *Perkins House* at 1935 E. La Cresta Drive was built in 1952. This brick house was likely built at the end of the private lane that became La Cresta Drive. It was documented with an Intensive Level Survey in 2018. The style of the house is an interesting hybrid of the Minimal Traditional and Early Ranch styles with a below-grade garage. The first owners were Robert and Phyllis Perkins. Robert Perkins' parents, Briant and Adah Perkins, were the primary land owners of the first Greenfield Village subdivision when the first plat were filed in 1953. La Cresta Drive was originally called Westwood Way on the plat. The split-level brick house at 1681 E. Village Green Road is identical to other houses in the Greenfield Village Plat D. The construction date of 1945 in the tax records is likely an error. A date of 1958 is more accurate.

Subdivision Development and Growth, 1953-1982

The General Findings section of this report provides an overview all of the resources built during this period. The 2016 survey noted that most of the housing stock from this period are in the Union and Butler Bench areas and appear to be tract housing developments with a fairly cohesive style. In order to access each neighborhood's eligibility as a potential NRHP historic district the following narratives have been divided by each subdivision development area.

Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision

Thirty-four single-family dwellings were evaluated in the Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision [Photograph 1]. This was the only subdivision in this survey where Ineligible resources outnumbered Eligible resources [Map #4]. Twelve houses were Contributing and 17 were Non-contributing due to alterations. The first houses were built in 1953 with the majority built by 1955. Four houses were built between 1959 and 1965. Five houses were evaluated as Out-of-Period, built between 2010 and 2023. Three replaced older homes. One was built as infill and one built at the north end of Virginia Hills Drive, partially out of the subdivision plat. The subdivision has three contributing outbuildings and 13 non-contributing outbuildings.

In many ways, the Cottonwood Ridge subdivision does not retain integrity for an early 1950s ranch-style neighborhood. One example with good integrity is 6870 S. Virginia Hills Drive [Photograph 2]. The neighborhood's biggest asset, the ridge with a view, has become its biggest liability in terms of historic preservation. Nearly all of the newer homes have second stories. This trend is likely to continue, especially if the parcels to the west remain undeveloped. **This survey does not recommend the Cottonwood Ridge Subdivision as a candidate for the National Register of Historic Places.**

Steffensen Heights Subdivision

The Steffensen Heights Subdivision has the distinction of being the only surveyed subdivision with zero Out-of-Period homes within its boundaries [Map #6]. The ratio of Eligible/Contributing to Ineligible/Non-Contributing is also particularly good, with all but two built between 1953 and 1957. There are 81 (84 percent) contributing houses and 15 non-contributing houses (16 percent). The high integrity of the neighborhood is likely because the vast majority of houses were built with good quality face brick and attached garages. With the exception of a few updated remodels, the streetscape is remarkably cohesive [Photographs 3 & 4]. The attached garages also account for the lack of contributing detached garages. The number of contributing outbuildings is six (12 percent) compared to 51 non-contributing outbuildings, mostly small sheds in rear yards that do not impact the overall character of the subdivision (88 percent).

This survey recommends the Steffensen Heights Subdivision as a good candidate for National Register of Historic Places historic district to represent early subdivision development in the City of Cottonwood Heights. The subdivision has good integrity in design and materials, mid-century subdivision planning principles, and distinctive borders.

The variety of floor plans built in Steffensen Heights were informed by the irregularity of the lots on the curving streets. The following are good examples of different types, which can also be recommended for Intensive Level Surveys based on historic integrity. Further research in the subdivision may suggest more examples based on historical, rather than architectural, significance.

At the north end of the subdivision where the slope is steep, there are several examples of ranch houses with below-grade garages or walk-out basements [Photographs 4, 5 & 6]. For example, 2751 E. Carole Drive and 7631 S. Dell Road. Most of the ranch-style houses in the flatter sections of the subdivision are typically wide with an attached garage at one end (e.g., 7716 S. Dell Road and 2881 E. Pamela Drive) [Photographs 7 & 8]. A few have prominent garages or side entry garages on corner lots (2721 E. Carole Drive and 7620 S. Steffensen Drive) [Photographs 9 & 10].

Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons, and Bradford Ranchos Subdivisions

As a combined neighborhood of three distinct subdivisions, Cottonwood Heights and the flanking subdivisions were the most difficult to evaluate [Map #8]. Together 322 houses were evaluated in the neighborhood. The number of Eligible/Contributing houses was 237 (74 percent). There were 78 Ineligible/Non-Contributing houses (altered, 24 percent) and six Out-of-Period houses (2 percent). Approximately one-third of the 217 outbuildings are contributing (22 percent, garages and sheds).

Evaluated separately, the north half of the neighborhood, which is primarily brick housing stock, has a better contributing to non-contributing ratio [Map #8a]. The 27 houses in the Bradford Ranch are divided between 21 Eligible/Contributing resources (78 percent) and six Ineligible/Non-Contributing resources (22 percent, altered). The contributing resources included the *Badger Summer House* and the later subdivision development [Photographs 11 & 12]. The two Johnsons subdivision have a total of 67 resources divided between 62 Eligible/Contributing (92 percent) and five Ineligible/Non-Contributing (9 percent). Brick was the dominant material in this subdivision, which included a large number of unusual L-shaped, ranch-style houses with semi-detached and attached garages [Photographs 13 & 14]. Neither Bradford Ranchos nor Johnsons subdivisions have Out-of-Period houses.

In contrast, the largest subdivision Cottonwood Heights and its subsequent amendment have a total of 225 houses. Of this total, 151 are Eligible/Contributing (68 percent). There are 67 Ineligible/Non-Contributing altered historic houses (29 percent) and seven (3 percent) Out-of-Period houses. The Cottonwood Heights subdivision features a mix of brick and frame ranch-style houses [Photograph 15]. The less favorable ratios are due to the high percentage of altered frame houses in the southern half of the neighborhood [Maps #8a & #8b, Photograph 16]. The amended section of Cottonwood Heights features a number of split-level style houses that combine brick and siding [Photograph 17].

Cottonwood Heights subdivision is notable for a high percentage of perpendicular ranch-style houses with both façade and side entries [Photograph 18]. The majority originally had carports with built-in storage sheds. Conversions from carports to garages or rooms were common in and outside of the period of significance [Photographs 19 & 21]. Many of the wide façade examples also had carports. California-influenced wide façade houses with flat roofs and ribbons windows were also common [Photographs 20 & 22].

This survey does not recommend that the collective Cottonwood Heights, Johnsons, and Bradford Ranchos subdivisions be considered for a National Register of Historic Places district at this time. The recommendation is a “maybe later” for three reasons. First, the current ratio of contributing to non-contributing buildings is lower than most districts, with a marked difference between the north and south halves of the neighborhood. Second, the neighborhood lacks a distinct boundary to the west where the current streets extend into areas with similar housing stock that is also within the historic period. Between 2825 East and 2700 East, subdivisions include Johnsons 5, and Cottonwood Heights 3, 4 and 5. Third, 2700 East is a more distinct boundary with several extant historic houses that predate the subdivision.

This survey recommends doing additional RLS work between 2825 East and the east side of 2700 East. Including in a future survey this area may improve the ratio of contributing to non-contributing of the overall neighborhood, as well as provide important context on the history of 2700 East and the use of the Cottonwood Heights name in the 1940s. It is recommended that Intensive Level Surveys be chosen from the future survey sample.

Greenfield Village Subdivision Phases

As the largest neighborhood included in this survey, the Greenfield Village Subdivision appeared in several articles and advertisements during its many phases [Figure 1, Map #9]. The total number of resources evaluated for Greenfield Village was 365. Of that number, 266 buildings (73 percent) were evaluated as Eligible/Contributing. Seventy-five buildings (20 percent) were evaluated as Ineligible/Non-Contributing due to alterations. There were also 24 Out-of-Period buildings (7 percent). The outbuildings were mostly non-historic detached garages and sheds, so it is not surprising that out of the 213 outbuildings there were only 19 contributing (9 percent) compared to 194 non-contributing examples (91 percent). In contrast to the other single-family-only subdivisions, the Greenfield Village phases included 11 duplexes, six commercial buildings, four medical office buildings, one church and one private gym.

The six phases of Greenfield Village included in this survey at A, B, C, D, E & H [Maps #9 & #10]. Minor amendments for a few parcels along the west and north boundaries where modifications to Highland Drive and the Interstate-215 corridor were made later. The development of Greenfield Village began along Highland Drive with subsequent phases plated in a roughly counterclockwise direction. Plat A included Perkins land north of the 1952 house at 1935 E. La Cresta Drive [Photograph 23].

The housing stock in Plat A consisted mostly of fairly traditional brick ranch-style houses [Photograph 24]. Plat B included land south and west of La Cresta Drive and Plat A. It is notable for defining the main road into the subdivision: Greenfield Way [Photograph 25]. In addition to traditional wide façade ranch houses, Plat B introduced examples of frame perpendicular ranch houses with carports [Photographs 26 & 27]. These houses with narrower façades could be situated more easily on the irregular shaped lots along curving Greenfield Way, Brookhill Way, and Village Road [Map #10 & #10a].

Plat C was surveyed with Fort Union Boulevard (7000 South) frontage to the west of Greenfield Way. Clover Dale Road was the straightest street in Greenfield Village as it paralleled Fort Union Boulevard on the ridge above [Photograph 28]. Clover Dale Road in Plat C was connected to Brookhill Drive, Village Road, and a new street, Village Green Road, which curved from southeast to northwest. Plat C has the highest percentage of frame houses and consequently a somewhat higher percentage of non-contributing housing [Map #10 & #10b]. Plat C includes the commercial lot with frontage on Fort Union Boulevard, a non-contributing altered strip mall.

Plat D completed the extension of the Greenfield Village neighborhood to the borders of the proposed new elementary school. Plat D has noticeably more regular lots and straighter streets: Meadow Drive, Meadow Downs Way, Springbrook Way, and Willow Way [Photograph 29]. Both Clover Dale Road and Village Green Road were extended through Plat D to the school property. Plat D has a higher number of brick buildings, including perpendicular and traditional ranch houses built of oversized bricks [Photographs 31 & 33]. Frame buildings, originally covered in shingle siding, were also popular [Photograph 32, report cover photograph of 6850 S. Springbrook Way].

Plat E completed the north arc of the fan-shaped neighborhood with extensions to Meadow Downs Way, Meadow Drive, and Greenfield Way. While there are floor plans and facades that are repeated in Plat E, the neighborhood has a greater number of unique designs and possibly architect-designed houses [Photographs 34, 35, & 36]. Plat E has several excellent examples of ranch-style houses built with skintled brick and/or weeping mortar [Photograph 37]. Along Meadow Downs Way, which parallels the East Jordan Canal, the generally large lots have produced an architectural conundrum: dramatic contemporary designs and also the highest number of teardowns and replacements in the neighborhood [Photograph 39, Maps #10 and #10b].

Greenfield Village plats F and G are located west of the former school property and therefore not included in this survey. The last plat was Plat H, the smallest plat designed to fill in property on Highland Drive north of the intersection corner, which had transitioned to commercial development by the 1960s. Plat H represents its era, with very wide ranch houses and typical split levels [Photographs 39 & 40].

Despite the number of developers and a variety of housing stock, the Greenfield Village Subdivision is a remarkably cohesive mid-century neighborhood within very distinctive boundaries. **This survey recommends the neighborhood as a good candidate for the National Register of Historic Places.** A future nomination may consider removing out-of-period properties with Fort Union Boulevard and Highland Drive frontage from the historic district, but these properties do not have a major impact on the neighborhood as a whole and may be included as part of the context of the neighborhood's development.

Intensive Level Surveys for Greenfield Village may be chosen from the photographs used to illustrate this portion of the report. However, because the subdivision was extensively covered in the local newspapers, an in-depth search may find the addresses of the model homes, including residences highlighted during the popular Parade of Homes in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Interstate Freeway, Commercial Nodes, & Luxury Homes Period, 1983 to Incorporation & Beyond

No findings and recommendations will be made for this contextual period as the few examples were evaluated as part of each subdivision, rather than individually.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The historic preservation process has been defined as a series of steps: Identification, Evaluation, Documentation, Registration, Education and Treatment. The Reconnaissance Level Survey fulfills the requirements of the first two steps, Identification and Evaluation. The following recommendations have been formulated to coordinate the preservation process with the duties of the Cottonwood Heights Historic Committee as outlined in the City's Code of Ordinances (2.140.601-608). Decisions regarding which steps to pursue may be based on available financial and personnel resources, but should have the support of the City, affected property owners, and other community stake holders.

Further Reconnaissance Level Survey Work

The Cottonwood Heights Code of Ordinances cites a "survey and inventory" of the city's historic resources as one of the duties of the CHHC. This survey partially fulfills that requirement. The main objective of this survey was the identification and evaluation of the earliest subdivisions in the city. As a result, a large number of resources, including later historic subdivisions, built prior to the current 50-year cutoff for NRHP eligibility were excluded. Cottonwood Heights should have a goal of inventorying all historic resources, but further RLS work should be prioritized. As recommended by the 2016 a future Certified Local Government (CLG) grant may be used to continue selective survey work along the main transportation corridors. Historic properties along private lanes, especially those on large parcels, would be the second highest priority since there is interest in building larger modern homes on view lots or near the creeks. The 2016 survey should be updated in the near future to include more NRHP eligible properties outside of the subdivision development.

Historic properties within established residential subdivisions are more insulated from development. Though Cottonwood Heights was a little slower to develop subdivisions in the post-World War II building boom than other Salt Lake County communities, there are numerous neighborhoods that may qualify for the National Register of Historic Places. This report recommends that the CHHC continue to identify historic subdivisions that may be surveyed. The city code requires an RLS update at least every ten years.

Local Historic Landmark and Site Registers

The city's preservation ordinance has two levels of Registration: the Cottonwood Heights Historic Landmark Register and a Historic Site Register, representing the historic preservation "stick" and "carrot" respectively (2.140.605 & 2.140.604). A discussion of both registers was included in the 2016 survey report. This survey does not recommend listing the subdivision resources at this time. The City of Cottonwood Heights and the CHHC will need to determine if they have the personnel and other resources to add hundreds of new addresses to the City's registers.

Property owners and the general public should be educated on the differences between the NRHP and the Historic Landmark Register: an NRHP listing places no restrictions on the property, but the local landmark designation would. The CHHC may want to ease reluctant property owners into the process by suggesting a NRHP listing first, then the local listing; but with the clear understanding the two processes are separate. Because contributing buildings within a historic district are considered listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a general discussion of the process has been included below:

National Register of Historic Places Nominations

The National Register of Historic Places is the Documentation and Registration standard for the majority of significant historic resources in Utah. The NRHP is a federal listing of properties with local, state, or national historic or architectural significance.¹² Each state utilizes its SHPO to administer the NRHP program for the National Park Service (NPS). The NRHP documents the appearance and significance of districts, buildings, structures, objects and sites that contribute to our understanding and appreciation of our shared history. To be eligible a property must be at least 50 years-old, have a high degree of physical integrity, and meet criteria for significance, including associations with historic events or persons, architectural style or method of construction, or broad patterns of history. A property may be listed individually, as part of a historic district, or as an individual property associated with a context developed through the Multiple Property Documentation form (see discussion below). Property owners of NRHP-listed buildings may request an NRHP plaque. The plaques are available for a fee from the Utah SHPO.

A listing on the NRHP can provide many benefits for property owners and a sense of pride for the community. CLG grant money can be used to prepare NRHP nominations, but property owners must give their approval and have a right to object at any point in the process. Education becomes an important tool for helping potential property owners to understand the NRHP.

The following discussion of the benefits of an NRHP-listing has been adapted from fact sheets produced by the Utah SHPO. Benefits include, but are not limited to the following:

- Recognition and Community Pride
- State and Federal Tax Credits for Rehabilitation
- Grants (limited)
- Low-Interest Loans, Utah Heritage Foundation
- Building Code Leniency
- Local Zoning Variances
- Rehabilitation Advice provided by the Utah SHPO and the National Park Service
- Enhanced Property Values
- Education

A major benefit of the NRHP listing is that owners of historic properties are eligible for historic preservation tax credits. The Utah SHPO administers a 20 percent tax credit for the rehabilitation of residential buildings individually listed on the NRHP or listed as contributing buildings within an NRHP historic district.

¹² The National Historic Landmark (NHL) program is a limited program for properties with exceptional national significance. Most NHL-listed properties are listed on the NRHP first.

The Utah SHPO also does the preliminary review for a federal tax credit administered by the NPS. The federal tax credit is 20 percent for the rehabilitation of commercial or income-producing properties.¹³ It is important to note that the rehabilitation work should be pre-approved and must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.¹⁴ Some owners have used the tax credit program to reverse modifications to ineligible buildings, so that they can be listed on the NRHP and receive the tax credit.

The NRHP is an honorific designation and there are no restrictions on property owners of listed buildings. Some local governments use the documentation provided by an NRHP listing to create their own landmark registers or historic district overlays. This has created the mistaken impression that the NRHP restricts property owners. However, it is only local government that may place restrictions on the remodel or demolition of historic properties through their local planning and zoning ordinances. The NRHP listing does not restrict property rights. The following explanations are reproduced from a SHPO fact sheet:

- Listing in the National Register does not interfere with a private property owner's right to alter, manage or dispose of the property.
- The owner does not have to restore or maintain the property or open it to the public.
- National Register listing does not affect the property taxes or how the buildings may be used.
- Local preservation ordinances, where present, may have some implications for a building owner. But local ordinances are entirely separate from the National Register. Most cities in Utah do not impose restrictions on historic building owners. Those that do usually limit their control to the exterior.

Although not a financial incentive, National Register status can create a sense of pride for both property owners and others in the community. NRHP listings, particularly when accompanied by a plaque, can educate the public about a community's historic resource, and some cases can increase heritage tourism in the area.

NRHP Historic District Nominations:

In order to be considered as a historic district a neighborhood must meet the general eligibility criteria of the NRHP in the areas of age, integrity and significance. A district may have architectural significance, but a district may also represent the broad patterns of history, for example, the subdivision development boom period in Cottonwood Heights. The strongest candidates for district nominations also display a cohesive historic character and have easily definable boundaries. The Utah SHPO recommends that a potential historic district have at least 70 percent contributing resources within its boundaries.

One of the advantages of a historic district is that a building does not have to be individually significant to be eligible for NRHP programs. Buildings that are contributing resources within a district are listed on the NRHP with all the benefits of an individually listed resource, including plaques. Most importantly, contributing buildings are eligible for the tax credit programs. In addition, the owner of a non-contributing building may utilize the tax credits to reverse non-historic alterations and rehabilitate their building into a contributing building in the district.

¹³ Some residential rental properties may qualify for both credits.

¹⁴ Detailed information on the tax credits is available from the Utah SHPO or on the Utah State History website and the NPS website. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are available on the NPS website.

A review of this survey's recommendations for the four early subdivision neighborhoods is below:

Cottonwood Ridge	NO , based on lack of historic integrity
Steffensen Heights	YES , good historic integrity and distinct boundaries
Cottonwood Heights, Bradford Ranchos & Johnsons Subdivision	MAYBE , has potential but more survey work and research recommended
Greenfield Village Subdivision	YES , good integrity, distinct boundaries, and context for both residential and commercial development in the area

Multiple Property NRHP Submission

The Multiple Property Submission (MPS) is a thematic process for listing individual properties. An explanation of the process from the National Register of Historic Places Bulletin 16b is reproduced below:

The **Multiple Property Documentation Form** is a cover document and not a nomination in its own right but serves as a basis for evaluating the National Register eligibility of related properties. It may be used to nominate and register thematically related historic properties simultaneously or to establish the registration requirements for properties that may be nominated in the future. The nomination of each building, site, district, structure, or object within a thematic group is made on the National Register Registration Form (NPS 10-900). The name of the thematic group, denoting the historical framework of nominated properties, is the **Multiple Property Listing**. When nominated and listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the Multiple Property Documentation Form, together with individual registration forms, constitute a **Multiple Property Submission**.

Individual properties and districts are nominated based on their association with themes or specific contextual periods established in the MPDF. Examples in Utah include listings based on property types, such as *Carnegie Libraries* or *Post Offices*, or based on geographic associations, such as *Historic Resources of Draper City*. As with a district, resources that may not appear to be individually eligible for the NRHP (e.g., EC properties with some alterations) can often be listed individually under the "umbrella" documentation of an MPS because their significance can be supported within the contextual periods. Because the historic resources in Cottonwood Heights are mostly residential buildings, the city could request an MPDF that is organized by chronological contextual periods similar to those developed during this RLS, or possibly based on the historic communities (e.g., Union, Butler or Danish Town).

Intensive Level Surveys

An Intensive Level Survey (ILS) is another tool in the Documentation step of the preservation process. Intensive Level Surveys are prepared for individual properties and include more in-depth research than is possible with an RLS. For example, an ILS usually includes biographic materials for each owner or occupant during the historic period, best estimates for date of construction, builder or architect information if available, etc.

There are several reasons to complete an Intensive Level Survey for a historic building or structure. The most applicable to this survey are ILS work performed to provide information for a historic district nomination. The Utah SHPO typically asks for ILS work on a representative sample of buildings within a potential historic district. For example, buildings representing different floor plans or different phases within a subdivision development. This type of property or neighborhood research can be used for educational purposes (walking or driving tours, local signage or plaques, school curriculum, and local histories).

Public Education & Community Outreach

This survey may be used to select properties for public education and awareness projects, such as historic house tours, driving or walking tours, themed newspaper articles, classroom or field trips presentations, and historic plaques. The city and the CHHC can host workshops or produce fliers that offer helpful hints on historic preservation (e.g., how to seal historic wood windows, drainage for low pitch roofs, characteristics of the ranch style, etc.). The NPS and the Utah SHPO are invaluable resources for technical information. Access to the “touchable past” is important for understanding a community’s history, especially for young people. Public awareness and appreciation is a vital part of the management and preservation of historic resources.

SUMMARY

The City of Cottonwood Heights’ historic preservation ordinance states: “The city recognizes that its historical heritage is among its most unique, irreplaceable and important assets. It is therefore the city’s intent to identify, preserve, protect and enhance historic buildings, structure, sites, objects, and districts lying within the city’s limits” (2.401-601). This survey is an important step toward helping the city and the Cottonwood Heights Historic Committee fulfill its historic preservation goals.

SELECTED RESOURCES

Broschinsky, Korral. Intensive Level Survey of the Carl and Rose Badger House. Unpublished TMs, 2018.

Butler, Merlin A. "A History of Butlerville." Unpublished TMs, April 1962.

Butters, Judith B. "History of the Butlerville Area." Cottonwood Heights, Utah: Salt Lake Brighton Stake Relief Society, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Cottonwood Heights, Utah, 1997.

Conger, Gayle. *Danish Town*. Researched and written by Gayle Conger. Unpublished TMs, [2012].

Deseret News. Various issues.

Ferrin, John Ralph. "Historical Site Survey of Southeast Salt Lake County." MA Thesis, University of Utah Department of History, June 1981.

Granite View Stake. *Granite, the Story of a Land and Its People*. Sandy, Utah: Granite View Stake, 1995.

Madsen, Steven K. *A Union, Utah History*. Union, Utah: Union Fort Chapter, Sons of Utah Pioneers, 1981.

National Park Service. *Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*. By David L. Ames and Linda Flint McClelland. National Register Bulletin, September 2002.

National Park Service. *The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors*. By John Sandor, David Trayte, and Amy Elizabeth Uebel. Preservation Brief 16.

Pope, Arnold C. "Butlerville, 1847-1967." [S.l.: Butler Stake, 1967].

Roberts, Allen D. *City Between the Canyons: A History of Cottonwood Heights, 1849-1953*. Cottonwood Heights, Utah: Cottonwood Heights City, 2018.

Salt Lake Tribune. Various issues.

Sillitoe, *History of Salt Lake County*. Utah Centennial County History Series. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Historical Society and Salt Lake County Commission, 1996.

Sperry, David J., Loretta B. Derrick, Diane Stokoe. "Heritage and Future of Willow Creek Stake." Unpublished TMs, [1993].

Stelter, Melt. *Chris Lane: A "Bit" O'History!* Privately printed 2004.

APPENDICES

(Final Report & Appendices correspond to the following Utah SHPO files)

FINAL REPORT

Appendix A: Maps

Appendix B: Report Photographs

Appendix C: Figures

Appendix D: Separate Photographic Contact Sheet/Date Reports Corresponding to Each
Surveyed Subdivision/Neighborhood