1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **GRAND CANYON VILLAGE**

Other Name/Site Number:

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: Grand Canyon National Park Not for publication:___

City/Town: Grand Canyon Vicinity:___

State: AZ County: Coconino Code: 005 Zip Code: 86023

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property		Category of Property	
Private:	X	Building(s):	___
Public-Local:	___	District:	X
Public-State:	___	Site:	___
Public-Federal:	X	Structure:	___
		Object:	___

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Non-contributing	
212	35	buildings
1	___	sites
44	11	structures
___	___	objects
257	46	Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 257

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: Historic Park Landscapes in National and State Parks, 1995

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this _X_ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

_____ _____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

____ Entered in the National Register
____ Determined eligible for the
National Register
____ Determined not eligible for the
National Register
____ Removed from the National Register
____ Other (explain): _____

_____ _____
Signature of Keeper Date of Action

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:	Landscape	Sub: Park
	Recreation & Culture	Sub: Outdoor Recreation
	Domestic	Sub: Single Dwelling
	Domestic	Sub: Multiple Dwelling
	Domestic	Sub: Institutional Housing
	Domestic	Sub: Hotel
	Transportation	Sub: Road-related
Current:	Landscape	Sub: Park
	Recreation & Culture	Sub: Outdoor Recreation
	Domestic	Sub: Single Dwelling
	Domestic	Sub: Multiple Dwelling
	Domestic	Sub: Institutional Housing
	Domestic	Sub: Hotel
	Transportation	Sub: Road-related

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Bungalow/Craftsman
Other: NPS Rustic

MATERIALS:
Foundation: Stone/Concrete
Walls: Stone/Log/Shingle
Roof: Shingle
Other:
Site Furnishings: Stone/Wood/Metal/Concrete
Pavements and Curbs: Packed Earth/Gravel/Asphalt/Stone/Concrete
Retaining Walls and Other Landscape Structures: Concrete/Stone/Packed Earth

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Summary
The Grand Canyon Village National Historic Landmark (NHL) District is located within Grand Canyon National Park adjacent to the south rim of the canyon, approximately five miles north of the park's southern boundary. The historic district was first entered into the National Register of Historic Places on November 20, 1975. The original nomination included 39 buildings. It was amended in 1982 to include the Bright Angel Lodge, which added 25 buildings to the total. The nomination was further amended in 1995, when the boundaries of the district were enlarged to encompass the entire historic village area. The total number of buildings in the enlarged district became 247, and 55 landscape structures and 3 sites were described. The current National Historic Landmark Nomination describes the same district boundaries as the existing National Register district and encompasses the same number of buildings and structures. Two discontiguous sites of the National Register district, which are cemeteries, do not relate directly to the theme of Park Service landscape architecture, and so are not included in the NHL District.

The setting of the NHL District is dominated by the south rim of the Grand Canyon and the adjacent Coconino Plateau forests of Ponderosa pine, pinion, and juniper trees. The district conveys a strong sense of architectural unity, as most of the buildings are of the "NPS Rustic" style. The district possesses a high degree of integrity relative to the original street plan, organization of developed areas, and overall setting. The vast majority of resources date to the 1920s and 1930s and alterations to historic structures are minor.

The most important impact on the integrity of the historic town plan overall has been the reorientation of arriving automobile traffic from a southern approach to an eastern approach, which was done in the 1960s as part of the development of the new visitor center and other facilities to the east of the historic district. The town's plaza, originally an arrival point at the center of the plan, no longer serves that function because of this change. The plaza itself retains physical integrity, however, since the space itself is intact. The historic civic buildings around it are in excellent condition (although the old Babbitts' Brothers store burned to the ground in 1995). The alteration to the overall circulation in the district has changed the sequence of spaces for most arriving visitors; but the plaza does retain its physical integrity and therefore is part of the historic district.

Description of Contributing Resources in the Historic District
The following description of contributing resources is divided into seven categories:

Spatial Organization
Circulation
Topography
Vegetation
Structures
Buildings
Sites

Spatial organization refers to the composition and sequence of outdoor spaces within the district. Circulation refers to the means and patterns of movement through the district.

Topography refers to the ways in which the landscape planning responds to the topographic features of the site, and also to modifications of that topography. Vegetation also refers both to the response to existing vegetation, and to the management of vegetation through pruning, removal, or addition of trees and shrubs. Structures include all the contributing structures in the district, including roads, trails, retaining walls, etc. Buildings are defined as structures intended to shelter a human activity. Sites are defined as discrete areas designed for a specific use, such as cemeteries or golf courses. No archeological resources have been considered in this survey.

Spatial Organization

The overall spatial organization of the Grand Canyon Village NHL District is expressed in Daniel Hull's 1924 site plan for Grand Canyon Village. The basic spatial organization and zoning implied in Hull's plan were determined by the topography and vegetation of the area, and by a response to existing resort development and perceived needs for village expansion.

A large "village square" was designated at first at the point where the railroad and motor road came together below El Tovar. The first administration building (CB1) was built to face this proposed public space. Today the area is a busy intersection defined by the first administration building, the guardwall at the railhead (CS26), and the Fred Harvey Garage (CB109).

The basic spatial organization of Hull's plan already had taken shape in the early 1920s. Most of the proposed development of the new town was located away from the rim, on the south side of the natural divide offered by the Bright Angel drainage. The land to the south of the drainage was, itself, naturally divided into two small hills, divided by a central, north-south swale perpendicular to the larger swale of the Bright Angel drainage. Hull proposed a central road down this smaller swale, with residential subdivisions on either side. Because the entrance road followed a natural valley, the residential neighborhoods remained relatively undisturbed on either side of the through road. The effect was to create two well defined neighborhoods, which were occupied by the Fred Harvey staff (to the west) and Park Service personnel (to the east).

The 1924 plan called for a separation of land-uses into distinct zones. Older resort development, such as El Tovar (CB105) and the Kolb Brothers Studio (CB102), had been located along the rim to exploit the spectacular views from those points. A zone of visitor services already was established along the rim, and Hull's 1924 plan suggested the expansion of hotel accommodations within the same well defined zone. The plan indicated that El Tovar would be expanded with a new western annex, and that the Bright Angel Camp would be completely rebuilt. Two sites east of El Tovar also were set aside for new development. The new residential subdivisions on the other side of the Bright Angel drainage also defined a discrete land-use zone. Utility areas, one for the concessioners and one for the Park Service, were planned to be separate from both the public zone along the rim and the private residential areas, although convenient to both.

One of the most important features of any successful town plan of this type was the central civic space. The town square typically served as a hub of circulation, an arrival point, and the site of the community's most important public buildings. As early as 1922, Hull probably already had decided to relocate the town's principal civic space, the "plaza," to its

present location. On the 1924 plan, a new automotive approach from Williams was indicated to allow a main entrance from the south, rather than the east. This important change transformed Hull's center road between the residential subdivisions, making it the new South Entrance Road. The new automotive entrance also brought visitors to the center of Grand Canyon Village, rather than to its east side. The plaza, as it became known, was relocated to this central arrival point. It was originally intended as a large open square, and figures prominently in its new location in the center of the 1924 plan. The new Babbitt Brothers' store, the post office, and a second park administration building were all sited around the plaza (as was a proposed museum that was never built). Like the plaza in the 1923 Yosemite plan, the Grand Canyon plaza also terminated the automotive entrance into the village. In both cases, these plazas became prime parking locations, eventually detracting from their usefulness as gathering places.

Over the next decades, the 1924 plan guided the development of Grand Canyon Village, although numerous alterations were made. The new hotel and casino complex was never built, nor was the annex to El Tovar. The construction of the nearby Kachina and Thunderbird Lodges (non-contributing), however, roughly followed the strategy of concentrating visitor accommodations in the rim zone. The Fred Harvey mule barns remained in their original locations and were not relocated, and the new power house and laundry (1926) were built next to them. Perhaps most significantly, the plaza was reduced in size, and apparently from an early date it was used for parking.

Circulation

Daniel Hull's 1924 plan called for certain changes in existing circulation patterns and suggested how the village should be expanded. Circulation at the site already had been determined to a large degree by topography. Both the railroad approach (from the west) and the Grandview Road (from the east) followed the natural right-of-way of the Bright Angel drainage, a long swale parallel to the canyon, typically at an elevation about 50 feet below that of the south rim itself. Since the principal point of arrival (by train or car) was at this point, this was the original location of the village plaza. The 1924 plan delineated the new approach road from the south, which created a new point of arrival for automobiles near the center of the village and led to the relocation of the village plaza to its present site.

Probably the most significant alteration of the 1924 plan occurred when highway construction in the 1960s redirected arriving automobiles to the original (pre-1924) point of arrival at the east end of the village. This alteration undermined the position of Hull's plaza, which no longer was an arrival point. The new traffic pattern also created a particularly confusing intersection at the critical point--between the first administration building and the Fred Harvey Garage--where visitors get their first impression of the area.

In the residential areas of the plan, each subdivision was given its own character in part through the design of characteristic circulation features. To the west, three parallel streets all curve to suit the slope and each connects to the perpendicular center road, forming a gently curved grid. On the other side of the road, only one main entry to this smaller area implied an extended cul-de-sac arrangement. A new Park Service utility area also on the east side (where it was convenient to the Park Service residences) was arranged orthogonally; the arrangement of utility buildings created central work yards that were well screened from the nearby residential area. On the Park Service side, the cul-de-sac

arrangement allowed automobile access to the back (kitchen) sides of residences. The front doors therefore opened onto communal public space and connected to informal pedestrian routes leading to school and work. Pedestrian and automotive circulation remained fully separated in this arrangement, and the network of pedestrian paths became fully integrated into the pedestrian paths elsewhere in the village. The Santa Fe Railway (Fred Harvey) residences on the other side of the South Entrance Road demanded a different treatment. Generously set back, the front doors of these cottages faced the streets, lending the neighborhood an entirely different character. Access to garages set at the rear of building lots required long alleys, parallel to the streets, down the center of the blocks.

Within the residential areas alone at Grand Canyon Village, there were five distinct street types: pedestrian paths lined with front entrances; a narrow main street lined with back entrances and garages; a slightly wider main street lined with the fronts of houses; service alleys; and the South Entrance Road itself, carrying through traffic. The Park Service utility area, with its very wide, rectilinear streets, featured a sixth typical street section.

Topography

The town planning process that Daniel Hull employed depended above all on a response to existing topography. A 1917 topographic survey (drawn at one inch to 100 feet, with five-foot contour intervals) was available for Hull to use as a base map for the town plan developed between 1920 and 1924. The response to topography helped define the basic spatial organization of the plan, the alignment of streets and roads, and the locations of different land uses.

The swale of the Bright Angel drainage provided a logical boundary between residential areas and more public areas near the rim. The perpendicular swale of Center Road similarly was used to locate that road and to divide the residential areas. The rim itself, elevated above the swale, created its own topographic zone, which was inherently separated from the other areas of the village, and which offered the most spectacular views.

The alignment of the streets of the village generally curve where necessary to better conform to topography. The relatively flat areas of the drainage itself provided appropriate terrain for the railroad originally, and subsequently for various utility uses associated with it. The gentle slopes of the residential areas provided pleasant and well drained terrain for subdividing.

Vegetation

Hull's 1924 plan also exploited the character of the existing vegetation. While the subdivisions were proposed on lightly wooded, well drained slopes, almost no new building was proposed in the Bright Angel drainage. This preserved a fine stand of Ponderosa and Pinyon pines, typical vegetation found in the moister soils of such a drainage. These trees reinforced the division between the accommodation zone near the rim and the new residential and utility zones to the south.

In general, the Park Service landscape architects and CCC foremen made a point of preserving existing vegetation, even relocating trenches for sewers and utility lines, for example, to minimize the damage to the roots of trees. One of the most successful road projects in the village, the main road between the Fred Harvey garage and the town plaza

(along the south edge of the railroad tracks) was replaced by two new roadways, which were separated by a straight, 30-foot wide mall. The two roadways, each carrying one-way traffic, were laid out on either edge of the mature grove of Pinyon and Ponderosa pines that remained in the Bright Angel drainage. The effect fully exploited the beauty of the trees, and probably also preserved more of them than a single two-way road would have.

Perhaps most significantly for the appearance of the village, scores of CCC boys were employed in the difficult and time consuming tasks of improving soils and transplanting native trees and shrubs from surrounding areas. The work typically involved transplanting native plants in areas damaged by visitors or by new construction. This so-called "landscape naturalization" of disturbed areas attempted to recreate not so much the original conditions at an individual site, as a "beautified" condition featuring composed displays of native flora. At Grand Canyon, the planting designs emphasized the native plants of the pinyon-juniper belt that characterizes the 4,500 to 6,500-foot elevations in the park. Yuccas, Fernbush, Squawbush, and Bush mint were all used effectively to establish shrub borders and woodland understories. Pinyon pines and junipers, some of them large enough to require hoists and trucks to move the boxed roots, also were transplanted in the village area wherever ornamental plantings were desired.

Areas around new construction received special attention, a fact which contributed immeasurably to the successful "harmonization" of new buildings. Such planting never hid the architecture behind a screen of vegetation, however, but enhanced and augmented the effect of the facade elevation. Local trees and shrubs planted strategically at the corners of buildings or as foundation plantings contributed as much to the building's total effect as did the choice of building materials. In other heavily used areas, such as along the rim walk, small islands of junipers, yuccas, and Fernbush were arranged as ornamental compositions that also contributed to the aesthetic appreciation of the park's flora generally.

A great success of Park Service landscape architecture was in developing artistically compelling ornamental compositions while making use of local plants transplanted from nearby woods. Such planting design reinforced the general goals of landscape architectural development by strengthening spatial compositions or augmenting architectural facades; but by using local plants grouped by correct ecological associations, work of this type also "naturalized" areas that had been disturbed by construction or overuse, fulfilling the mandate to minimize the impact of physical development.

Structures

The landscape structures of the district--curbs, walls, furniture, etc.--all made use of "native" materials, especially Kaibab limestone. The rough workmanship and choice of materials in the built portions of the site work helped put the park buildings into a context of an overall development plan. The strong sense of architectural unity in the district is largely due to the consistent use of construction details outside of the buildings themselves that extend the look and inspiration of the architecture.

The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) recruits in Grand Canyon were employed digging utility lines and sewers, paving roads and trails, and smoothing and regrading roadsides. The recruits built many of the most significant landscape structures in the village during the 1930s. The stone guardwall along the canyon, although portions of it dated back to 1905,

eventually was completed and regularized along its length. It was complemented by the treatment of the rim trail, which like other heavily used footpaths in the village was paved to a width of five feet and lined on either side with pieces of limestone set as curbs. Log seats were set at advantageous points along the trail. The flagstone esplanade in front of the Bright Angel Lodge was completed in 1939. Stone walkways, stairs, and retaining walls were built all around the village, including the wall around the mule corral at the head of the Bright Angel Trail. CCC recruits also completed numerous headwalls, culverts, and catch basin structures throughout the village.

Contributing Structures:

CS1.	Structure:	Stone Wall	NR#: L-1
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1905-1934
	Builder:	NPS	
CS2.	Structure:	Dance Platform	NR#: L-2
	Location:	Hopi House	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS3.	Structure:	Mud Ovens	NR#: L-3
	Location:	Hopi House	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS4.	Structure:	Stone Wall	NR#: L-4
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1933
	Builder:	NPS	
CS5.	Structure:	Flagstone Patio	NR#: L-5
	Location:	Bright Angel Lodge	Date: 1939
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS6.	Structure:	Concrete Sidewalk & Arch	NR#: L-6
	Location:	Kolb Studio	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Kolb	

CS7.	Structure:	Stone Wall	NR#: L-7
	Location:	Kolb Studio	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS8.	Structure:	Stone Wall	NR#: L-8
	Location:	Kolb Studio	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS9.	Structure:	Concrete Stairway	NR#: L-9
	Location:	Kolb Studio	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS10.	Structure:	Stone Drinking Fountain	NR#: L-10
	Location:	Bright Angel Cabins	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS11.	Structure:	Mule Corral	NR#: L-11
	Location:	Bright Angel Trailhead	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS12.	Structure:	Stone Walkways & Walls	NR#: L-13
	Location:	Bright Angel Cabins	Date: 1940
	Builder:	NPS	
CS13.	Structure:	Stone Walls & Stair	NR#: L-14
	Location:	Bright Angel Lodge	Date: 1935
	Builder:	BPR/Santa Fe	
CS14.	Structure:	Stone Walls & Stair	NR#: L-15
	Location:	Colter Hall	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS15.	Structure:	Stone Curb	NR#: L-16
	Location:	El Tovar Entrance Road	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS16.	Structure:	Stone Curb	NR#: L-17
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	BPR	
CS17.	Structure:	Stone Curb	NR#: L-18
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	BPR	

CS18.	Structure:	Stone Retaining Wall	NR#: L-21
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	BPR	
CS19.	Structure:	Stone Wall (Jesus Morales)	NR#: L-22
	Location:	Railroad Grade	Date: 1928
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS20.	Structure:	Pipe Rack Stanchions	NR#: L-25
	Location:	Railroad Grade	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS21.	Structure:	Metal Fence & Gate	NR#: L-26
	Location:	Railroad Depot	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS22.	Structure:	Stone Curb	NR#: L-27
	Location:	RR Depot Parking Area	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	BPR	
CS23.	Structure:	Power Pole and Sign Brackets	NR#: L-28
	Location:	Railroad Depot	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS24.	Structure:	Rubble Wall	NR#: L-29
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS25.	Structure:	Stone Wall	NR#: L-30
	Location:	Superintendent's House	Date: 1921
	Builder:	NPS	
CS26.	Structure:	Stone Retaining Wall, Stair and Sidewalk	NR#: L-31
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS	
CS27.	Structure:	RR Tracks & Grades	NR#: L-32
	Location:	Bright Angel Wash	Date:1901, 1927
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS28.	Structure:	Concrete RR Platforms	NR#: L-33
	Location:	Railroad Depot	Date: 1921
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS29.	Structure:	Stone Entrance	NR#: L-36

		Walls & Stair	
	Location:	Navajo Street	Date:ca1934
	Builder:	NPS	
CS30.	Structure:	Stone Drop Culverts	NR#: L-37
	Location:	Navajo Street	Date:ca1934
	Builder:	NPS	
CS31.	Structure:	Rock Entrance Pylon	NR#: L-39
	Location:	Garage (NR#790)	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS32.	Structure:	Concrete Foundation Wall	NR#: L-34
	Location:	Bright Angel Wash Channel	Date:Unknown
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS33.	Structure:	Headwalls and Culvert	NR#: L-42
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1934
	Builder:	BPR	
CS34.	Structure:	Headwalls and Culvert	NR#: L-43
	Location:	F.Harvey Garage (NR#551)	Date: 1934
	Builder:	BPR	
CS35.	Structure:	Headwalls and Culvert	NR#: L-44
	Location:	Tapeats Circle	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CS36.	Structure:	Headwall	NR#: L-45
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS	
CS37.	Structure:	Headwall	NR#: L-46
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS	
CS38.	Structure:	Headwall	NR#: L-47
	Location:	Center Road	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS	
CS39.	Structure:	Concrete RR Platforms	NR#: L-48
	Location:	Building (NR#104)	Date: ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	

CS40.	Structure:	Stone Walls	NR#: L-49
	Location:	F.Harvey Garage (NR#551)	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CS41.	Structure:	Village Historic District Roads	NR#: L-50
	Location:	Tonto Street Apache Street (Avenue A) Boulder Street (Avenue B) Center Road (South Park Entrance Road) Juniper Hill Street Kaibab Street Navajo Street El Tovar Hotel Entrance/Service Roads	Date:1901-1936
	Builder:	NPS/BPR	
CS42.	Structure:	Village Historic District Footpaths	NR#: L-51
	Location:		Date:1920-41
	Builder:	NPS	
CS43.	Structure:	Village Historic District Streetlamps	NR#: L-52
	Location:		Date:ca1920
	Builder:	NPS	
CS44.	Structure:	Bright Angel Wash Channel	NR#: L-53
	Location:	Railroad Tracks	Date: 1901
	Builder:	Santa Fe	

Non-contributing Structures:

NCS1.	Structure:	Wayside Exhibit	NR#: L-12
	Location:	Bright Angel Trailhead	Date:ca1980
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS2.	Structure:	Bus Shelters	NR#: L-19
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1970
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS3.	Structure:	Stone Curb	NR#: L-20
	Location:	Civic Center Bus Stop	Date: 1994
	Builder:	Federal Highways	

NCS4.	Structure:	Steel Stair	NR#: L-23
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1980
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS5.	Structure:	Footbridge	NR#: L-24
	Location:	Bright Angel Wash Channel	Date:ca1970
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS6	Structure:	Headwalls and Culvert	NR#: L-40
	Location:	By-pass Road	Date:Ca1970
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS7.	Structure:	Footbridge	NR#: L-35
	Location:	Bright Angel Wash Channel	Date: 1988
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS8.	Structure:	Concrete Stair	NR#: L-38
	Location:	Hospital (NR#100)	Date:ca1970
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS9.	Structure:	Headwalls & Culvert	NR#: L-41
	Location:	Bright Angel Wash Channel	Date:1960
	Builder:	NPS	
NCS10.	Structure:	Transformers & Chain Link Fence	NR#: L-54
	Location:	Grand Canyon Power House	Date:ca1970
	Builder:	Arizona Public Service	
NCS11.	Structure:	Radio Antenna	NR#: L-55
	Location:	Mountain States Telephone Building	Date:ca1970
	Builder:	US West	

Buildings

The buildings of the Grand Canyon Village NHL District are the largest and most diverse assemblage of park architecture in the national park system. There are six National Historic Landmarks designated in the theme of architecture within the district boundaries: El Tovar (CB105), Hopi House (CB106), the Lookout Studio (CB101), the Power House (CB115), the Grand Canyon Depot (CB 108) and the Second Administration Building (CB65).

The buildings of the historic district represent an entire range of park architecture, from the 1890s to World War II. The 1897 Buckey O'Neil Cabin (CB78) is the oldest standing building built on the rim. Charles Whittlesey's 1905 El Tovar ranks as one of the finest of all the national park lodges built for concessioners in the early 20th century. Mary E. J.

Colter's collection of dramatic park structures is unique. And no more comprehensive collection of Park Service Rustic architecture exists. Daniel Hull's 1921 first administration building (CB1) is one of the earliest and most influential of this type; Thomas Vint's 1929 second administration building (CB65) is one of the most accomplished. Together there are 247 buildings in the historic district. Over 85% of them (all but 35) are contributing.

The buildings of the NHL District represent an extraordinary collection of Park Service and concessioner architecture. Along the rim of the canyon, the older resort architecture is typically more elaborate and eclectic than the official structures commissioned by the Park Service. Mary Colter, in particular, employed elaborate masonry techniques and fanciful elevations in her rim zone buildings. In the civic zone of the village (along the rail corridor between the first administration building and the 1924 plaza), the public architecture designed by Daniel Hull and Thomas Vint projects a very different image. Using massive Kaibab sandstone veneers over concrete foundations and piers, as well as dark log or wood siding on upper stories, the Park Service landscape architects created a powerful and controlled imagery, now known as Park Service Rustic. This consistent idiom connected all the official buildings in the parks, together projecting a strong sense of official responsibility and appropriate sensibility.

In the residential subdivisions of the village, another architectural distinction was made, between the concessioner residences and the Park Service residences. The simpler bungalows on the Park Service side were designed with front doors accessing the semi-public pedestrian paths that characterize that subdivision. The larger residences on the concessioner side of Center Street presented more decorative elevations with stone foundations, and fronted on the street side of each lot.

Contributing Buildings:

CB1.	Building:	First Administration Bldg./Superintendents Residence	NR#: 1
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1921
	Architect/Builder:	Daniel Hull/NPS	
CB2.	Building:	General Foreman's Residence	NR#: 2
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1922
	Builder:	NPS	
CB3.	Building:	Storage	NR#: 2A
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	

CB4.	Building:	Asst. Superintendent's Residence	NR#: 3
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1923
	Builder:	NPS	
CB5.	Building:	Park Clerk's Residence	NR#: 4
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1924
	Builder:	NPS	
CB6.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 4A
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB7.	Building:	Chief Ranger's Residence	NR#: 5
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1924
	Builder:	NPS	
CB8.	Building:	Duplex Cottage	NR#: 6
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1926
	Builder:	NPS	
CB9.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 6C
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB10.	Building:	Duplex Cottage	NR#: 7
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1926
	Builder:	NPS	
CB11.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 7A
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB12.	Building:	Park Service Doctor's Residence	NR#: 9
	Location:	Navajo	Date: 1936
	Builder:	Del E. Webb Const. Co.	
CB13.	Building:	Park Stenographer's Residence	NR#: 11
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1928
	Builder:	NPS	
CB14.	Building:	Storage	NR#: 11A
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1928
	Builder:	NPS	
CB15.	Building:	Second Chief Ranger's	NR#: 12

		Residence	
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1934
	Contractor :	Del. E. Webb Const. Co.	
CB16.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 12A
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB17.	Building:	Second Assistant Superintendent's Residence	NR#: 13
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1928
	Builder:	NPS	
CB18.	Building:	Second General Foreman's Residence	NR#: 14
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB19.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 15
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB20.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 15A
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB21.	Building:	Checking Station Residence	NR#: 16
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1925
	Builder:	NPS	
CB22.	Building:	Outbuilding	NR#: 16A
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB23.	Building:	Bachelor Ranger's Residence	NR#: 17
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1929
	Builder:	NPS	
CB24.	Building:	Park Naturalist's Residence	NR#: 19
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1931
	Builder:	NPS	
CB25.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 19A
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1931
	Builder:	NPS	

CB26.	Building:	Third Assistant Superintendent's Residence	NR#: 21
	Location:	Kaibab Street	Date: 1931
	Builder:	NPS	
CB27.	Building:	Chief Ranger's Resid.	NR#: 23
	Location:	Tapeats Circle	Date: 1941
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB28.	Building:	Park Service Mess Hall/Duplex	NR#: 24
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1920
	Builder:	NPS	
CB29.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 24C
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB30.	Building:	Park Engineer's Resid.	NR#: 25
	Location:	Tapeats Circle	Date: 1941
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB31.	Building:	Asst. Superintendent's	NR#: 27
	Location:	Tapeats Circle	Date: 1941
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB32.	Building:	County House	NR#: 40
	Location:	Apache Street	Date:ca1924
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB33.	Building:	Four-Car Garage	NR#: 43
	Location:	Navajo Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB34.	Building:	Community Building	NR#: 44
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS	
CB35.	Building:	Park Service Employee's Cabin	NR#: 47
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB36.	Building:	Park Service Employee's Cabin	NR#: 50
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	

CB37-40.	Building:	Park Service Bachelor's Cabins	NR#:51-54
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1931
	Builder:	NPS	
CB41.	Building:	Park Service Bachelor's Cabin	NR#: 55
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1931
	Builder:	NPS	
CB42.	Building:	Lavatory Building	NR#: 60
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB43-47.	Building:	Park Service Laborer's Cabins	NR#: 61-65
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB48.	Building:	Teacherage	NR#: 66
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date:1920, 1938
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB49.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 67
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1940
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB50.	Building:	Carpenter's Shop	NR#: 69
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1923
	Builder:	NPS	
CB51.	Building:	Blacksmith Shop/Garage	NR#: 74
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1923
	Builder:	NPS	
CB52.	Building:	Park Service Machine Shop	NR#: 75
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1928
	Builder:	NPS	
CB53.	Building:	Rangers Dormitory	NR#: 76
	Location:	Tonto Street	Date: 1921
	Architect/Builder:	Daniel Hull/NPS	
CB54.	Building:	Park Service Warehouse	NR#: 78

	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1926
	Builder:	NPS	
CB55.	Building:	Park Service Gas Station	NR#: 79
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS	
CB56.	Building:	Park Service Vehicle Paint Shop	NR#: 80
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB57.	Building:	Park Service Jail	NR#: 87
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB58.	Building:	Park Service Coal Storage	NR#: 88
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB59.	Building:	ECW Warehouse	NR#: 90
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB60.	Building:	Storage Building	NR#: 94
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB61.	Building:	Firehouse	NR#: 97
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB62.	Building:	Park Service Mule Barn	NR#: 98
	Location:	Sunset Drive	Date: 1937
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	

CB63.	Building:	Vehicle Storage Building	NR#: 99
	Location:	Sunset Drive	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB64.	Building:	Park Hospital	NR#: 100
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1930
	Builder:	NPS/G. Walters, Contractor	
CB65.	Building:	Second Park Administration Building	NR#: 103
	Location:	Center Road	Date: 1929
	Builder:	NPS/Old Bros. Const., Contractor	
CB66.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 159
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB67.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 161
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB68.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 163
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB69.	Building:	Post Office	NR#: 166
	Location:	Civic Center	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/Del E. Webb, Contractor	
CB70-72.	Building:	Vehicle Storage Bldg.	NR#:183-185
	Location:	Sunset Drive	Date: 1935
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
CB73.	Building:	Grand Canyon School	NR#: 208
	Location:	Navajo Street	Date:ca1917
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB74.	Building:	Grand Canyon Middle School	NR#: 227
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1939
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	

CB75. Building: Mountain States Telephone Building NR#: 500
Location: Civic Center Date: 1937
Contractor: W.C. McCudden

CB76. Building: Duplex Garage NR#: 504
Location: Civic Center Date: 1936
Builder: GSA

CB77. Building: Bright Angel Lodge NR#: 507
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB78. Building: Buckey O'Neil Lodge NR#: 508
Location: Canyon Rim Date:1897, 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB79. Building: Powell Lodge NR#: 509
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB80. Building: Four-Room Rim Cabin NR#: 510
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1936
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB81. Building: Two-Room Rim Cabin NR#: 511
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1936
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB82. Building: Four-Room Rim Cabin NR#: 512
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1936
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB83. Building: Two-Room Rim Cabin NR#: 513
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1936
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB84. Building: Three-Room Rim Cabin NR#: 514
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1936
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB85. Building: Four-Room Cabin NR#: 517
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB86. Building: Cabin NR#: 518
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nussbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB87. Building: Cabin NR#: 519
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nussbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB88. Building: Four-Plex Cabin NR#: 520
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nussbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB89. Building: Laundry Building NR#: 520.1
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB90-92. Building: Four-Plex Cabins NR#:521-523
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB93. Building: Cabin NR#:524
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB94. Building: Cabin NR#:525
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB95. Building: Red Horse Cabin NR#: 526
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1890/1935
Builder: Unknown

CB96-100. Building: Cabins NR#:527-531
Location: Bright Angel Cabins Date: 1935
Architect/Contractor: Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.

CB101. Building: Lookout Studio NR#: 532
Location: Canyon Rim Date: 1910
Architect/Builder: Colter/Santa Fe

CB102. Building: Kolb Brothers Studio NR#: 533
Location: Canyon Rim Date:ca1914
Builder: Kolb Bros.

CB103.	Building:	Telephone Building	NR#: 535
	Location:	Bright Angels Cabins	Date: 1935
	Architect/Builder:	Colter/Santa Fe	
CB104.	Building:	Colter Hall	NR#: 539
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1937
	Architect/Builder:	Colter-Nusbaum/Santa Fe.	
CB105.	Building:	El Tovar Hotel	NR#: 542
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1905
	Architect/Builder:	C.F. Wittlesey/Santa Fe	
CB106.	Building:	Hopi House	NR#: 545
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1905
	Architect/Builder:	Colter/Santa Fe	
CB107.	Building:	Verkamps Curio Store	NR#: 546
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1905
	Builder:	John Verkamp	
CB108.	Building:	Grand Canyon Depot	NR#: 549
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1910
	Architect/Builder:	Francis Wilson/Santa Fe	
CB109.	Building:	Fred Harvey Garage	NR#: 551
	Location:	Navajo Street	Date:ca1914
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB110.	Building:	AT&SF Executive Residence	NR#: 552
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1914
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB111.	Building:	AT&SF Executive Residence	NR#: 554
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:ca1914
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB112.	Building:	Mule Barn	NR#: 562
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1906
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB113.	Building:	Livery Stable	NR#: 563
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1906
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB114.	Building:	Blacksmith Shop	NR#: 564
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1906

	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB115.	Building:	Grand Canyon Power House	NR#: 567
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1926
	Architect:	Santa Fe	
CB116.	Building:	Fred Harvey Laundry	NR#: 569
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1926
	Architect:	Santa Fe	
CB117.	Building:	Fred Harvey Paint Shop	NR#: 572
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1931
	Architect:	Santa Fe	
CB118.	Building:	Victor Hall	NR#: 576
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1937
	Architect/Builder:	Colter-Nusbaum/W.P. Neil Co.	
CB119.	Building:	Victor Hall Annex	NR#: 578
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1913, 1937
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB120-127.	Building:	Four-Plex Cabin	NR#: 581-588
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date: 1940
	Architect/Contractor:	Colter-Nusbaum/P.W. Womack	
CB128.	Building:	Laundry Building	NR#: 589
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date: 1940
	Architect/Contractor:	Colter-Nusbaum/P.W. Womack	
CB129-142.	Building:	Cabin	NR#: 595-608
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date: 1927
	Architect/Builder:	Colter/Santa Fe	
CB143.	Building:	Restrooms/Bath Cabin	NR#: 609
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date: 1931
	Architect/Builder:	Colter/Santa Fe	
CB144-149.	Building:	Cabin	NR#: 610-615
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date: 1926
	Architect/Builder:	Colter/Santa Fe	

CB150.	Building:	Kolb Garage	NR#: 617
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1927
	Builder:	Kolb Bros.	
CB151.	Building:	Boiler House	NR#: 631
	Location:	Maswick Area	Date:ca1927
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB152.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 777
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1927
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB153.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 779
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB154.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 780
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB155.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 781
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB156.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 783
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB157.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 788
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB158.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 789
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB159-167.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 790-798
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1931
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB168.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 799
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1927
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	

CB169.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 800
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1927
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB170-174.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 801-805
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1929
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB175.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 806
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1930
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB176.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 807
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB177.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 808
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1930
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB178.	Building:	U.S. Postal Employee Residence	NR#: 809
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1934
	Builder:	GSA/Del E. Webb Const. Co.	
CB179.	Building:	Postal Employee Residence	NR#: 810
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1934
	Builder:	GSA/Del E. Webb Const. Co.	
CB180-191.	Building:	AT&SF Residence	NR#: 812-823
	Location:	Apache Street	Date: 1927
	Architect/Builder:	W.H. Mohr/Santa Fe	
CB192.	Building:	Case House	NR#: 824
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date:ca1917
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB193.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 827
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1927
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB194.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 829
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	

CB195.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 834
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1929
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB196.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 835
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1931
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB197.	Building:	Barn/Garage	NR#: 837
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date:ca1924
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB198-201.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 838-842
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1931
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB202-205.	Building:	Garage	NR#: 842.5-844
	Location:	Apache Street Alley	Date: 1931
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB206.	Building:	4-Car Garage	NR#: 857
	Location:	Boulder Street Alley	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB207.	Building:	4-Car Garage	NR#: 858
	Location:	Boulder Street Alley	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB208.	Building:	Fred Harvey Gas Station	NR#: 867
	Location:	Center Road	Date: 1939
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
CB209.	Building:	Stone Pump House	NR#: B-1
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date:pre1930
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB210.	Building:	Boiler	NR#: B-2
	Location:	Bright Angel Cabins	Date:ca1935
	Builder:	Unknown	
CB211.	Building:	Woodshed	NR#: B-3
	Location:	Bright Angel Cabins	Date:ca1935
	Builder:	Unknown	

CB212.	Building:	Woodshed	NR#: B-4
	Location:	Bright Angel Cabins	Date:ca1935
	Builder:	Santa Fe	

Non-contributing Buildings:

NCB1.	Building:	Park Service Employee Cabin	NR#: 46
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	Reconst. 1986
NCB2.	Building:	Park Service Employee Cabin	NR#: 48
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	Reconst. 1986
NCB3.	Building:	Storage Shed	NR#: 66A
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: ca1938
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	
NCB4.	Building:	Park Service Residence	NR#: 169
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: 1936
	Builder:	NPS/CCC	Reconst. ca1980
NCB5.	Building:	Trailer	NR#: 200
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: ca1960
	Builder:	N/A	
NCB6.	Building:	Trailer	NR#: 200.1
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: ca1960
	Builder:	N/A	
NCB7.	Building:	Trailer	NR#: 210
	Location:	NPS Utility Area	Date: ca1960
	Builder:	N/A	
NCB8.	Building:	Scout Building	NR#: 241
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: ca1960
	Builder:	Unknown	
NCB9.	Building:	Teacherage	NR#: 322
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1953
	Builder:	GC Unified School District	

NCB10.	Building:	School Building	NR#: 323
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1953
	Builder:	GC Unified School District	
NCB11.	Building:	Teacherage	NR#: 325
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1955
	Builder:	GC Unified School District	
NCB12.	Building:	Teacherage	NR#: 326
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1955
	Builder:	GC Unified School District	
NCB13.	Building:	Modular House	NR#: 472
	Location:	Juniper Hill Street	Date: ca1972
	Builder:	GC Unified School District	
NCB14.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 506
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date: 1948
	Builder:	Verkamp's	Reconst. ca1960
NCB15.	Building:	Verkamps Storage Bldg.	NR#: 547
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1970
	Builder:	Verkamp's	
NCB16.	Building:	Railroad Utility Bldg.	NR#: 548
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: ca1980
	Builder:	Santa Fe	
NCB17.	Building:	Fred Harvey Transportation Dorm	NR#: 558
	Location:	Village Loop Drive	Date: 1920
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB18.	Building:	Fred Harvey Carpenter Shop	NR#: 575
	Location:	Utility Zone	Date: 1906
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB19.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 845
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB20.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 846
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB21.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 847
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930

	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB22.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 848
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB23.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 849
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB24.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 850
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB25.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 851
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB26.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 852
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB27.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 853
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB28.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 854
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB29.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 855
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB30.	Building:	Residence	NR#: 856
	Location:	Boulder Street	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB31.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 859
	Location:	Boulder Street Alley	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980

NCB32.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 860
	Location:	Boulder Street Alley	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB33.	Building:	Coal Shed	NR#: 861
	Location:	Boulder Street Alley	Date:ca1930
	Builder:	Santa Fe	Reconst. ca1980
NCB34.	Building:	Thunderbird Lodge	NR#: 1300
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1968
	Builder:	Fred Harvey Co.	
NCB35.	Building:	Kachina Lodge	NR#: 1320
	Location:	Canyon Rim	Date: 1971
	Builder:	Fred Harvey Co.	

Sites

There is one contributing site in the historic district. Without its seating, the amphitheater qualifies as a site rather than a structure.

CSI1.	Site:	Maswick Amphitheater	NR#:
	Location:	Far west end of district	Date:ca1930

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties: Nationally: X Statewide:___ Locally:___

Applicable National Register Criteria: A X B_ C X D_

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A___ B___ C___ D___ E___ F___ G___

NHL Criteria: 1, 4

NHL Theme(s): III. Expressing Cultural Values
5. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Urban Design

VII. Transforming the Environment
3. Protecting/Preserving the Environment

Areas of Significance: Landscape Architecture
Community Planning and Development
Politics/Government

Period(s) of Significance: 1897-1942

Significant Dates: 1897, 1901, 1905, 1915, 1919, 1924, 1933, 1942

Significant Person(s): N/A

Cultural Affiliation: N/A

Architect/Builder: Hull, Daniel; Vint, Thomas; Colter, Mary E. J.; Whittlesey, Charles F.; National Park Service; Bureau of Public Roads; A.T. & S.F. Railway

NHL Comparative Categories:
XVII. Landscape Architecture
XXXII. Conservation of Natural Resources
C. The Conservation Movement Matures, 1908-1941
6. The Origin and Development of the National Park Service
XXXIV. Recreation

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

Summary

The Grand Canyon Village NHL District meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 1 for its association with the American park movement. The initiation of advanced town planning techniques in the design of national park villages and other developed areas was an essential step in the progress of planning and developing large scenic reservations for public use, without unduly marring the scenery being made accessible. The development of National Park Service town planning techniques also influenced and was integrated into later "master planning" procedures, another milestone in the history of American park planning. The district also meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 4 as an exceptionally valuable example of American landscape architecture, specifically as the most significant example with the greatest integrity of National Park Service town planning.

The Grand Canyon Village NHL District is significant under National Register Criterion A for its association with the American park movement. The district is also significant under National Register Criterion C as an example of American landscape architecture, specifically as a unique and outstanding example of community planning and development.

One of the most pressing issues addressed by early Park Service landscape architects was the need for well planned, centralized "developed areas" that would provide basic services for visitors, housing and office space for administrators, and sites for concessioners to develop their facilities. From 1914, when landscape architect Mark Daniels first articulated the idea, the "park village" was put forward as an appropriate model for this type of town planning in the context of national parks.

The concept of the park village was as old as the landscape park itself, but in the early 20th century Park Service landscape architect Daniel Hull developed specific policies and procedures (drawn from contemporary British and American town planning) for planning park villages that would provide needed services, while remaining consonant with surrounding landscape scenery. Yosemite Village was the first major Park Service town plan drawn up by Hull (and the architect Myron Hunt, ca. 1923); but it was at the south rim of the Grand Canyon for which the largest and most ambitious town plan was created. Hull finalized the major features of the plan in 1924, and today, Grand Canyon Village represents the most historically significant park village plan, with the greatest degree of integrity, ever designed by the Park Service. It was at Yosemite Village and Grand Canyon Village that the basic priorities for Park Service town planning were established. The higher degree of integrity at Grand Canyon, however, in addition to its great artistic and historical significance, make it a unique example of Park Service town planning in the 1920s.

Park Service town plans, like later Park Service master plans, were idealized models of contemporary professional planning principles. Because of federal ownership in parks, park villages could be "zoned," and exacting architectural standards could be maintained. The town plan for Grand Canyon divided the village into discrete residential, commercial, and civic areas; a consistent architectural idiom (Park Service Rustic) was employed throughout; a hierarchy of street sections, from pedestrian paths to through roads, was developed; a central "plaza" had the villages major public buildings sited around it. These and other

features of the plan make it not only an exceptional example of Park Service town planning, but a highly significant example of American town planning in the 1920s in general. The innovative use of pedestrian paths, for example, predates the 1929 Radburn, New Jersey plan (Clarence Stein and Henry Wright) by several years. Although there are other interesting examples of Park Service town planning of this period, no other example combines the historic associations, the size, the artistic significance, and the excellent state of preservation of the Grand Canyon Village NHL District.

The period of significance of the district begins in the 1890s, specifically with the construction of the Buckey O'Neil Lodge in 1897, the oldest standing structure built on the rim. The period of significance ends in 1942, when the CCC was discontinued, by which time the village was largely complete. Significant dates include 1901, the date the railroad spur was extended to the location of Grand Canyon Village; 1905, the date Mary E.J. Colter completed Hopi House, the first sections of the stone wall along the rim were completed, and El Tovar opened; 1915, the world's fair year when visitation to the canyon soared; 1919, when national park legislation for the canyon was signed; 1924, the date of Daniel Hull's approved plan for Grand Canyon Village; and 1933, the date the Public Works Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps began pouring in capital and labor to complete the village.

Historic Context

The legislative drive to reform the management of national parks shared certain inspirations and motivations with the civic movement to reform the planning and management of American cities. In the activities of key figures such as Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and J. Horace McFarland (the former a famous landscape architect, the latter the director of the American Civic Association), the nexus was clear. At the same time Olmsted was developing scientific planning techniques and organizing city planning as a new profession, for example, he was also working with McFarland in Washington to draft the 1916 legislation authorizing the National Park Service.

Other figures lobbying for the new park bureau also saw it as a potential agency for implementing scientific, systematic planning. As early as 1910, Secretary Ballinger had called for "complete and comprehensive plans for roads, trails, telegraph and telephone lines, sewer and water systems, hotel accommodations, transportation, and other conveniences" to be drawn up for every park before substantial amounts of money were invested in them.[1] Four years later, the landscape architect Mark Daniels had reiterated the desire for "comprehensive plan[s] . . . for all the national parks."[2] It was Daniels as well who pointed out that once a community reached a population of thousands, as Yosemite Valley did by then on a regular basis, "it ceases to be a camp; it becomes a village." And what was more, "it has municipal problems . . . it must have a sanitary system, a water-

[1]Department of the Interior, 1910 Annual Reports, 57.

[2]Department of the Interior, 1915 Annual Reports, 849.

supply system, a telephone system, an electric light system, and a system of patrolling." What was needed, according to Daniels, was "some sort of civic plan."[3]

True comprehensive, or master plans, however, were not undertaken at the Park Service until substantial and consistent funding made them both possible and necessary in the late 1920s. In the meantime, various problems associated with vastly increased populations of visitors demanded that some kind of plans be made to address the problems associated with increased visitation. In Yosemite Valley, the impact of visitors was particularly evident. By 1913, the acting military superintendent had called for a "plan for development" by "competent landscape, architectural, sanitary, and engineering specialists for the development of this park." Of particular concern were the dangerous sanitary conditions and the lack of basic utilities and accommodations for both visitors and the growing number of permanent residents in the valley.[4] Secretary Lane's appointment of Mark Daniels as "landscape engineer and general superintendent" of the national parks in 1914 in large part responded to the growing problems at Yosemite.[5] Lane had initially asked the San Francisco landscape architect that March to "prepare a comprehensive general plan for the development and improvement" of the valley "so as to bring into view the full scenic beauty of the surroundings." Daniels's plans included locations for roads, trails, and bridges, as well as suggestions for pruning and removing trees in some areas in order to maintain the scenic views that had become obscured since seasonal burns of the valley meadows had been suppressed.[6]

Daniels's most ambitious plans for the park, however, involved the "proper location and arrangement of a village in Yosemite Valley." Several alternative studies for such a park village were drawn up, and at least one was published as the "Plan of Yosemite Village."[7] The village plan (which was not implemented) featured a central lodge on the north side of the Merced River flanked by separate residential and service districts. Daniels's statement, quoted earlier, that the location and character of every building was determined "in the light of a careful study of the best arrangement of the buildings and for picturesqueness,"[8] is borne out by the placement of new buildings along gracefully curving roads that met in large wye intersections. Daniels apparently also proposed substantial excavation and impounding of the Merced River to create pools and lagoons along the edge of the new town. Lane was

---

[3]Department of the Interior, Proceedings of the National Park Conference Held at Berkeley, California, 1915 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1915), 18-19.

[4]Department of the Interior, 1913 Annual Reports, 723-24, 731.

[5]Stephen Mather's initial impulse to involve himself directly in national park affairs resulted from his dismay--as a mountaineer, a Sierra Club member, and a native Californian--with conditions at Yosemite and Sequoia as he found them in 1914. Shankland, Steve Mather, v-vi; Horace M. Albright, "How the National Park Service Came into Being--A Reminiscence,"in American Civic Annual (Washington, DC: The American Civic Association, 1929), 9-12.

[6]Department of the Interior, 1914 Annual Reports, 88.

[7]Mark Daniels, "Preliminary Plans and Tentative Studies of Architectural Character for the New Village, Yosemite National Park," n.d., Yosemite National Park Research Library.

[8]Department of the Interior, Proceedings of the Berkeley Conference, 1915, 20.

impressed enough with Daniels's work at Yosemite in 1914 to expand the scope of his appointment to include all the national parks.

Whether or not the village plan for Yosemite was advisable in all its features, its basic purpose was "to do away with unsightly buildings that now mar the scenery . . . and establish a village properly planned, comprising buildings of carefully studied architecture."[9] The "old village" at Yosemite was a disparate amalgamation of hotels, residences, and barns that had been deposited along the Merced over the previous 50 years of sporadic resort development. Whatever the aesthetic shortcomings of the old village, there were practical inadequacies involving sewage disposal, adequate drinking water, and traffic circulation.[10] These were problems not that different from those faced by towns and municipalities all over the country. But Daniels's response in the spring of 1914--a proposed new town plan--reflected the unique circumstances of working within the setting of a national park. In such a context, Daniels was free to advise the total demolition of the offending town and its replacement with a unified, comprehensively planned new town on the other side of the Merced River.

Park village planning of this type was as old as the landscape park itself; the controlled setting of the landscape park had always offered planners the opportunity to express ideal civic arrangements. In 18th-century British landscape parks, old villages were sometimes demolished to make way for a new lake or expansive greensward. The people so displaced might be rehoused in architecturally unified villages of arranged, pseudo-vernacular cottages, like the ones designed by Lancelot Brown for Milton Abbey in the 1760s. In the later context of American national parks, the device of a new "park village" continued to imply that groups of pseudo-vernacular buildings would be arranged and sited as visual elements of the larger landscape composition (in other words as parts of picturesque scenes) and therefore would not dominate or detract from the scenery that visitors came to appreciate.

In the early 20th century there were, of course, far more direct precedents for the design of such new towns than the park villages of Lancelot Brown. Landscape architect/planners such as F.L. Olmsted, Jr., and John Nolen had brought American "town planning" to a high degree of sophistication by the time Mark Daniels made his proposals for Yosemite. In 1911, working with the architect Grosvenor Atterbury, Olmsted had developed Forest Hills Gardens in New York for the Russell Sage Foundation. This "garden suburb" employed a consistent vocabulary of tree lined streets, rusticated construction finishes, pitched tile roofs, and carefully articulated public spaces to create a unified visual effect and "village" atmosphere. Nolen, in particular, became the most prolific "town planner" of the era. An early graduate of the Harvard landscape program and initially a close associate of the younger Olmsted, Nolen opened an office in Cambridge in 1904. As municipalities began to search for planning consultants, Nolen received commissions for the design of new towns, such as Kingsport, Tennessee (1915), as well as city plans for more established cities such as

---

[9]Department of the Interior, 1915 Annual Reports, 849-850.

[10]Linda Wedel Greene, Yosemite: The Park and Its Resources, Historic Resource Study, 3 vols. (Denver: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1987), vol. 1, 446-450.

Little Rock (1913) and Bridgeport (1916). His firm was soon the most active planning office in the country.[11]

The distinction between "town planning" and "city planning" was an important one to Nolen. In one of the earliest of his many publications, he pointed out the very different requirements of providing services for "cities and towns planned in advance of settlement" (town planning) and for "existing cities replanned or remodeled to meet new requirements" (city planning).[12] But the term town planning was also an Anglicism (city planning being the more common term in the United States) and revealed the extent of the influence of British planners in this branch of American landscape architecture. The backers of projects like Forest Hills Gardens attempted to create American "garden cities" modeled on the new model towns and suburbs that had been developed in Britain since the turn of the century. The most influential of the new British town planners was Raymond Unwin, whose 1909 book Town Planning in Practice immediately became an important source for planners on both sides of the Atlantic.[13] Unwin in turn had been influenced by 19th-century German city planners (who had greatly impressed Nolen and Olmsted, as well) and Unwin reproduced city plans for Nuremburg, Rothenburg, and Cologne in his textbook. The primary examples Unwin used in 1909, however, were the "garden city" developments he and the architect Barry Parker had undertaken since 1904. Letchworth, the prototypical garden city designed by Unwin and Parker, employed a broken grid of streets that partially conformed to topography, a hierarchy of street types from "Broadway" to narrow cul-de-sacs, and a segregation of industrial and residential areas. Civic buildings were to be sited along a centrally located town square, and the residences of the new community typically were intended to be "workingman's cottages" and other housing types of Arts and Crafts inspiration. The architectural office of Unwin and Parker had already done much to popularize simple and affordable cottages that emphasized traditional construction materials and unpretentious craftsmanship. In the arrangement of such houses in cul-de-sacs, closes, and other alternatives to traditional grid schemes, the architects also incorporated generous setbacks, garden spaces, and communal open spaces in their town plans.

At first disseminated by example and through Unwin's textbook, British town planning along these lines increased in popularity in the United States partly as a result of World War I. At the outset of war, the British government recognized that a national dearth of decent housing for workers impeded vital defense production. Private capital, under the pressure of wartime prices, could not meet demand, and a major public housing effort began immediately in 1914. New towns for war workers were hastily laid out, many by Britain's foremost town planner, Raymond Unwin. In 1917, the United States faced a similar, if less desperate, situation in industrial centers around shipyards and munitions factories. Although the government did not react with alacrity, the Department of Commerce eventually organized the U.S. Housing Corporation to spend millions of dollars building

---

[11]John Hancock, "John Nolen: The Background of a Pioneer Planner," in Donald A. Krueckeberg, ed., The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections (New York: Methuen, 1983), 37-57.

[12]John Nolen, Replanning Small Cities (New York: B.W. Huebsch, 1912), 3.

[13]Raymond Unwin, Town Planning in Practice: An Introduction to the Art of Designing Cities and Suburbs (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1909).

accommodations for wartime industrial workers. An unprecedented mobilization of American landscape architects, architects, and engineers provided plans for the new communities. Olmsted headed the Town Planning Division of the corporation, and Nolen, Hubbard, Kessler, Arthur A. Shurtleff, James Sturgis Pray, Charles Downing Lay, James S. Greenleaf, Albert D. Taylor, Ferrucio Vitale, and William H. Punchard (Charles Punchard's uncle) were among the many landscape architects who acted as town planners for the over 60 projects that were initiated.[14]

Perhaps because the effort was modeled on its British counterpart, principles of British (or "garden city") town planning were emphasized, and judging by the results, to some degree the experience proved a crash course in Unwin and Parker's techniques, as interpreted by Olmsted and others. John Nolen, for example, had already demonstrated his preference for arrangements of radiating street grids, central town squares, and zoned land uses in the design of new towns, and he subsequently produced one of the finest subdivisions of the war effort in Camden, New Jersey. All of the landscape architects and architects working for the Housing Corporation received "standard" or "type" plans from Olmsted at the outset, as well as detailed "suggestions for town planners."[15] Olmsted's advice for the group summarized his town planning methods at a critical and opportune moment. Planning, he insisted, should be initiated through a consultation of topography and other natural features. Detailed topographic surveys were repeatedly emphasized as the sine qua non of town planning; other environmental factors were to be considered as well. "Whatever the present condition of the site," he advised, the town planner "must see what it offers as a developed site; how its exposure will suit its occupancy; whether the topography is such as to afford convenient . . . disposition of communication and subdivisions, [and] what natural features . . . may be retained or improved as recreational and breathing spaces." The practical components of the plan ("lay-out, grading, and planting") were "the best possible foundation for the good appearance which comes from the artist's touch . . . . The curving street that minimizes the cost of grading and gives picturesque interest to the buildings along it must be a convenient means of circulation and make for the most advantageous subdivision of the lots on which those buildings are set."[16]

For many landscape architects and planners, their war experience would prove a strong influence on their subsequent professional practice. One of the American landscape architects drawn into World War I planning efforts was Daniel Ray Hull. A native of Kansas, Hull had studied at the University of Illinois under Charles Mulford Robinson, who had just joined the faculty there as professor of "civic design." Robinson, a journalist and municipal reformer from Rochester, New York, had become a leading proponent of "civic art" and town planning through numerous publications, beginning in 1901 with The

---

[14]Department of Labor, Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, Report of the United States Housing Corporation 2 vols. (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1919), vol. 1, 185-187, vol. 2, 15-18. Plans of the projects are reproduced in the second volume of the report.

[15]Department of Labor, Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, Report of the United States Housing Corporation, vol. 2, 497-504.

[16]Department of Labor, Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, Report of the United States Housing Corporation, December 3, 1918 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1919), 74.

Improvement of Towns and Cities. In 1913, Hull was one of four students who worked closely with Robinson on a city planning study (which was later published) that suggested planning strategies for the communities of Champaign and Urbana.[17] Hull then went on to receive his Master's degree in landscape architecture from Harvard in 1914. At that time Harvard professors Henry Hubbard and James Sturgis Pray would have been the principal influences on his education. After traveling in Europe, Hull began his professional career in California, where he planned the Montecito Country Estates subdivision in Santa Barbara with Francis T. Underhill.[18] He also worked for a San Francisco firm, Daniels, Osmont and Wilhelm, and his probable association with Mark Daniels at that point might explain how he later came to be chosen as Charles Punchard's assistant at the Park Service.[19]

From 1918 to 1919, Hull planned cantonments and hospital camps as an officer in the U.S. Army. Planning camps for the Army differed substantially from designing new subdivisions for civilian factory workers; but basic town planning procedures were applied systematically in this aspect of war planning as well, again in large part because of Olmsted's influence. Olmsted, with E.P. Goodrich and George B. Ford, had offered the services of American planners to the Cantonment Division of the U.S. Army immediately in 1917, and the landscape architect subsequently played a central role organizing wartime cantonment planning. George Kessler, Warren Manning, and James Sturgis Pray were among the civilian planners employed by the Cantonment Division.[20]

Hull's early experience qualified him as one of the growing number of landscape architects who specialized in town planning. His education in "civic art" and "city planning" at Illinois and Harvard would have been reinforced by his professional work in California and by his military experience as a cantonment planner. After leaving the Army, Hull went to work at the National Park Service in August of 1920 as assistant to the ailing Charles Punchard. Since 1918, Punchard had picked up where Mark Daniels had left off as chief Park Service landscape architect: reviewing concessioners' plans, advising superintendents, and acting as a one-man art commission to assure that buildings and other proposed facilities were "harmonious with their surroundings" and "disturbed the natural conditions of the parks" as little as possible. Yosemite was a particular concern, and Punchard had continued work on a village plan for the valley while being stationed there for over seven months between 1918

---

[17]University of Illinois, Notes for a Study in City Planning in Champaign-Urbana by the 1913 and 1914 Classes in Civic Design (Chicago: R.R. Donnelly and Sons, 1915).

[18]"Daniel Ray Hull," Mather Collection, Entry 135, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[19]McClelland, Presenting Nature, 113. According to Park Service reports, Hull was living in Milwaukee at the time he was hired in July 1920. He probably had relocated earlier that year. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1920 Annual Report, 93. See also: Carol Roland, "Hull, Daniel Ray," in Charles A. Birnbaum and Julie K. Fix, eds., Pioneers of American Landscape Design II: An Annotated Bibliography (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1995), 79-83.

[20]James Sturgis Pray, "Planning the Cantonments," Landscape Architecture 8, no. 1 (October 1917), 1-17. In recognition of Olmsted's contributions to planning the war effort, the American Society of Landscape Architects struck a bronze medal, the Olmsted Medal, and presented it to him at the end of 1918. Landscape Architecture 10, no. 2 (January 1920), 96.

and 1919.[21] He advised that the new village north of the Merced River, which had been "for many years . . . the subject of much discussion," be divided into commercial, industrial, and residential "zones."[22] That summer he oversaw the construction of the new rangers' club (1920) in the proposed village area. Designed by Charles K. Sumner with steeply pitched roofs pierced by dormers, the facility recalled (at a reduced scale) concessioner architecture at Yellowstone and Glacier.[23]

Punchard died that fall, and Daniel Hull found himself, at the age of 30, the chief landscape architect of the Park Service. Park Service director, Stephen Mather, by that time had secured some of his most important early victories in Washington, including the amendment to the Federal Water Power Act that exempted the parks from becoming the sites of new power and irrigation dams. The "principle of complete conservation," Mather reported in 1920, "has been upheld." In not unrelated developments, Mather also dedicated the new Park-to-Park Highway route that year, "a truly national highway system" which provided "well-built feeders to the entrances of the various parks and monuments" and encouraged the "tremendous increase in motor travel to the parks" that had been underway for years. Appropriations for the Park Service exceeded $1,000,000 for the first time in 1921; but an ambitious Mather estimated that well over twice that amount would be necessary to meet just the "essential needs" outlined by his superintendents.[24] Hull had arrived at a turning point in the administrative history of the Park Service. The crusades and campaigns of the past were giving way to secure annual appropriations and bureaucratic growth. Hull would soon have opportunities to see plans and designs realized in ways that Daniels and Punchard had not.

Hull's first step was to establish headquarters at Yosemite Valley, a logical center for his Park Service activities where he could also remain in touch with associates and clients in Santa Barbara and Los Angeles. In February, he was joined by an assistant landscape architect, an old friend from University of Illinois days, Paul P. Kiessig. Kiessig traveled extensively that summer reporting on conditions in other parks.[25] Hull immediately made it known that he was not satisfied simply offering advice and reviewing concessioner proposals on an ad hoc basis. Immediate needs, however, demanded his attention: "The construction of parapets along dangerous roads, removal of poles and wires from conspicuous locations, improvement of springs to make them more attractive and at the same time more sanitary, screening objectional views by planting native materials," and

---

[21]Greene, Yosemite, vol. 2, 580-581.

[22]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1919 Annual Report, 26-27, 331-332.

[23]Mather himself financed the rangers' club, an indication of still inadequate Congressional appropriations. The building was made a National Historic Landmark for its architectural significance in 1987. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 199-210.

[24]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1921 Annual Report, 14-16, 22-23.

[25]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1921 Annual Report, 274-275. The Landscape Engineering branch of the Park Service apparently remained headquartered in Yosemite Valley until 1923. Olsen, Organizational Structures of the National Park Service, 34-35.

other tasks occupied much of his and Kiessig's time. With only one assistant, Hull felt that "it has been difficult to give proper study to many of our most pressing landscape problems," such as planning "civic groups, or village plans" to centralize administrative and utility areas. Still, by 1922 Hull and Kiessig had begun "tentative general plans" for Yellowstone, Yosemite, Sequoia, Grand Canyon, and Mesa Verde.[26]

At Yosemite, where the most pressing need for a new park village plan continued to be felt, the Los Angeles architect, Myron Hunt, was hired as a consultant. The annual meeting of park superintendents, held at Yosemite in 1922, had pushed the issue of planning future improvements for the valley to the forefront. "For years," Hull reported that year, "the building of [the new village] and the elimination of the present dilapidated shacks . . . has been considered essential both from the standpoint of practical operation and landscape effect."[27] Hunt and Hull collaborated on the village plan, which in 1923 finally set the shape of the new village on the north side of the Merced. The nature of Hunt and Hull's collaboration on the plan remains uncertain. Hull clearly credits Hunt with the plan, which was selected from among several alternatives by James Greenleaf and the other members of the Commission of Fine Arts. The plan, however, was entirely unlike Myron Hunt's orthogonal campus plans of the previous decade. Devoid of grand axes and monumentalism, the plan for Yosemite Village epitomized the priorities for park planning that had been articulated by Mark Daniels and others since 1914; the plan also embodied the principles of town planning that Olmsted had described for his World War I planners, and which had been inculcated in the young Hull through his education and professional experience.

Even while Yosemite received this attention, Hull was actively planning other national park villages. At Sequoia, where automotive tourists had also begun to swarm, Hull worked on a new village plan for the edge of the Giant Forest, where visitors would be less likely to compact root zones and damage the trunks of the great trees as they did when camping in the forest itself. A new administrative village was also planned on the park's western, Ash Mountain entrance.[28] At Mesa Verde, a park village was also being constructed in the early 1920s, beginning with the construction of a unique superintendent's residence in 1921. The buildings of the administrative core of the Mesa Verde village, designed primarily by superintendent Jesse Nussbaum and his wife Aileen, were constructed of sandstone blocks and had flat roofs supported by viga poles. The village again exemplified how a unified architectural ensemble could be conceived as a contextual element of the larger landscape scene. In this case, the ethological study of "early modern Pueblo Indian" architecture provided an appropriate inspiration for a group of buildings that complemented and preserved the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding park scenery and archeological sites. Mather felt the architecture perfectly "fit in with the atmosphere of the park."[29]

---

[26]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1922 Annual Report, 157.

[27]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1923 Annual Report, 52-53; 184.

[28]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1922 Annual Report, 157; Tweed, et al., Rustic Architecture, 37.

[29]Jesse Nussbaum also personally carved and constructed the Mission Revival furniture for the administration building. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1923 Annual Report, 71; The six buildings at the core of the

The largest and most significant Park Service town plan being pursued in the early 1920s, however, was that for the south rim of the Grand Canyon. Park Service planning for the Grand Canyon began officially only in 1919, when long anticipated federal legislation finally transformed the national monument into a national park, and so transferred jurisdiction from the Forest Service to the Park Service.[30] Interest in the region as a tourist destination, however, had developed in the 1880s when the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad first reached Flagstaff. Although numerous attempts to finance a spur line to the rim of the canyon failed, stage services were soon initiated. By 1892, three regularly scheduled stages were making the difficult 60-mile journey to the very edge of the precipice, at a point christened Grandview. That year, the Santa Fe and Grand Canyon Railroad also began rail service to Anita, only 20 miles from the canyon. From that point a stage carried passengers to a hotel near the Bright Angel trailhead, nine miles west of Grandview. In 1901, the railroad extended its track all the way to this location on the rim, which had become the site of a growing settlement called simply Grand Canyon. Ever since, this area has been the principal point of arrival for visitors to the region.[31]

Proposed national park status for the Grand Canyon had always inspired influential support. No scenery in North America more obviously deserved such designation. Benjamin Harrison, while still an Indiana senator, had first proposed national park legislation in 1882. In 1893, he had the opportunity as president to declare the region a forest reserve, and he did so. Theodore Roosevelt, as well, had a personal determination to preserve the canyon from inappropriate development. In 1903 he visited the canyon, and in 1908 he enhanced its status as a public reservation by creating the 800,000-acre Grand Canyon National Monument.[32] In the meantime, the south rim railhead had grown into a small town; when Roosevelt visited in 1903, there was a post office, two voting precincts, a population of miners and, increasingly, of tourists. That year the Santa Fe Railway (through its subsidiary the Fred Harvey Company) began construction of its second hotel, the luxurious El Tovar. Several other tourist establishments continued to operate in the vicinity.[33]

Efforts to pass park legislation in Congress did not end with the declaration of national monument status; Secretary Ballinger advocated national park status for the region beginning in 1909. Park legislation met difficulties, however, due to complex local politics and conflicting interests among those who hoped to operate businesses on the south rim.

Mesa Verde administrative village, built mostly between 1921 and 1928, were made a National Historic Landmark District for their architectural significance. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 211-228.

[30]The Forest Service retained jurisdiction over national monuments created out of existing national forests until 1933, when Roosevelt transferred management of all the national monuments to the Park Service. The Forest Service had managed the Grand Canyon as a national forest since 1893, and as a national monument since 1908. Mackintosh, The National Parks, 24.

[31]Margaret M. Verkamp, History of Grand Canyon National Park [1940] (Flagstaff: Grand Canyon Pioneers Society, 1993), 22-23.

[32]Hal Rothman, America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation (University Press of Kansas by arrangement with the University of Illinois, 1989), 64-68.

[33]Verkamp, History of Grand Canyon, 23-26, 39.

Local entrepreneurs had used mineral claims (allowed even after the forest reserve designation) to assert sometimes dubious rights to develop tourist accommodations and guide services. For Fred Harvey and the Santa Fe Railway, national park status would be a welcome step not only to assure the more complete preservation of the area, but also to eliminate competitors: as a national park concessioner the railroad could hope to be granted a limited monopoly. The Forest Service, for its part, would have welcomed national park status. In 1914, Chief Forester Henry S. Graves held several meetings with Mark Daniels, and he subsequently described "an informal cooperation arrangement" with Daniels that allowed the national monument to "be administered along national park lines as far as possible." But Graves felt there was little the Forest Service could do to improve the situation until the General Land Office cancelled the "fraudulent" mineral claims that had been placed with the sole intention, he felt, of controlling public access to key points along the south rim.[34]

The Forest Service exacerbated the situation in 1915, year of the San Francisco World's Fair, when visitation to the canyon skyrocketed. As expected, thousands of California-bound tourists made side trips to national parks; but at the Grand Canyon, over 100,000 tourists arrived, a total greater than that for Yosemite and Yellowstone combined that year. In order to augment totally inadequate visitor services, the Forest Service had made an open invitation to local entrepreneurs to operate livery services. Enough cowboys and ranchers responded to the potential windfall that the scene on the south rim soon degenerated into what park historian Margaret Verkamp describes as "considerable unpleasantness." The noisy competition made support for creating a national park that much stronger.[35]

The Forest Service had attempted to plan the growth of the town of Grand Canyon, Arizona; with little expertise or funding for such work, however, their efforts had foundered. In 1909, forest examiner (later forest supervisor) W.R. Matoon produced a detailed "Working Plan for Grand Canyon National Monument." In it he described some of the problems of the young town, including the critical lack of water, inadequate sanitation, and few roads or trails from which tourists might view the scenery from surrounding points on the rim. Matoon felt a scenic rim drive was particularly warranted. It was clear that some sort of conveyance along the rim would soon be built one way or another, and "all development along the rim," the forester urged, should be made "for the benefit of the public at large rather than in the interest of any individual or commercial enterprise." Matoon also recommended "thinning for scenic effect" along the rim, and the construction of seats and "rustic shelters" at the most popular points for viewing the canyon. Shelters consisting of "a

---

[34]Henry Graves, "Memorandum on Conditions at the Grand Canyon National Monument and Suggestions for Improving Them," November 23, 1914, Grand Canyon, General Files, Entry 749A, RG 48, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[35]Verkamp, History of Grand Canyon, 40; Rothman, America's National Monuments, 97. George Horace Lorimer, in particular, published a series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post in 1916 (with titles such as "Ballyhooing in the Temple") in support of legislation to make the Grand Canyon a national park. The number of visitors to the canyon quickly returned to about one third of the 1915 total in the following years.

roof, stained green, and resting on natural juniper posts," he pointed out, would be "in good harmony with the surroundings."[36]

In his general desire for "rustic" design details that would "harmonize" with the landscape, Matoon simply expressed the widely prevailing sensibility for construction details appropriate in the setting of a landscape reservation. In a separate report the next year, however, he proposed a more ambitious scheme for the planned extension of the town of Grand Canyon; and here the forester showed how useless "rustic" architectural inspiration could be when unaccompanied by correspondingly appropriate site planning techniques. Matoon's proposed "townsite plan" was no more than an even grid of four square blocks, subdivided into eight lots apiece; the new blocks were surveyed parallel to the train tracks, just south of the point at which the rails ended.[37] The plan, like countless railroad towns laid out in the 19th century, drew its geometry and orientation from its relationship to the railroad, not surrounding natural features. Far from a response to topography, the grid was laid out without the benefit even of a topographic survey.

In the meantime, the town of Grand Canyon had grown larger, with 300 to 400 permanent residents and a transient population that exceeded that number. Over 50 temporary and permanent buildings (including a school) had been erected by 1914, most of them since railroad service began in 1901.[38] After 1915, the Forest Service reactivated its planning efforts for Grand Canyon, in part due to the negative publicity generated by the events of that year's travel season. In 1916, Matoon's successor as forest supervisor, Don P. Johnston, teamed up with a new forest examiner named Aldo Leopold to author a "Grand Canyon Uses Working Plan." They began their report by acknowledging that visitors to the canyon were subjected to "offensive sights and sounds . . . unsanitary conditions . . . [and] inconvenient facilities," to name just some of the municipality's problems. Noting that federal ownership and administration of the monument allowed for the legal enforcement of "regulations" over both permitees and, importantly, over those entrepreneurs operating by right of mineral claims, Johnston and Leopold urged a far-reaching plan of land-use "zones" to restrict specific land uses to specific parts of the town.[39] Johnston and Leopold implied (as did many city planners of the day) that land-use zoning could be a regulatory solution to the kinds of conditions plaguing the town of Grand Canyon. The "division of the ground into zones" and the "segregation of various classes of services," they insisted, could "reduce the offensiveness of material service as far as possible" and make it possible for visitors to

---

[36]W.R. Matoon, "A Working Plan for Grand Canyon National Monument," 1909, manuscript #17460, pp. 61, 85-87, 105. Grand Canyon Museum Collection, Grand Canyon National Park.

[37]W.R. Matoon, "A Townsite Plan for Grand Canyon National Monument," 1910, manuscript #17460. Grand Canyon Museum Collection, Grand Canyon National Park.

[38]Many of the railroad's facilities were constructed within the acreage granted as part of its right-of-way. Michael P. Scott, National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Grand Canyon Village Historic District, typed manuscript (1995), p. 24. National Register nominations are available at the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 800 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC.

[39]Don P. Johnston, Aldo Leopold, "Grand Canyon Uses Working Plan," 1916, manuscript #18555, Grand Canyon Museum Collection, Grand Canyon National Park, no page numbers.

avoid the sights and sounds of the mules, steam engines, trash, and offal that were the inevitable result of tourism to the canyon.

Municipal zoning plans and ordinances of this type, although widely discussed and occasionally employed in the United States by 1916, would only be fully validated by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions in the early 1920s. But Johnston and Leopold pointed out that the unusual situation of a city within a national monument made the implementation and enforcement of a zoning plan far more feasible than it would be among private property owners at that time. Their revised 1917 plan described seven zones, each with prescribed land uses and regulations: the "Rim Zone," the "Accommodation Zone," the "Residence Zone," the "Commercial Zone," the "Seasonal Camp Zone," the "Public Camp Grounds," and the "Stables Zone." As refined as these categories were, the authors did not neglect to specify a range of variances and grandfather arrangements that allowed "inferior use of a superior zone," such as the intrusion of Verkamp's Curio Shop in what was otherwise the most restrictive area, the rim zone. The foresters also determined the relative aesthetic merits of structures that might be considered "objectionable" or not, depending on the standards that applied for each zone.[40] Although Johnston and Leopold did consider the location of future development for the town, they offered little insight on what physical form expansion might take. Included as an appendix to their 1917 revision were Mary E.J. Colter's plans for Fred Harvey's proposed cabin group at Indian Gardens; but this was no more than an endorsement of the concessioner's proposals on the part of the planners.[41] The Grand Canyon Working Plan mainly sought to eliminate existing nuisances and stabilize future land uses for specific areas. The residential zone, for example, (located in approximately the same area Matoon had suggested) precluded hotels, stables, and stores; the rim zone allowed only trails, "rustic shelters," and inconspicuous signs. Seasonal and temporary camping were assigned each to specific areas, and each activity was limited to its proper location.

Johnston and Leopold's analysis would prove valuable for future park managers, and their 1917 plan revision did include a feature that Olmsted had called the first prerequisite of town planning: a detailed topographic survey. The planners did not, however, plat land for anticipated residential developments, nor did they delineate future streets or public spaces. In 1918, the Forest Service took the next step and engaged Frank Waugh to devise a more detailed, physical plan for the expansion of the town. Waugh's plan for the "Village of Grand Canyon," which took Johnston and Leopold's land-use zones as a starting point, was published separately that year. In the residential zone south of the railhead, Waugh proposed to subdivide lots along new streets that curved to conform to the gentle slope of the site. A "civic center" was proposed directly in front of the new Fred Harvey garage (1914), between the railroad tracks and the proposed subdivision to the south. This center, Waugh suggested, could be a "grassy parklike . . . public square," around which he proposed siting new stores, a federal building, a community club, and a church. Near the main automotive entry to the town (still via Grandview Road from the east) and across the tracks from the

---

[40]Don P. Johnston, Aldo Leopold, "Grand Canyon Working Plan," 1917, typed manuscript #28343, Grand Canyon Museum Collection, Grand Canyon National Park, no page numbers.

[41]The cabin group was never built at Indian Gardens, although Colter's Phantom Ranch, a similar cabin group on the floor of the canyon, was built in 1922.

Grand Canyon Depot (1910), the proposed plaza would have provided a prominent civic space and a central arrival and gathering point for the village.[42]

Frank Waugh was more experienced as an educator and a garden designer, however, and at this point his plan descended into idiosyncracy. Suggesting that the canyon landscape required "some sort of introduction," Waugh proposed "a broad straight walk . . . rising by rustic stone steps" from Grandview Road directly up to the canyon rim, at a point just east of Verkamp's Curio Store. Extending in an equally straight alignment in the opposite direction, the new avenue, named "Tusayan Mall," cut through the proposed residential district and terminated in a proposed "aviation field" located, remarkably, on the high ground in the middle of the residential subdivision. The proposed mall also bisected the property of the new school (1917) "in an objectionable manner," Waugh admitted; but Fred Harvey's compound to the west left little alternative for siting a dramatic "introduction" to the canyon near the center of town. Other unusual features of the plan included an "automobile outlook" on the rim, and "Tusayan Garden," a botanic garden also located on the rim. The botanic garden, of course, was to feature only native plants.[43]

Even as Waugh made these proposals, however, the shift to Park Service administration had been widely anticipated for some time. In 1916, Mather had gone so far as to include the Grand Canyon in his National Park Portfolio. Charles Punchard, in his capacity of Park Service landscape architect, visited the canyon in January 1919, a month before the park legislation had even been signed.[44] Although the Forest Service continued to administer the new park for several months (while the Park Service awaited an appropriation) Mather's chief engineer, George Goodwin, and the new acting superintendent, William H. Peters, immediately assessed conditions at the park. Goodwin and Peters advised that as a first priority the road to Hermit's Rest be improved and opened to automobiles. They predicted that private automobiles, a growing presence in the park already, were about to increase in number exponentially.[45] Annual park visitation had doubled since 1916 (to over 67,000 in 1919) and many of the new tourists were arriving in their own motor vehicles, making the arduous journey from Flagstaff to Grand Canyon via Grandview. That year Mather reported that the Grand Canyon was in need of "broad development" in a number of areas; but the widening and resurfacing of scenic rim drives to the east and west of Grand Canyon Village was "the most urgent work."[46]

---

[42]Frank A. Waugh, A Plan for the Development of the Village of Grand Canyon (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1918), 8-11. The Grand Canyon Depot was made a National Historic Landmark for its architectural significance in 1987. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 123-133.

[43]Such development on the rim of the canyon did not accord with the "Rim Zone" restrictions suggested by Johnston and Leopold. Waugh, Grand Canyon Plan, 14-16.

[44]Stephen Mather to Charles Punchard, September 3, 1919, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[45]George Goodwin to Stephen Mather, August 17, 1919, Grand Canyon, General Files, Entry 749A, RG 48, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[46]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1919 Annual Report, 96.

After the construction of roads and trails, Mather described a second major category of concern as "administrative village betterments." He outlined a construction program, including new administrative buildings, residential quarters, campgrounds, utilities, and other facilities, which amounted to nothing less than a project to build a small city.[47] That winter, Charles Punchard returned to the canyon and met with Peters to consider issues such as the siting of the new Park Service administration building. In considering new construction at Grand Canyon, Punchard asserted in a letter to Mather that "too great a variety in architecture . . . is going to make the place look like a jumble." He felt that it would be best to "adhere to the free rough [sic] which has been done by the rail road company in its small rest houses and curio stores, or else to the adobe architecture which is indigenous."[48] For his part, Mather had made it policy that no permanent buildings were to be erected in any park without the prior approval of the Park Service landscape engineer.[49] Inexperience, however, took its toll. Despite Goodwin's assistance estimating the cost of road improvements, Peters drastically overspent his first year's budget and bankrupted the park even before its official dedication, which had been delayed until April 1920. Mather was forced to personally plead with the Fred Harvey Company to assist with routine maintenance for the remainder of the fiscal year.[50]

Congress soon increased appropriations, however, and visitor numbers continued to climb. As Daniel Hull took charge of landscape engineering in the fall of 1920, Grand Canyon National Park, like Yosemite, was poised to undergo a major development program. Hull remained headquartered at Yosemite, but he visited Grand Canyon that winter. He sent Kiessig to the park at least twice, the second time for the entire summer of 1921 while the new administration building was being built.[51] The opportunity to design the Grand Canyon administration building, and soon other buildings at Grand Canyon, gave Hull a unique chance to affect the course of Park Service architectural style and planning procedures. He noted that the situation at Grand Canyon, where the park was being administered out of a few temporary shacks and the superintendent was housed in an old log cabin, presented an opportunity for a "practically new field in administrative development." And it is significant that his design of new administrative buildings in the early 1920s proceeded in tandem with the delineation of a new town plan for the village. In 1920, Hull and Kiessig undertook a "careful study of the landscape," which resulted in "the adoption of a layout for future

---

[47]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1919 Annual Report, 96-98. Mather makes no mention of Waugh's village plan, which was not implemented. Punchard dismissed Waugh's plan lightly, and wrote to Goodwin that he was "sure that the Forest Service plan [could be] improved upon." Charles Punchard to George Goodwin, September 3, 1919, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[48]Charles Punchard to Stephen Mather, July 28, 1920, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[49]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1921 Annual Report, 57.

[50]Stephen Mather to Ford Harvey, March 15, 1920, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[51]Arno Cammerer to DeWitt Reaburn, October 12, 1921, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

development."[52] Using the 1917 topographic survey as a base, Hull sketched initial suggestions for the town plan and distributed them for review early in 1921.[53]

Hull's training as a landscape architect/town planner was evident in his sensitivity to existing natural features. Circulation at the site had already been determined to a large degree by topography: both the railroad approach (from the west) and the Grandview Road (from the east) followed the natural right-of-way of the Bright Angel drainage, a long swale parallel to the canyon, typically at an elevation about 50 feet below that of the south rim itself. Hull proposed a large "village square" (as Waugh had) at the point where the railroad and motor road came together below El Tovar in the usually dry bed of the drainage. The new administration building was sited on the north side of the proposed square, slightly elevated on the slope leading up to the rim. The elevated site made the administration building, which also served as a visitor center and contact station, a prominent feature for visitors arriving by train or car. Like most of Hull's proposals for Grand Canyon, however, it was well away from the rim itself, which remained unencumbered by botanic gardens or other "introductions."

The rest of the proposed administrative development of the new town was even farther from the rim, on the south side of the natural divide offered by the Bright Angel drainage. The land to the south of the drainage was, itself, naturally divided into two small hills, divided by a central, north-south swale perpendicular to the larger swale of the Bright Angel drainage. Hull proposed a central road down this smaller swale, with residential subdivisions on either side.[54] The effect was to create two neighborhoods which were subsequently assigned to Fred Harvey staff (to the west) and Park Service personnel (to the east). Already evident, as well, was some indication that Hull intended each subdivision to have its own character. To the west, three parallel streets all curved to suit the slope and each connected to the perpendicular center road, forming a gently curved grid. On the other side of the road, only one main entry to this considerably smaller development implied an extended cul-de-sac arrangement. A new Park Service utility area also on the east side (where it was convenient to the Park Service residences) was arranged orthogonally; the arrangement of utility buildings created central work yards that were well screened from the nearby residential area.

Hull also exploited the character of the existing vegetation. While the subdivisions were proposed on lightly wooded, well drained slopes, almost no new building was proposed in

---

[52]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1921 Annual Report, 102.

[53]Assistant Director Cammerer (acting for Director Mather) approved sketches for the "tentative layout" of the village in 1921. Arno Cammerer to Daniel Hull, March 17, 1921, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. Only one print of Hull's early sketches for Grand Canyon Village has so far been recovered; signed by Hull and dated July 18, 1922, it is drawn (like the 1917 survey) at one inch to 100 feet with five-foot contour intervals. "Grand Canyon National Park, Tentative General Plan," Central File, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. Official correspondence contains numerous references to earlier sketch plans, however, which were distributed to Mather and others for approval in 1921, and which must have shown more or less the same arrangement as this 1922 sketch.

[54]A portion of this road already existed at the time of the 1917 survey, and was used to access horse and mule pastures that covered the sites of the proposed subdivisions.

the Bright Angel drainage. This preserved a fine stand of Ponderosa and Pinyon pines, typical vegetation found in the moister soils of a such a drainage. These trees reinforced the division between the accommodation zone near the rim and the new residential and utility zones to the south. The older resort development (already long established on the rim of the canyon) was also accommodated in the new village plan. The hotels along the rim established their own land-use zone, as the Forest Service planners had observed, which was respected in the new village plans. The Fred Harvey utility area, which had been developed along the railroad right-of-way on the west side of the town, also created its own zone, in this case characterized by livery barns and mule corrals. These existing uses helped determine Hull's overall layout; the new Fred Harvey residential area, for example, was on the west side of the new village, in order to be more convenient to the existing Fred Harvey utility area.

The basic spatial organization and zoning implied in Hull's early sketch were suggested by topography, vegetation, existing development, and circulation needs in the village area. Hull's village plan, which was already taking shape in 1920, would become (with some important alterations) the essential blueprint for construction in the village over the next 20 years. The town planning methods he employed established a basic procedure for planning new "park villages" that protected the visual character of the surrounding scenery, and responded both to natural features and to the demands of maintaining and ameliorating earlier tourist developments.

This was not, however, Hull's only contribution to Grand Canyon Village at this time. While at Yosemite and elsewhere Hull often collaborated with architectural consultants in the design of new administrative facilities; beginning in 1920 he had the chance to design his own buildings at Grand Canyon. Hull's Grand Canyon administration building, which was serving visitors as well as park managers by the end of 1921, helped define what would later be described as Park Service Rustic architecture two years before Myron Hunt and Gilbert Stanley Underwood undertook their Yosemite commissions.[55] At the lower level of the two-story structure, Hull employed Kaibab limestone, heavily rusticated and laid in a random ashlar pattern. The upper level, sheathed in darkly stained board and batten, was dominated by the intersecting gables of the broad, wood-shingled roofs.[56] As was Myron Hunt two years later, Hull clearly was familiar with contemporary California Arts and Crafts architecture. He also had the example of earlier "rustic" park buildings built by concessioners. The buildings Mary E.J. Colter had designed for the Fred Harvey Company must have made a particularly strong impression; she had already completed Hopi House (1905), Hermit's Rest (1914), and the Lookout Studio (1914), which together had determined the fanciful character and high quality of the resort architecture along the rim

---

[55]Numerous items of correspondence make it clear that Hull designed buildings as well as landscape plans as part of his work. A letter from Cammerer in 1921, for example, specifically states that Hull designed the administration building and other buildings at the Grand Canyon. Arno Cammerer to Daniel Hull, March 17, 1921, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. In 1921 Hull also designed a more modest administration building for Sequoia and a log cabin entrance station for Rocky Mountain. Tweed, et al., Rustic Architecture, 31-32.

[56]A new wing was added to the first administration building when it was converted into the superintendent's residence in 1931. In the early 1980s the interior was remodeled to serve as an office annex for the Fred Harvey Company. Billy Garret, "Adaptive Reuse: The Superintendent's Residence at Grand Canyon National Park," Cultural Resource Management 7, no. 4 (December 1984), 6-7.

itself.[57] The first administration building at Grand Canyon, however, remains today as clear evidence that Park Service Rustic architecture did not develop independently from park planning, but as a consistent formal articulation of the same principles that guided the overall landscape development effort that was underway at the Park Service.

The designers of landscape parks, really from the 18th century on, had vigorously reiterated that buildings were appropriate in the landscape park setting only to the degree that they contributed as visual elements in perceived landscape scenes. Perceptions of scenery therefore ultimately determined the appropriateness of any architectural additions to the landscape; and perceptions of scenery had been shaped through a long history of the artistic genres of landscape, not the history of architecture. Painting (and later photography), descriptive poetry (and later travel guides and other literature), and landscape design (in the United States the design of large public parks in particular) had established over many years sensibilities of what defined an appropriate architectural image in landscape scenery. Whether the cottage vernacular of Lancelot Brown's landscapes, the Shingle style of Franklin Park, the Mesa Verde Pueblo style, or Park Service Rustic, "appropriate" park buildings shared an initial inception as visual elements of another, previsualized artistic composition--the landscape scene--which to some degree predetermined the desired visual character of new construction. Since the 18th century, park designers had attempted to evoke some variation of local vernacular construction technique and craftsmanship in the design of park buildings. In the same vein, the construction materials employed often were (or appeared to be) drawn from surrounding forests and quarries. Such construction conformed to expectations derived from artistic genres of landscape, and therefore resulted in buildings that did not conflict with the desired appreciation of land as landscape, and places as scenery. As Mather would say, such architecture "fit the atmosphere of the park."

Since at least the 1880s, some form of "rustic" architecture had been deemed appropriate in larger scenic reservations of all types, including national parks. Virtually everyone involved in early national park management, including Army engineers, railroad executives, and Forest Service supervisors, agreed that proposed architectural development should "blend" and "harmonize" with its surroundings. The physical characteristics of such architecture included dark wood siding, prominent wood shingled roofs, heavily rusticated or boulder masonry, and peeled log walls, columns, and trusses; the success of Robert Reamer's Old Faithful Inn in 1903 had cemented this association in the popular imagination. What Daniel Hull brought to the Grand Canyon Village in 1921, however, was landscape architectural design that used such "rustic," or naturalistic, architectural construction as a logical extension and consistent expression of an overall strategy for park development. The precedent of municipal and regional landscape park design of the Fairsted School therefore provided the essential model. Since the days of the elder Olmsted and Charles Eliot, naturalistic design details had been applied in municipal and regional landscape parks not only in the design of individual buildings, but in coordinated schemes of park development

---

[57]Colter's architecture, however, emphasized anthropological allusions and elaborate masonry effects that were more suited to resort architecture than to official Government buildings. Hull would have also been familiar with Colter's plans for tourist cabins at Indian Gardens that had been inserted in the 1918 Forest Service Working Plan. Four of Colter's south rim buildings (including her 1931 Desert Watchtower) were made National Historic Landmarks for their architectural significance in 1987. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 99-121.

that included roads, bridges, guardwalls, and drainage structures, as well as in shelters, comfort stations, and other buildings necessary for the convenience of park visitors.

Working within this tradition of landscape park development (which ultimately referred back to the design techniques and formal vocabulary of the Fairsted School) Hull designed buildings at the Grand Canyon that were conceived as formal expressions of an overall landscape development plan. The construction details employed in his administration building, for example, were consistent with the materials and workmanship eventually employed in the needed roads, guardwalls, trails, signs, and other built features of Grand Canyon Village. In the setting of the 20th-century landscape park, "rustic" architecture did not imply the splendid, if isolated, presence of an Old Faithful Inn or an El Tovar; such architecture formed one element of a coordinated, understated landscape development scheme, governed above all by the "comprehensive plan" that assured all parts were expressions of a unified artistic purpose. Hull's Park Service Rustic architecture, unlike earlier park architecture sponsored by concessioners, emanated from the overall landscape plan; the scale, location, and character of individual buildings depended on their place as elements of that plan. Each structure, large or small, was calculated as a contribution to the larger work of art, the unified artistic expression that the elder Olmsted would have called the "single work of art . . . framed on a single, noble motive": the landscape park.

For Mather, Hull, and others that shared these cultural assumptions regarding the development of landscape reservations in the early 20th century, architecture considered suitable to form part of a landscape scene--architecture that Mather would have felt "harmonized" with the landscape--depended above all on the visual qualities of that landscape. The architecture itself might vary significantly from park to park; what made buildings appropriate for the landscape park setting did not depend on specific construction or materials as much as stylistic consistency and contextuality. Hull's early Park Service Rustic buildings became the basis of architectural uniformity in Grand Canyon Village (and in other park villages) and therefore averted the potential "jumble" that had so alarmed Punchard. The Nussbaums' design for the Pueblo style superintendent's residence at Mesa Verde in 1921 served a similar purpose. The subsequent construction of the park village at Mesa Verde in the 1920s extended the use of the same architectural idiom, again creating a stylistically unified village, which because of its unity more easily contributed as an element in the perceived landscape scene. In each case, the unified visual impression of the village was calculated to correspond--and to contribute--to a previsualized image of landscape scenery. National park architecture, whatever its visual characteristics, would be successful only if it contributed to the culturally determined aesthetic perception of landscape scenery considered appropriate to the specific region.

Seen in this light, Myron Hunt's 1923 administration building at Yosemite succeeded, as did his town plan for Yosemite Village that year, primarily because the architect wisely chose to meet the criteria for national park landscape development that Daniel Hull had already begun to establish at Grand Canyon Village. In both cases, the separation of different uses characterized the overall town plan. Utility areas, laid out orthogonally, were well separated but convenient to residential subdivisions. Visitors arrived at open "plazas," defined in part by the facades of the most important public buildings of the village, which together established the civic zone of the village. The buildings themselves expressed a unified, pseudo-vernacular architectural ensemble. These procedures and priorities represented

standard town planning practice of the day, as described by Unwin, Olmsted, and Nolen; and it was Hull's training and experience as a landscape architect/town planner that assured the consistent application of these procedures in the national park system.

Hull, assisted by Kiessig, designed numerous other buildings for Grand Canyon at this time, some of which were built. By May of 1921, Hull's locations for the "cottages" for railroad employees had been determined, and the first bungalow in the Park Service residential area was completed in 1922.[58] A dormitory, community buildings, and other buildings were still on the drawing boards, however, when the entire planning effort at Grand Canyon was temporarily derailed in 1922. At that time, Mather was at the height of his disputes with Ralph H. Cameron, a well connected entrepreneur who was elected to the United States Senate in 1920. Cameron, who was a principal holder of the opportunistic mineral claims on the south rim, used his position in Congress to promote his interests in Arizona--and to vilify Mather on Capitol Hill. Animosities raged for years, but Cameron's mineral claims on the south rim remained embedded.[59] Partly as a result, early in 1922 Mather suffered his second nervous breakdown since assuming his work for the Park Service. Horace Albright, while visiting the Grand Canyon that spring, discovered that the Fred Harvey Company had engaged a prominent Chicago architect, Pierce Anderson, to redesign the entire Grand Canyon Village plan around a proposed multi-million dollar hotel complex. Although the timing may have been suspect, the offer by the concessioner to invest millions of dollars in new visitor facilities was received warmly. Albright and Cammerer (acting for Mather) instructed Hull to suspend all planning efforts until Pierce Anderson had presented his plans; the famous architect's proposals were to take precedence.[60]

A new community building designed by Hull, a new store planned by the Babbitt Brothers, and several other projects were immediately "put on hold" until their final locations in the new plan could be determined. Hull continued, nevertheless, to consider his plans for the village. Cammerer, responding to some restlessness on Hull's part, wrote to him that summer telling him again to "stop all work on the Grand Canyon plans . . . with the idea of cooperating with the general development scheme . . . entrusted to Pierce Anderson."[61] By

---

[58]The cottage locations were approved by superintendent Reaburn and Director Mather. Daniel Hull to DeWitt Reaburn, May 28, 1921, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. The Santa Fe cottages were designed by the railroad's architect, William H. Mohr. For the dates of construction and other details for all the buildings in the Grand Canyon Village Historic District, see Scott, "Grand Canyon National Register Nomination."

[59]Cameron had a long history on the south rim. He had built and operated a hotel at the site of the Bright Angel Lodge, and for many years he charged a toll for the use of the Bright Angel Trail. See: Douglas Hillman Strong, "The Man Who `Owned' Grand Canyon," The American West 6, no. 5 (September 1969): 33-54; Albright and Cahn, Birth of the National Park Service, 169-186.

[60]Arno Cammerer to Daniel Hull, April 7, 1922, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. Anderson, a principal of the Chicago firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, had trained in Paris and was an accomplished master of early 20th-century neoclassism: he is best known as the architect of Union Station (1902) in Washington, DC, and as Daniel Burnham's assistant in planning the Philippine summer capital of Baguio (1903). It would be difficult to suggest two projects, however, more antithetical to the design and planning efforts underway within the Park Service in the 1920s.

[61]Arno Cammerer to Daniel Hull, July 26, 1922, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

December, Hull had still not met with Anderson. In response to Hull's inquiries, the new superintendent at the Grand Canyon, Walter W. Crosby, confessed that he "knew nothing of Mr. Anderson's plans," nor could he "get any definite line on them." Anxious to spend the appropriated money for the new community building, Crosby took the unusual step of encouraging Hull to make his case directly to Mather (who by then had resumed his duties) in order to get access to Anderson's plans.[62] Mather, however, had not seen the plans himself; he was as distraught as Crosby at the necessity of delaying the Babbitt Brothers' store and other needed buildings. Cammerer wrote to Ford Harvey (president of the Fred Harvey Company) stating roundly that "we are shortly going to be up against it with the location of some new buildings at the Grand Canyon." They were waiting, he added, to know what Anderson's plans would look like.[63]

They continued to wait. But Pierce Anderson had fallen gravely ill soon after receiving the Fred Harvey commission. Although that January the plans had already been delayed "somewhat longer than we expected," according to Cammerer, it was not until the following October that he and Mather finally reviewed several alternative "general layouts" in Anderson's Chicago offices. Shortly after the meeting, however, Anderson returned to the hospital, critically ill. In the meantime, Mather explained apologetically to Hull that he "fully realized the perplexities you and Colonel Crosby have been in . . . [but] the fact is we have not yet got an approved plan."[64] Superintendent Crosby, for his part, was exasperated; virtually all permanent construction in the park had been stalled for 18 months. The new community building was a particular sore point; but the superintendent had a long list of buildings, especially utility buildings and employee residences, which had been delayed.[65] In January 1924, after another visit to Chicago, Mather communicated to the new superintendent at Grand Canyon, J. Ross Eakin, that "on account of Pierce Anderson's illness, things are more or less at a standstill as regards the landscape plans at Grand Canyon."[66]

The standstill had continued long enough. Anderson's long illness may or may not have affected the Fred Harvey Company's plans, but at about the time the architect died in February 1924, the concessioner decided to delay the construction of a new hotel. That spring, Hull (who in the meantime had completed the village plan for Yosemite with Myron

---

[62]William Crosby to Daniel Hull, December 10, 1922, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[63]Arno Cammerer to Ford Harvey, January 4, 1923, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[64]Stephen Mather to Daniel Hull, December 18, 1923, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. Hull had finally met that August with "the architect employed by the operator" at Grand Canyon. He reported that "various schemes" were being considered. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1923 Annual Report, 57, 189.

[65]William Crosby to Daniel Hull, November 13, 1923, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[66]Cammerer quoted Mather directly in his own letter to the Grand Canyon superintendent. Arno Cammerer to J. Ross Eakin, January 8, 1924, Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 6, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Hunt) drafted a new plan for the "community development" at Grand Canyon. The new plan essentially improved and elaborated the village scheme he had been developing all along. Hull signed the plan, dated June 1924, and Mather, Superintendent Eakin, and Ford Harvey subsequently approved it.[67] Mather attributed the plan to "Park Service landscape engineers, the Santa Fe System engineers, and Fred Harvey officials." Myron Hunt was also thanked for his "advice and assistance."[68]

The new plan did differ in several regards from Hull's earlier sketches. Most importantly, a new automotive approach from Williams allowed a main entrance from the south, rather than the east. This plan transformed Hull's earlier center road between the residential subdivisions, making it the new South Entrance Road. Because the entrance road followed a natural valley, the residential neighborhoods remained relatively undisturbed on either side of the through road. The new automotive entrance also brought visitors to the center of Grand Canyon Village, rather than to its east side. As early as 1922, Hull had probably already decided to relocate the town's principal civic space, the "plaza," to this central arrival point. This plaza, which was originally intended as a large open square, figures prominently in its new location in the center of the 1924 plan. The new Babbitt Brothers' store, the post office, and a second park administration building were all sited around the plaza (as was a proposed museum that was never built). Like the plaza in the 1923 Yosemite plan, the Grand Canyon plaza also terminated the automotive entrance into the village. In both cases, these plazas became prime parking locations, eventually detracting from their usefulness as gathering places. Overall, however, the redesigned entry and plaza combination vastly simplified and centralized the Grand Canyon Village plan.

Another major change from Hull's earlier plans involved the expansion of future hotel accommodations on the rim. Ford Harvey had made it clear that, sooner or later, his company would like to expand its operations significantly. Mather welcomed such cooperation from the concessioner, who was widely reputed to run the finest hotels in the Southwest. On the 1924 plan, Hull indicated that El Tovar would be expanded with a new western annex, and that the Bright Angel Camp would be completely rebuilt. Two sites east of El Tovar were also set aside: one for a "new first-class hotel for future consideration" and a second for a "proposed casino." Both presumably represented the remnants of Pierce Anderson's proposals for the Fred Harvey Company. Near the site of the existing Fred Harvey mule barns and utility buildings along the railroad tracks Hull proposed a consolidated complex of power house, laundry, and public garage. The mule barns and other buildings were to be relocated to an area along the southern arm of the railroad wye at the western edge of the village.

Over the next decades, the approved 1924 plan guided the development of Grand Canyon Village, although numerous alterations were made. The new hotel and casino complex was never built, nor was the annex to El Tovar. The Fred Harvey mule barns remained in their

---

[67]Drawing NP.GC/46, Technical Information Center, Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Denver. The plan was drawn at one inch to 100 feet without the contour lines of earlier sketches. Tree masses were rendered in this presentation drawing.

[68]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1924 Annual Report, 39-40.

original locations, and the new power house and laundry (1926) were built next to them.[69] Perhaps most significantly, the plaza was reduced in size, and apparently from an early date it was used for parking. The first administration building, located near the original site of the proposed "town square," ended up fronting on the busy intersection between Grandview Road, the access to El Tovar, and the new main route to the town center.

With the approved plan finally in place, however, construction in the village proceeded rapidly. Between 1924 and 1933, 16 new bungalows, duplexes, and assorted garages were built in the Park Service residential subdivision. Several buildings were added to the nearby Park Service utility area, and a new park hospital (1930) was completed. During the same period, on the concessioner's side of town, the Santa Fe Railway completed over 50 new residences, garages, and other structures along the three parallel curving streets that Hull had designated.[70] This building campaign was directed primarily by Hull and, after 1922, by a new assistant landscape architect, Thomas C. Vint. When Hull left the Park Service in 1927, Vint continued as chief landscape architect. Also in 1927, Minor R. Tillotson replaced Eakin as superintendent, and for the next 11 years "Tilly" Tillotson oversaw and managed the most intensive period of development in the park's history.

The new residential areas at Grand Canyon Village continued to be built along distinctive lines. On the Park Service side, the cul-de-sac arrangement allowed automobile access to the back (kitchen) sides of residences; the front doors therefore opened onto communal public space and connected to informal pedestrian routes leading to school and work. In the 1930's (under Vint's direction) these implied routes were paved in asphalt and lined with rounded pieces of limestone set as curbs. Pedestrian and automotive circulation remained fully separated in this arrangement, and the network of pedestrian paths became fully integrated into the pedestrian paths elsewhere in the village. The arrangement established a hierarchy of semi-public and public spaces and enabled a convenient pattern of daily pedestrian circulation for residents. This type of arrangement would later be called "the Radburn idea," after the New Jersey subdivision designed by architects Clarence S. Stein and Henry Wright in 1929; its application at Grand Canyon Village, however, appears to have been underway at least several years earlier.

The Santa Fe Railway (Fred Harvey) residences on the other side of the South Entrance Road demanded a different treatment. This larger subdivision had been designed as a grid of connected streets, and the standard cottage designed by the concessioner's architect was slightly larger and more elaborate than the simple Park Service bungalows. Generously set back, the front doors of the cottages faced the streets, lending the neighborhood an entirely different character. Access to garages set at the rear of building lots required long alleys, parallel to the streets, down the center of the blocks. This arrangement introduced yet another street type to the hierarchy of street sections being developed by Hull and Vint. Within the residential areas alone at Grand Canyon Village, there were five distinct street types: pedestrian paths lined with front entrances; a narrow main street lined with back

---

[69]The powerhouse was made a National Historic Landmark for its architectural significance in 1987. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 257-267.

[70]Scott, "Grand Canyon National Register Nomination," 7-18.

entrances and garages; a slightly wider main street lined with the fronts of houses; service alleys; and the South Entrance Road itself, carrying through traffic. On the Park Service side, houses were organized along a (modified) cul-de-sac; on the concessioner's side, all the alleys and streets connected in a grid. The new Park Service utility area, with its very wide, rectilinear streets, featured a sixth typical street section. This refinement in the hierarchy of street types typified the contemporary town plans of, for example, John Nolen. The sophistication of circulation patterns, the varied modes of residential entrances, and the emphasis on the development of public and semi-public outdoor spaces were all lessons of British "garden city" planners, disseminated in particular through Unwin's 1909 textbook. The studied response to topography, vegetation, and natural systems that made this kind of town planning so particularly appropriate in a national park setting had been promulgated by F.L. Olmsted, Jr., in his various capacities as the leading planning professional in the United States. Grand Canyon Village epitomized the most skillful town planning techniques of the day.

One of the most important features of any successful town plan of this type was the central civic space. The town square typically served as a hub of circulation, an arrival point, and the site of the community's most important public buildings. At Grand Canyon, the Babbit Brothers' store finally opened in 1926 on the southern edge of the plaza, where Hull had sited it in 1924. In 1929, Thomas Vint contributed one of the most important buildings in the entire village, a second administration building, also located on the new plaza (where it had been sited in the 1924 plan). Vint's two-story building, now considered one of the finest existing examples of Park Service Rustic style, again featured a lower level of rusticated limestone and an upper level of dark wood siding surmounted by intersecting roofs covered in wood shingles. In this case the stone foundation extended up into the second story in massive rectangular piers reaching almost to the roofline. Peeled log columns set on the piers carry the roof beams and frame walls of dark wood siding pierced by windows.[71] As in many classic Park Service Rustic structures, neither the rough courses of stone nor the peeled logs serve their apparent structural purposes; the building does, however, project a powerful image representing the civic administration of the park. The presence of the second administration building dominated the Grand Canyon town plaza, and the peeled log trusses and rough stone or boulder masonry came to be completely identified with the scenic wonders of the Grand Canyon--and of national parks in general. For many park visitors, the decorative facades of the Park Service Rustic style also came to visually embody another aspect of the increasingly convenient national park system: the efficient and ethical management of national parks by a modern government bureau.

Other parts of Grand Canyon Village were developed before 1933 as well, including the Fred Harvey tourist cabin complex west of the railroad wye. After 1933, however, when the copious funds and abundant manpower of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal suddenly were available to the Park Service, construction in the village received new impetus. By 1941, when the Civilian Conservation Corps and other New Deal programs effectively came to an end, over 70 new buildings had been built, including residences, utility buildings, tourist cabins, dormitories, a new school, a firehouse, and a new post office (the last located next to

[71]The second administration building was made a National Historic Landmark for its architectural significance in 1986. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 301-309.

the Babbit Brothers' store on the town plaza). During the same period, the Fred Harvey Company redeveloped the Bright Angel Camp area and built the Bright Angel Lodge (1935), a motor lodge and cabin complex. Mary E.J. Colter, who designed the new lodge with Robert L. Nussbaum, had already done more than anyone to determine the character of commercial development along the rim. The Bright Angel Lodge was her last and most ambitious contribution to the development along the rim of the Grand Canyon. Less imposing and more decentralized than El Tovar, the new facility was geared to the more middle-class clientele that typically arrived by automobile. The low, sprawling complex incorporated several historic cabins in the area, and as a whole it maintained a low profile along the canyon rim. The interiors, as in all Colter's buildings, featured fantastic stone fireplaces, Hopi rugs and other crafts, and handcrafted furniture and details.

The presence of up to four Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) camps in Grand Canyon National Park between 1933 and 1941 was especially significant for the Grand Canyon Village itself, since large numbers of youths could be employed there in labor intensive tasks such as digging utility lines and sewers, paving roads and trails, and smoothing and regrading roadsides. Two CCC camps ultimately were located in Grand Canyon Village itself: the first near the Park Service utility area and the second south of the residential area. The initial camp at Grand Canyon Village was made up almost entirely of Texas boys, who like other CCC recruits, were from families that had been receiving some sort of public relief.[72] The recruits, working under the supervision of locally experienced men as well as the (now more numerous) Park Service landscape architects, built many of the most significant landscape structures in the village during the 1930s. The stone guardwall along the canyon, although portions of it dated back to 1905, eventually was completed and regularized along its length. It was complemented by the treatment of the rim trail, which like other heavily used footpaths in the village was paved in "oil bound macadam" to a width of five feet and lined on either side with pieces of limestone set as curbs. "Log seats" were set at advantageous points along the trail.[73] The last traces of wooden boardwalks and fences along the rim were removed during this period, and the flagstone esplanade in front of the Bright Angel Lodge was completed in 1939. Stone walkways, stairs, and retaining walls were built all around the village, including the wall around the mule corral at the head of the Bright Angel Trail. CCC recruits also completed numerous headwalls, culverts, and catch basin structures throughout the village.[74]

In general, the Park Service landscape architects and CCC foremen made a point of preserving existing vegetation, even relocating trenches for sewers and utility lines, for example, to minimize the damage to the roots of trees. In one of the most successful road projects in the village, the main road between the Fred Harvey garage and the town plaza (along the south edge of the railroad tracks) was replaced by two new roadways, which were

---

[72]Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming were subsequently represented as well. Each camp consisted of 100-200 recruits. "Narrative Reports Concerning ECW (CCC) Projects in National Park Service Areas, 1933-35," Arizona, Entry 42, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[73]Harry Langley, "Report to Chief Landscape Architect," September 8, 1932, Grand Canyon, Entry 7, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[74]Scott, "Grand Canyon National Register Nomination," 19-21.

separated by a straight, 30-foot wide mall. This type of mall was a favorite device of Thomas Vint's; he used it at Yellowstone, Glacier, and other parks during the 1930s. In this case, the two roadways, each carrying one-way traffic, were laid out on either edge of the mature grove of Pinyon and Ponderosa pines that remained in the Bright Angel drainage. The effect fully exploited the beauty of the trees, and probably also preserved more of them than a single two-way road would have.

Perhaps most significantly for the appearance of the village, scores of CCC boys were also employed in the difficult and time consuming tasks of improving soils and transplanting native trees and shrubs from surrounding areas. Few plans exist for landscape work of this type, and apparently much of it was directed in the field by the crew supervisors and by the Park Service landscape architects who oversaw all the work being done by CCC recruits.[75] The work is described in some detail, however, in reports submitted by CCC project superintendents to Superintendent Tillotson. Assistant and resident Park Service landscape architects also made regular and detailed reports to Vint, and both types of reports included photographs of construction progress and activities.[76] The work typically involved transplanting native plants in areas damaged by visitors or by new construction. This so-called "landscape naturalization" of disturbed areas attempted to recreate not so much the original conditions at an individual site, as a "beautified" condition featuring composed displays of native flora. At Grand Canyon, the planting designs emphasized the native plants of the pinyon-juniper belt that characterizes the 4,500 to 6,500-foot elevations in the park. Yuccas, Fernbush, Squawbush, and Bush mint were all used effectively to establish shrub borders and woodland understories. Pinyon pines and junipers, some of them large enough to require hoists and trucks to move the boxed roots, also were transplanted in the village area wherever ornamental plantings were desired. Areas around new construction received special attention, a fact which contributed immeasurably to the successful "harmonization" of new buildings. Such planting never hid the architecture behind a screen of vegetation, however, but enhanced and augmented the effect of the facade elevation. Local trees and shrubs planted strategically at the corners of buildings or as foundation plantings contributed as much to the building's total effect as did the choice of building materials. In other heavily used areas, such as along the rim walk, small islands of junipers, yuccas, and Fernbush were arranged as ornamental compositions that also contributed to the aesthetic appreciation of the park's flora generally.

Planting design and "landscape naturalization" of this sort clearly were influenced by the "natural gardens" described by Frank Waugh and others in the early 20th century. By the late 1920s, assistant Park Service landscape architects, working under Vint, had developed refined approaches to "naturalizing" disturbed areas by transplanting native trees and shrubs. In addition, by 1930 park scientists and interpreters such as Harold C. Bryant had put forward compelling environmental reasons for precluding the use of exotic species as

---

[75]Among the assistant and resident Park Service landscape architects making reports to chief landscape architect (through Superintendent Tillotson) during this period were: Harry Langley, Thomas E. Carpenter, and Alfred C. Kuehl. "Reports to the Chief Landscape Architect Through Superintendent," Grand Canyon, Central Files, Entry 7, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[76]"Narrative Reports Concerning ECW (CCC) Projects in National Park Service Areas, 1933-35," Arizona, Entry 42, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

ornamentals in national parks.[77] The term "landscape naturalization," in this case, implied the establishment of only native species, although William Robinson had originally coined the term to indicate the importation of suitable exotics. In any case, the use of nursery exotics in remote areas under harsh conditions would not have been cost effective (or even feasible) compared to making use of the hardened plant stock so readily available in nearby forests and meadows. The great success of assistant Park Service landscape architects, such as Ernest Davidson and Merel Sager, was in developing artistically compelling ornamental compositions while making use of local plants transplanted from nearby woods. Such planting design reinforced the general goals of landscape architectural development by strengthening spatial compositions or augmenting architectural facades; but by using local plants grouped by correct ecological associations, work of this type also "naturalized" areas that had been disturbed by construction or overuse, fulfilling the mandate to minimize the impact of physical development.[78]

In planting design, certainly, Park Service landscape architects successfully drew on the contemporary theory and examples of "natural style" gardeners such as Jensen or Waugh in order to create strategies for ornamental planting design appropriate for national parks. The use of native plants in "natural" arrangements had also been established as an appropriate complement to Arts and Crafts domestic architecture in California and elsewhere, and so it was a logical strategy for site work around new Park Service Rustic construction. Such horticulturally intensive work, however, made up only one component of the landscape architectural planning and design underway on the rim of the Grand Canyon in the 1920s and 1930s.

By the time the United States entered World War II, Grand Canyon Village had been essentially completed. It remains, remarkably, largely unaltered. Today there are 302 buildings and structures in the Grand Canyon Village NHL District, which was first placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1975. Only 35 of these were built after 1941 or have been modified enough to significantly alter their appearance.[79] There are numerous other examples of Park Service village planning of this era, including Yosemite Village, the Mesa Verde administrative district, Yellowstone's Mammoth Hot Springs and Fishing Bridge Museum areas, Longmire and Yakima Park villages at Mount Rainier, the Munson Valley and Rim Village areas of Crater Lake, the Giant Forest and Ash Mountain areas of Sequoia, and others. In some cases, such as Mammoth Hot Springs, the Park Service planners merely reorganized circulation and visitor services in what was already an established administrative center. In others, such as Yakima Park (now called Sunrise), planners designed an entirely new developed area. The situation was usually somewhere in

---

[77]McClelland, Presenting Nature, 149-161, 221. McClelland discusses important, if ephemeral, examples of "natural gardens" cultivated as interpretative displays in national parks in the 1920s and 1930s, including the Yosemite Nature Garden.

[78]Ernest Davidson and Merel Sager were particularly active in the Pacific Northwest, and the administrative village and rim village areas of Crater Lake National Park retain original ornamental planting designs of particular significance from this era. Cathy A. Gilbert, Gretchen A. Luxenberg, The Rustic Landscape of Rim Village, 1927-1941 (Seattle: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1990).

[79]Scott, "Grand Canyon National Register Nomination," 7-18.

between, as it was at Grand Canyon. With the exception of Yosemite Village, however, none of these examples of park village planning compare to Grand Canyon Village in terms of size, historical significance, and artistic distinction.

Yosemite Village, because conditions there kindled the first attempts at national park village planning in 1914, can claim to be the first site at which visitor and administrative services were consolidated in a picturesque village landscape. But like many park villages in the national park system, Yosemite Village was extensively altered after World War II, diminishing its historical integrity. The rapid increase in visitor numbers that boded so well for the future of national parks in the early 1920s completely overwhelmed many visitor facilities by the 1950s. As postwar automotive tourism soared, many parks reverted to the overcrowded, potentially unsanitary situations that had inspired officials to undertake planned park development in the first place. Beginning in 1956, the Park Service began a major park redevelopment campaign, called "Mission 66," to accommodate far greater numbers of tourists in developed areas. One of the park villages most affected, in the end, was Yosemite. The construction of a new Degnan's concession building (1959) and a large Park Service visitor center (1967) began a transformation of the central village civic zone. In 1972, much of the village circulation system was "pedestrianized"; since then motor vehicles have either bypassed the village center or have been parked in nearby lots. The central plaza, no longer an arrival point, became part of an extended pedestrian mall, with new paths, lighting, and construction details dating to the early 1970s. The plaza itself was partially filled with raised, planted islands, surrounded by seating walls.[80]

The "revegetation" of areas previously used for parking or other vehicular purposes led to the establishment of dense foliage in front of buildings and in open areas. This attempt to recreate oak woodland communities of native trees and shrubs may or may not have been successful ecologically. It is hard to imagine that a woodland ecosystem has been viably reestablished in an area which, even in 1914, was already a small city. What the reestablished vegetation definitely has done, however, is obscure the carefully crafted Park Service Rustic building facades behind screens of vegetation. This effect also diminishes the relationships of the buildings to one another, eroding the perception of the public spaces that the buildings once helped define. The central plaza, now largely "revegetated," is no longer perceptible as an important public space. Visitors no longer arrive at Yosemite Village at a well defined public plaza; and that plaza is no longer imbued with the sense of civic responsibility that Park Service Rustic architecture once embodied. As Daniel Hull knew so well, outside the context of an appropriate site plan, "rustic" architecture loses a great deal of its expressive and symbolic power. No longer "harmonized" with the landscape, the original buildings at Yosemite Village are now simply buried behind it. Perhaps most sadly, the maturing vegetation planted in the early 1970s now obscures many of the views from the village of the cliffs and other geologic formations of the surrounding valley. This geographic detachment greatly contributes to the generic, placeless quality of the village today--an ironic fate for a settlement privileged by such an extraordinary location.

---

[80]Land and Community Associates, Yosemite Valley, vol. 1, 2*114-2*116.

At Grand Canyon Village, however, postwar development averted major alterations to the original village area. Planners sited a new southern approach road to the rim at Mather and Yavapai points. The road then extended west, where a new visitor center, campground, and shopping mall were developed, before arriving at the entrance to the historic village area. Hull's South Entrance Road no longer served as a main public entrance to the village, and therefore reverted back to Center Road (as it is known today). Motor vehicles again began arriving at Grand Canyon from the east, via what was once Grandview Road. This alteration to the overall circulation plan has reduced Hull's town plaza to a less significant location in the village. The new traffic pattern also further complicated the already busy intersection at what became (again) the main arrival point to the village: the area where the railroad tracks end, between the first administration building and the Fred Harvey Garage. Two new motels were also developed in the village, on the rim near the location that had been proposed in 1924 for the El Tovar annex. Assembled from modular, precast slabs of darkened concrete, and massed with extremely low silhouettes, the Kachina (1968) and Thunderbird (1971) Lodges are successfully understated presences on the rim.

Besides these changes, Grand Canyon Village remains little changed. Even rail service, suspended in the 1960s, was resumed in 1989, making the Grand Canyon once again the only national park with direct rail access into a central area of the park. Under the special circumstances offered by its legal and physical context, the village became, and has remained, an idealized vision of how new towns can be developed in ways that would enhance civic life, minimize environmental damage, and remain visually consistent with established conventions for the visual appreciation of land as landscape.

The Park Service policies for village planning that Hull established at Grand Canyon would remain largely unaltered through the 1920s and 1930s. Unity in architectural inspiration, for example, continued to be an essential feature for park village development, as it always had been. Park Service planners would also continue to devise village plans that separated uses, mainly between residential, civic, and utility areas. Another type of use, first suggested by Johnston and Leopold's "rim zone" and later reaffirmed by Hull, attempted to eliminate all development from the immediate vicinity of visually or environmentally sensitive areas, such as the rim of the Grand Canyon. A central civic space remained a feature of national park village plans of the era, as did the refined hierarchy of street types, such as those that Hull and Vint devised. New village streets typically conformed to topography, but in legible patterns that prevented overly circuitous circulation systems. Ornamental planting was intended to reaffirm the general goals of spatial organization and circulation and also to provide well composed displays; but since plants were usually transplanted from somewhere nearby and grouped by appropriate ecological associations, ornamental plantations could also serve to "naturalize" areas that had been disturbed by construction or visitor traffic. And in general, the response to topography and the preservation of natural features that F. L. Olmsted, Jr., emphatically recommended to his World War I town planners continued to be hallmarks of all aspects of National Park Service planning.

The Grand Canyon Village NHL District survives, like other great landscape parks in American history, to express the particular ideals of civic form originally articulated by the park's managers, advocates, and constituents. If New York's Central Park preserves the "new urban vision" put forward for 19th-century American cities, Grand Canyon Village embodies the highest standards of American "town planning" of the early 20th century. The

precedents established at Grand Canyon for the development of national park villages were, at least for some, ideal prescriptions for urban development generally. In this sense, Hull advanced the role of national parks as 20th-century landscape parks: he initiated planning and development that would make the national park system a showcase of American planning ideals in the 20th century, just as municipal landscape parks had been in the 19th century.

The plan for Grand Canyon Village expounded the civic ideals of a certain generation of American planners and helped put National Park Service planning on the course it would follow at least until World War II. The challenges that face Grand Canyon Village today continue to be those that face American cities in general. As Grand Canyon Village has grown, it has sprawled--not unlike many American cities--in ways that early planners would not have anticipated. Increased traffic congestion and historic preservation are concerns that demand far greater attention than they did earlier in the century. Millions of tourists now arrive annually from all over the world, making the Grand Canyon one of the most visited places on earth. With luck, Park Service planners will continue to create design solutions that illustrate the best of what landscape architectural planning can achieve under such circumstances: development that alleviates the pressure put on delicate environments, while assuring that an ever larger and more diverse public continues to be able to fully appreciate "unimpaired" scenery, both as individuals and as a community. The Grand Canyon Village NHL District survives as evidence that this can be done.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Grattan, Virginia L. Mary Colter: Builder Upon the Red Earth. 2nd ed. Grand Canyon, Arizona: Grand Canyon Natural History Association, 1992.

Harrison, Laura Soulliere. Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1986.

Hughes, J. Donald. In the House of Stone and Light: A Human History of the Grand Canyon. Denver: University of Denver in cooperation with Grand Canyon Natural History Association, 1978.

James, George W. The Grand Canyon of the Arizona. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1910.

Lee, Ronald F. Family Tree of the National Park System. Philadelphia: Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1972.

Mackintosh, Barry. The National Parks: Shaping the System. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1991.

_____. National Park Service Administrative History. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1991.

McClelland, Linda Flint. Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916 to 1942. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1994.

Office of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work. Annual Reports of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work, 1936-1941. 6 vols. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Rothman, Hal. America's National Monuments. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas by arrangement with the University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Strong, Douglas Hillman. "The Man Who `Owned' Grand Canyon." The American West 6, no. 5 (September 1969): 33-40.

U.S. Department of the Interior. Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Verkamp, Margaret M. History of Grand Canyon National Park. [1940] Flagstaff: Grand Canyon Pioneers Society, 1993.

Waugh, Frank A. A Plan for the Development of the Village of Grand Canyon, Ariz. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1918.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

___ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
_X_ Previously Listed in the National Register.
__ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
_X_ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
_X_ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: # AZ-74, AZ-136
_X_ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: # AZ-41, AZ-45

Primary Location of Additional Data:

___ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State Agency
_X_ Federal Agency
___ Local Government
___ University
___ Other (Specify Repository):

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 123 approx.

UTM References:	Zone	Easting	Northing	Zone	Easting	Northing
	A 12	397810	3990860	**B** 12	398180	3990360
	C 12	397980	3990500	**D** 12	397540	3990220
	E 12	397280	3990220	**F** 12	396970	3990380
	G 12	397140	3990820	**H** 12	397410	3990760

Verbal Boundary Description:

See accompanying plan.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary includes the majority of the village site that was developed during the historic period of significance in accordance with the 1924 town plan and later master plans. A portion of the Grand Canyon auto camp, the adjacent Park Service public campground, and the area south of Boulder Street have been excluded because of lack of integrity. These areas on the edges of the district do not represent a significant portion of the area covered by the original 1924 plan.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Michael P. Scott, Gordon Chappell, Robbyn Jackson, Jamie Donahoe, Susan Begley, and Ethan Carr

Org.: National Park Service

Street/#: 800 North Capitol Street, Suite 360

City/Town: Washington

State: DC

ZIP: 20002

Telephone: 202-343-8148

Date: September 13, 1996

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS SURVEY
December 30, 1996