CHAPTER 4

LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION
CHAPTER IV – LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

The Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District and the Old NPS Housing Historic District and corresponding Study Areas examined in this CLR are distinguished from each other by location and purpose, but together they are representative of park development characterized by principles in park planning that had been formalized by the National Park Service between the years of 1916-1942. This time frame is closely aligned with the end of World War I (1914-1918) and the beginning of World War II (1939-1940). During this period, the national park system was extensively developed and modernized, with landscape architects and architects employed to create service villages within the parks that reflected a consistent “Rustic style” character and appearance. This aesthetic has had an impact on the way that visitors experienced, and expected to experience, the scenery and recreational amenities of the national parks. Between the establishment of Park facilities in 1924 and America’s entry into World War II in 1941, the concessionaire and administrative facilities developed within the Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area were deliberately planned to compliment the Park’s natural environment as well as to provide for the needs of a wide range of visitors.

The fourth chapter of this Cultural Landscape Report will begin by providing a background of the process and terms used in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nomination and a summary of the NRHP documentation as it relates to the Study Areas. Based upon this documentation and upon the research conducted for the History and Current Conditions Chapters, a statement of significance for the two Study Areas is presented which will also establish the needs of a wide range of visitors.

The Cultural Landscape Inventory and Report (CLI, CLR) method developed through the guidelines established by the National Register of Historic Places examines landscape significance according to specific criteria (A, B, C, D) within a period of significance.

The second historic context should be expanded to read as follows: Context 2) Influence of landscape architecture on National Park service facilities and the development of rustic building design. Within the framework of the cultural landscape as presented in this CLR, the second historic context should be expanded to read as follows: Influence of landscape architecture on site planning and comprehensive park development including service facilities and the development of rustic building design.

The NPS landscape architectural design standards that structured park planning within the Western United States and in particular Bryce Canyon National Park, during the periods of significance, are outlined in greater detail in a subsequent section in order to more carefully document landscape planning efforts.

This CLR presents Study Areas that were examined collectively in response to a wide overlap in history, analysis, and recommendations. In keeping with existing NRHP recommendations, the Districts and Study Areas in this CLR use the individual periods of significance established under Criterion A and C. Post WWII development (after 1945) and Mission 66 development (initiated in 1956) were not included in the period of significance. Within the Study Areas of this CLR, it is only the Utah Parks Service Station that occurred during these time periods; the structure is listed on the National Register for Historic Places and is thus protected. See the Historic Structures Report completed for Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District and the Old NPS Housing Historic District and BRCA Multiple Property Documentation Form.

Summary of National Register of Historic Places Registration Forms for Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District and the Old NPS Housing Historic District and BRCA Multiple Property Documentation Form

This Report includes two Study Areas that were derived from respective NRHP Districts: the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District and the Old NPS Housing Historic District. The two Study Areas overlap with supporting historical documentation that applies to all developed areas within the Park. This CLR therefore combines both Study Areas with information on respective Districts into one document. This Report is in agreement with the historical background for significance, statements of significance as well as the periods of significance outlined in the NRHP Registration Form for each District. This CLR also agrees with the historic context and subthemes outlined in the NRHP Multiple Property Documentation Form for Bryce Canyon National Park, particularly as they relate to development within the Park as a whole. Historic context and subthemes listed in documentation include the following:

- Context 1) Development of Recreational and Administrative Infrastructure in Bryce Canyon National Park 1924-1944 with subthemes that include Concessionaire Development in BRCA, 1924-1944 and National Park Service Administrative Development within BRCA 1928-1944
- Context 2) Influence of landscape architecture on National Park service facilities and the development of rustic building design. Within the framework of the cultural landscape as presented in this CLR, the second historic context should be expanded to read as follows: Influence of landscape architecture on site planning and comprehensive park development including service facilities and the development of rustic building design.
on the Service Station in 2004 for guidance regarding that structure and its surroundings.

The periods of significance for the two Study Areas have different start dates in order to reflect dates of construction projects for each District. However, much of the discussion in this Report is related to landscape architectural concepts and the influence this design profession had on Park planning at Bryce Canyon National Park. Therefore the text often notes a single period of significance. Additional comprehensive research of all developed areas in the Park might be warranted and one representative start date for a single period of significance established parkwide to better represent the landscape as a whole system.

The National Register of Historic Places nominations for these districts were completed in 1994, along with a number of other properties and areas of the Park, including the Bryce Canyon National Park Scenic Trails Historic District, the Bryce Canyon Inn, and the Old Administration Building. Although a detailed analysis of these other historic structures and Districts was not completed as a part of this CLR, some inventory and discussion of them can be found in Chapter 3 Existing Conditions under their respective Sub-Areas.

The Old NPS Housing Historic District (Study Area)

Statement of Significance

The old NPS Housing Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1994. The following text includes paraphrased segments (indicated through indented text) from the statement of significance found in the NRHP Nomination Form used to establish District status.

The Old Housing Historic District is associated with the development of NPS administrative infrastructure in Bryce Canyon National Park (BCNP), and is included in the property type that contains all improvements initiated by the NPS. It is recommended eligible under Criterion A (for its associative value) and under Criterion C (since the buildings remaining in the District are representative of “Simplified” Rustic design). Areas of significance include architecture, government, and recreation.

This District represents the first housing development within the park specifically designed to house NPS employees. The initial building constructed in this vicinity was the original Ranger’s Residence—an “exaggerated” rustic building with a massive stone foundation and fire place. Between 1930 and 1940, several small scale buildings were added to the district, designed for unmarried seasonal NPS employees as well as a single, small dormitory. Their presence reflects the need for additional Park personnel and also the availability of construction funds and manpower during the New Deal era. All of the plans for the buildings in the District originated from the NPS Branch of Plans and Design.

The District as a whole meets the registration requirements established for its property type. Overall, the exterior surfaces of the building within the District possess integrity of materials, workmanship, and design. Contemporary, intrusive elements are limited to the addition of two new dormitories adjacent to the south edge of the District. These new buildings are visible primarily from HS-10 and do not adversely affect the remainder of the District. The boundary for the District can be drawn to exclude these new buildings.

This CLR disagrees with the last two sentences in this statement. The new buildings are visible from the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District as the scale of the aforementioned buildings is larger and would not have been consistent with design standards used during the period of significance. Therefore the small scale of the cottage residences suffers as a result of the nearby out-of-scale larger dormitories. During the period of significance, attention was paid to maintaining the Old NPS Housing District as a zone for staff housing; it was segregated from visitor functions and views into the housing area were purposely obstructed. The small cabins of this zone fit with the topography and were surrounded by pine trees—many within scant feet of the structures themselves. The natural slope of this knoll and another adjacent knob, as well as the pine cover used to create an enclosed forested village atmosphere. The topography and natural setting was as much a part of the rustic style as the buildings. The new Concessionaire Dormitories built to replace lodging lost with the removal of the standard cabins near the Lodge disrupt this forest and are highly visible from visitor use areas. Their large scale construction, the massive regading of slopes necessary for their siting and the removal of the forest cover has had a dramatic effect upon the historic district as a whole.

Cabin designs were simplified and economized from the more elaborate structures in the visitor areas—thus the term “Simplified” Rustic style architecture arose. During the New Deal era, these non-invasive design techniques matured under the direction of Thomas Vint. Vint became the assistant landscape engineer for the National Park Service in 1923 and an associate landscape engineer in 1926. In 1927, he became the chief landscape architect in the NPS landscape program. Under Vint’s leadership, national park planning based on harmonizing with nature within “naturalistic” (rustic) principles of design, reached its zenith; these design standards had become a code of ethics within landscape architecture and preservation.


Period of Significance

The Old NPS Housing Historic District period of significance is listed as 1932-1944 with a beginning date reflecting the date of construction. This time frame is characterized by work programs established during the New Deal era; improvements were made in Bryce Canyon National Park as well as many other national park throughout the country.

Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District (Study Area)

Statement of Significance

The Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District was included in the NRHP under Criterion A (for its association with the development of the Park’s recreational facilities) and under Criterion C (as an example of Rustic building design). The District is associated with the development of concessionaire facilities and partnerships between the NPS and Union Pacific Railroad’s Utah Parks Company (1924-1944) and reflects the architectural work of Gilbert Stanley Underwood (1890-1960) who was an American architect praised for his lodge designs. Daniel Ray Hall (1890-1964), Chief NPS landscape engineer (landscape architect) collaborated with Underwood in an integrated design approach of the architecture and landscape architecture for the Lodge and cabins at Bryce (1924) as well as other National Parks including Zion (1924), the Ahwahnee Hotel at Yosemite (1927) and the Grand Canyon Lodge (1928). Hull was instrumental in making Rustic style architecture a recognizable NPS park style. He stressed the following toward this achievement: comprehensive site planning, subordinating development to the natural scenic landscape qualities, responding to the natural topography, sensitive building siting, vegetative screening, and using natural forms and natural materials in architectural design.

The Bryce Canyon Lodge was built between 1924 and 1925 using local materials and construction techniques. The Underwood design of the Lodge is a masterful example of NPS Rustic style architecture constructed by the railroads. The railroads and related concessionaires typically brought the first development to the parks, and the National Park Service promoted the hiring of landscape architects, architects, and engineers to develop plans and oversee construction of site facilities. This was a period in time when landscape architecture played an important role in influencing architecture and site planning toward the development of an appropriate park style.

The Lodge and Deluxe Cabins were given National Historic Landmark status in 1987. The following text includes paraphrased segments (indicated through indented text) from the statement of significance found in the NRHP Nomination Form used to establish District status.
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Chapter 2) It was the dominant building in the landscape and had deliberate spatial connections to other facilities, particularly the Deluxe Cabins (completed in 1929). Smaller in scale than the Lodge itself, the Deluxe Cabins were located below the Lodge, within the natural setting of a pine grove to the southeast. These cabins were placed in an arrangement so that they responded to the lay of the land thus giving them a “nestled into the landscape” appearance. The highly textured rubble masonry chimneys and stone corner piers on the exterior of the cabins add visual interest characteristic of Rustic style architecture that presents an integral relationship between the building and the natural surroundings.

The irregular massing and chunkiness of the Deluxe Cabins imitates the irregularities found in nature. The detailing of both the Lodge and the Deluxe Cabins is rugged and primitive in nature. The stones, quarried locally, match portions of the surrounding geology. The logs are the same size as the surrounding pines. The rough stonework, the free use of logs particularly on the buildings’ exteriors, the wave-patterned shingle roofs (appearing in the main Lodge and the Deluxe Cabins), the wrought-iron chandeliers, and the exposed framing and trusswork give the buildings a rustic honesty and informality characteristic of park architecture.

The structures of the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District, their materials and arrangement on the site as well as the clear integration of architecture and site architecture within the natural landscape itself was an overarching characteristic of NPS planning and a design philosophy that had been fully developed at Bryce Canyon National Park. The Rustic style architecture of the Lodge, Deluxe Cabins, Standard Cabins and other structures was a response to the forest, meadows, and the flow of topography. The built environment was meant to seem as if it were an integral part of the natural landscape itself. In this way the overall design was a reminder that humans are collectively a part of something larger.

Period of Significance
The Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District established a period of significance from 1924-1944; the start date is aligned with construction of the main Lodge building and spans, to the end of World War II in 1944. This was an era characterized by the development of visitor facilities by the National Park Service and built by the railroads. The collection of writings, teachings, and design work from these landscape designers and the ones to follow, inspired NPS park planning and led to the development and refinement of park Rustic style and Simplified Rustic style that was used in architecture, site planning and landscape architecture.

Henry Hubbard, Frank Waugh, and Charles Punchard made numerous suggestions on landscape architectural design that began to rigorously structure NPS park planning, forming the basis of park appearances. Their collective work on sweeping road alignment, mass and void of native plantings, views and vistas, park development zoning, and use of natural materials including cobblestone, rock, and timber brought to focus this evolving “naturalistic” style. Waugh, a professor of landscape architecture at what is now the University of Massachusetts, had several seasonal contracts with the Forrest Service and the National Park Service. He promoted the naturalistic park style (Rustic style) through a handbook

NPS Landscape Architectural Design Standards
Influence of Landscape Architecture on National Park Service Facilities and the Development of Rustic Style Architecture and Site Planning
The National Park Service was established as the administrative control for the design and management of the national parks in 1917. The early years of the establishment of the National Park Service (1916-1942) can be characterized as an era where planning philosophies and site design doctrines were created. The park style that emerged during this era was built as an amalgamation of ideas from previous landscape planning approaches including those from the English landscape style and theories promoted by early American landscape architects. Andrew Jackson Downing made popular the importance of connecting people to nature by emphasizing the role nature played in architectural design as presented in his book Cottage Residences (1844). Theories promoted by Frederick Law Olmsted Sr. and continued through the work of his sons in the landscape architectural firm, the Olmsted Brothers, promoted site planning and architectural form as a direct response to the natural conditions of the site and the notion of separation of pedestrian and vehicular (carriage) traffic became a signature element in their park designs. Charles Eliot’s work stressed the value of comprehensive park planning and careful understanding of site conditions as a tool for design. His philosophy on the management of vegetation in natural areas was widely accepted among landscape architects and used to develop approaches used by the NPS with respect to vegetation and scenery. “His techniques included vista clearing, vegetation studies, and general landscape forestry, allowing the park designer to manipulate the character of vegetation to attain a healthy and scenic landscape” (McClelland 1998, 3). The collection of writings, teachings, and design work from these landscape designers and the ones to follow, inspired NPS park planning and led to the development and refinement of park Rustic style and Simplified Rustic style that was used in architecture, site planning and landscape architecture.


### The Principles and Aesthetic Standards for Rustic Park Development

This style is best characterized by an overarching philosophy in which the natural features of the parks took precedence over the built environment. This concept thus created a cohesive style of design where park facilities such as lodges, visitor cabins, comfort stations, stores, ranger stations, and other functions would be designed to exist in harmony with scenic and natural qualities. Built amenities were carefully placed in a way that preserved the natural setting or intrinsic landscape identity. As park planning evolved, landscape stewardship and visitor comfort and experience played a dynamic role in development. The interlocking configuration of architecture, roads, trails, visitor services, and staff housing and related functions constructed during the periods of significance were shaped by masterful designers who were able to fully understand these considerations and synthesize them into fully functioning and harmonious landscapes. Thus site plans were holistic in nature and designers studied the entire Park toward the development of cohesive plans. As an organizational tool, the landscape characteristics used for analysis purposes are listed (in part) here as a way to describe the NPS design philosophy that created the basis for the landscape style that shaped Bryce Canyon National Park.

### Natural systems and features

- The natural environment was managed for health.
- The impact of the built environment was minimized while the natural environment was showcased.
- Natural systems and features played an important role in planning for development; architecture was subordinate to nature. Natural slopes and vegetation were used as amenities; they were organized and coordinated with development.
- The integrity of natural systems and features were preserved; minimal impact was made to natural systems; preservation of characteristic scenery was called for.
- Where development occurred the surrounding natural landscape was to look as if it had never been disturbed. Buildings were to have the illusion that they were somehow a part of nature—that they grew up out of nature. Structures were to seem as if they “fit” with the majestic landscape.
- Natural beauty should not be destroyed by any other use.
- The use of native plant materials was advocated.
- Site analysis was used in developing designs thus existing natural systems and features structured patterns of development.

### Spatial organization

- Zones of compatible use in planning development dictated how site plans were organized. These considerations were made in conjunction with understanding and appreciation for the patterns of the natural landscape. Related site functions were often placed adjacent to one another while dissimilar uses were placed away from each other and screened by use of natural features. In particular, staff related functions were located away from visitor functions and were screened from view.
- By using a zoned approach meaningful relationships between buildings and outdoor spaces could occur and harmonious spatial sequencing from one function to another could showcase natural wonders.
- Spatial harmony was achieved through a careful blending of the built environment with the natural. Considerations included: appropriate architectural scale, built forms that were in alignment with existing topography; use of existing forest vegetation for screening and protection. Existing vegetative cover was used to provide a “forested village” atmosphere. Spatial sequences were highly orchestrated. Lodges were often located at some distance from the spectacular natural view – to protect the ecology and provide a sense of drama once the view revealed itself.
- Parking was often located behind the pavilion or lodge so that the space between the lodge and the grand natural feature (the plateau rim in the case of Bryce Canyon National Park) could be protected from the high volume of automobile traffic.
- Views were important considerations in attaining spatial design harmony.
- Organization of spaces and spatial sequences included and unfolding of vistas and a variety of places where visitors could stop.
- Designers wanted to get people out into the landscape through scenic roads and nature trails. Straight lines in pathways and roads were discouraged.
- Within residential areas, spatial organization helped to create a small-scaled village atmosphere.
- The village compound included a careful method of choosing sites for the location of buildings; attention was paid to the proximity and relationships of other structures, human uses or natural systems—and organic pattern of development was employed as apposed to grid patterns.
- Considerations for scale included the clustering of small residential cabins with larger pavilions or lodges located as a central or focal feature.

#### Land use

- Visitor accommodations stressed conveyance and comfort and included pavilions, inns, lodges, cabins, camping, comfort stations, museums and information, picnicking, supply stores, gas stations, signs, and water fountains.
- Staff accommodations were usually screened from visitors’ views and were separated; ranger stations, residences, workshops, garages for ease in managing park maintenance were some of these uses.
- Utilities were planned for and often screened or placed underground. These include electricity, telephone, sewage, water. Planning these in conjunction with other functions was critical - proper siting was...
Trails were designed to provide visitor access but to also protect the natural landscape. Pedestrian pathways were meandering and not straight.

- Roads were designed for recreational scenic experience not just for transportation.
- Roads surfaces were often crushed stones as this had a more natural appearance and were able to better blend with the topography and vegetation.
- Road surfaces were often crushed stones as this had a more natural appearance.
- Roads were designed for recreational scenic experience not just for transportation.
- Pedestrian pathways were meandering and not straight.
- Trails were designed to provide visitor access but to also protect the natural landscape.

Topography

- Buildings and site features were placed in to have a deliberate relationship with topography.
- Grade as a result of the construction process were a careful balance of cut and fill—new slopes were to blend seamlessly into the existing topography so as to make construction seem as if it “fit” with the grade. Created slopes were gentle and sweeping (low percent slope) and not abrupt (steep).
- Natural topography was used as a design element thus the cottage cabins in the Old NPS Housing District were placed at the base of a natural slope to provide cover, seclusion, and give a “nestled” in nature feeling.

Vegetation

- Vegetation and vegetative patterns were used in the process of design as vital elements that helped shape development configurations. Existing vegetation was used to frame lodges, screen service areas, and provide an enclosed atmosphere for clusters of buildings particularly cottage style cabins.
- The character of the vegetation could be manipulated to attain a healthy and scenic landscape.
- “Vegetation was selectively thinned, transplanted, cleared, or reintroduced to open up scenic vistas (not recommended between Lodge and rim at Bryce Canyon as this was not the intent during the period of significance), prevent fire hazards, or blend construction with the natural setting of the park” (McClelland 1998, 2).

Buildings and Structures

- Subordination of structure to natural environment was paramount. Structures were to appear to be in harmony with the natural systems.
- Rustic style architecture used in lodge designs was inspired by the vernacular Swiss Adirondack style that was combined with Arts and Crafts influences from the Bay Area architects; these were merged in an understated expression.
- Use of natural materials found locally such as logs and stone masonry were employed.
- The Rustic Style and the Simplified Rustic Style used in NPS New Deal era cabins sought to create a small-scaled “nestled in the woods” atmosphere.
- Buildings fit with the topography with minimal topographic cut and fill. Slopes created as a result of construction were to smoothly “meet the grade” of existing contours.
- Development (roads and structures) were carefully situated and constructed to blend unobtrusively into the natural setting. They were to lay “lightly on the land”
- Good architecture was born out of a through “study of the site” Hull (as quoted by McClelland 1998 , 7) or site analysis.
- It was important to have a cross-section of residences to serve an economically diverse population.
- Coordinated with buildings were elevated terraces, sweeping stairways, and stone parapets.
- Proper scale in development was critical. The lodge or hotel was larger thus a central point of development and activity. Other service functions such as stores and museums were mid-sized. Closely clustered together residential cottage-like cabins were deliberately small in scale.

Cultural Traditions

- Native materials were stressed and traditional building techniques emphasizing hand craftsmanship of Rustic style structures were often employed. Use of log construction, stone foundations, overhanging roofs, small paneled windows came together in this style.
- Design rejected regularity and symmetry; inspiration was derived from the Arts and Crafts movement, Swiss Adirondack style architecture, and nature itself.

Cluster Arrangements

- Located in pine groves and accessed by meandering paths, the cottage-style cabins were built to harmonize with the natural setting; they were nestled into natural setting (trees and topography).
- Smaller buildings were often sited against hillsides in order to provide a scenic backdrop for the village atmosphere; this served to protect the cluster of cabins from outside views.
- Visitors’ comfort, convenience, and overall scenic experience was a priority in arrangements.

Circulation

- One-way curvilinear entry drives were used for tour buses and automobiles dropping off visitors so that they might experience the lodge front entrance.
- Loop entry drives for lodges were often used.
- Roads followed natural contours with attention to opportunities for vistas.
- Roads were not to detract from natural scenery.
- Curved road alignments were favored with sweeping lines that provided a variety of views and spatial sequences. Straight lines in roads and pathways were not favored as flowing lines had a more natural appearance and were able to better blend with the topography and vegetation.

Landscape architects and architects worked with the NPS to provide visitor amenities that would not disrupt the scenic and natural qualities of the national parks. During the periods of significance, Bryce Canyon and other national parks experienced an increase in visitors, thus the demand for park facilities and visitor comfort also expanded. Standards in design were created to insure that park structures and facilities would blend and not disturb the natural environment—its ecology and scenic and recreational value. The layout of the Developed Area at Bryce Canyon National Park had been informed by the collective amalgamation of landscape architectural design standards as outlined previously. Out of these standards the Rustic style in architecture and a corresponding style in site design evolved and characterized development. Buildings were required to fit with the land and natural setting and to respond to one another in a meaningful, compatible relationships. Park development had a rustic village atmosphere with soft winding pathways and hand crafted, scale-appropriate buildings made from natural materials found regionally. Use of native materials, including native plants, helped the Rustic style develop its regional strength and provided each park with a unique sense of place. Site designs were cohesive and born out of a clear understanding of the site—its

Conclusion
geology, soil, topography, meadows, forests, and other natural features. Circulation patterns flowed as they followed the topography; roads were surfaced in crushed stone and pathways were often left unpaved. Attention was paid to the relationships of facilities; similar uses were located in the same area while dissimilar uses were separated and often screened through siting that employed the use of existing natural features. Architectural scale was used to create hierarchies of space and to create order within the naturalistic setting.

During the periods of significance these standards went beyond mere aesthetics to become ethical considerations regarding park planning and human interface with nature. At Bryce Canyon National Park, preservation efforts warrant cohesive design approaches that take into consideration these standards which should be applied with advice from professional landscape architects and architects, as was the practice when the Park was developed. The spirit of Bryce Canyon National Park’s Rustic style architecture and site architecture (the built environment) can only be preserved with an understanding of the natural context. Preservation techniques will therefore incorporate notions of nature as systems that are dynamic.

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS**

The primary goal for this part of the chapter is to compare the condition of the landscape during the period of significance and the current condition, identifying similarities and differences and evaluating how evolution has affected the historic integrity of the place as a whole. Because cultural landscapes are a complex collection of elements working together at different scales, the analysis considered the landscape from different scales. First, the Study Areas will be considered the landscape at different scales. As opposed to the facilities constructed for concessionaire use, the NPS housing units were deliberately sited away from visitor service facilities, so as to avoid visually interfering with the Park experience, and yet still convenient to shared facilities such as the cafeteria. The result was an informal grouping of residential structures that created an intimate housing village for Park staff that was shielded from visitor’s eyes and isolated from the bustle of the tourist activities. No additions to the area were made between the construction slump caused by WWII and the expansions conducted in 1984. The 1980’s additions, larger in scale, serve functional needs for cost effective housing but are not in keeping with the scale and character of the Simplified Rustic style and related landscape aesthetic presented by the original housing structures and the overall setting created by harmony between built structures and natural features. As a result, the character of the area was dramatically altered. The Utah Parks Company Service Station is included in this Study Area because of its physical relationship to the housing units, but due to its date, purpose and architectural and landscape aesthetic presented by the original housing structures and the overall setting created by harmony between built structures and natural features. The historic structures from the existing grouping were (at the time of the road realignment) shielded by forest cover and topography and thus they were maintained in their original positions. These remaining structures are well maintained and forest cover and topography still serve to separate them visually from visitors. However, vehicular and pedestrian flow has been altered and the overall Rustic village character has been compromised by spatial relationships to the newer larger units. The harmonious feeling between the architecture and landscape was not achieved in the later dormitory additions, some of which, unlike the historic structures, are visible from several visitor vantage points.

**Land Use**

The Study Area has remained an exclusively residential area for Park employees, though the residential population has expanded to include concessionaire employees as well as NPS staff. As it was in the period of significance, today the Study Area houses a mix of permanent and seasonal residents, giving the community a high degree of occupant changeability over the course of each year. These occupants tend to modify their residences in small ways, adding and moving small scale features such as log piles, decorative plantings and site furniture (benches, tables, clothes lines).

**Circulation**

During the period of significance, access to the Study Area was available from only one point directly off of the Rim Road north of the Lodge. This road continued past the residential area, over a low saddle between the knolls and continued on to the NPS maintenance area. At some point after 1955, a second access point was created when a road was installed around the northern edge of the knoll behind the housing area. With this realignment, it was no longer necessary to go through the main housing area to reach the maintenance and dormitory buildings to the west. When the Rim Road was realigned in 1958, creating the current route that bypasses the Lodge area, the direct vehicular connection between the housing and the maintenance area was eliminated and the maintenance area was moved (Figure 4-1). The portion of the road between the Ranger’s Dormitory and the maintenance area was removed as well, though traces of it remain.

Two large parking areas, built after the 1980’s, were added to accommodate the newer lodges. The parking adjacent to the Manzanita Lodge is essentially a widening of the old roadbed with parking along either side. This new dormitory unit is actually located on a low knoll, connected to the parking area by a wide stairway with 3 landings. The slope has been seeded with grasses in an attempt to return it to a natural appearance, but it is steeper than the surrounding, natural topography. The parking area adjacent to the new Concessionaire Dormitories is larger, and is bounded on one side by...
a large retaining wall made of decorative concrete masonry units which holds back the hill slope that would have been present here. The material of the retaining wall is inconsistent with the native stone retaining walls seen in other parts of the Park. In addition to a difference of materials, both of these parking areas have proportions that are too large for the original small scale village atmosphere of the housing area (Photograph A/1 and A/2). These out of scale parking areas have increased traffic flow through the historic parts of the Study Area, particularly in front of the smaller cabins (B-5 and B-7-10). Within the period of significance, and before the construction of the Concessionaire’s Dormitories, the small spur road that is aligned with the front of these cabins would have received only occasional vehicular traffic. The addition of the combined 40 space parking areas have significantly changed this traffic pattern resulting in degradation of the quiet village atmosphere – reducing the overall historic integrity of the area.

When the changes to the Rim Road necessitated the removal of the NPS maintenance area, it included relocating the horse barn to the area now known as the Mixing Circle. A trail between the new barn location and the rim travels along the southern edge of the Old NPS Housing Study Area. Though it is not clear precisely when this trail was installed, it can be assumed because the horse barn was in a different location, that the trail was not present during the period of significance. However, the close relation of the horse concessionaire activities – whether it be the trail or the barn itself - and the NPS housing is not inconsistent with the historic pattern of land use. Additionally, the natural surface trail and the winding nature of the trail as it traverses and ascends the slope through the forest is supportive of the scenic qualities emphasized during the period of significance as well as the Rustic style of the built environment.

Both formal and informal pedestrian trails through the area have been present since the first structures were constructed, though new ones have arisen as a result of the larger dormitory facilities located here. The trails between the residences and trails to Bryce Canyon Lodge and the General Store are of particular importance. Park and concessionaire employees continue to use these routes as they would have during the period of significance as they commute between home environs and their work activities. These trails remain unpaved, but are well maintained and signed so they are easy to follow.

Topography

The forest village atmosphere of the Old NPS Housing Study Area has always been supported by its relationship with the natural topography. Each of the historic buildings was small enough to be located without significant changes to the surrounding topography, and as a result the village feels as if it has evolved within the forest. This was a part of the intention of the
Rustic style that was retained in the Simplified Rustic style of NPS housing at the time. The large knoll to the northwest of the cluster of housing units provides a sense of enclosure for the residences, which is reinforced by the fact that the units have been located in the trees, away from the edge of the meadow to the east. The smaller knoll to the south shields the residences from the Bryce Canyon Lodge, and would have been particularly important when the Lodge was the bustling center of the Park’s visitor activities.

The newer, larger dormitory units built in the 1980’s and 1990’s were at a larger scale, which necessitated considerable re-grading of the topography. The resulting retaining walls and altered topography including filled areas are not consistent with the existing natural slope. Additionally the landscape materials and construction techniques, including the blocks for the retaining walls, were treated in ways not consistent with historic construction materials or techniques.

Vegetation

In conjunction with the topography, the existing forest vegetation contributes to the atmosphere of this residential village. The vegetation helps to shield views to and from the buildings, offering a sense of seclusion and privacy from the rest of the Park. Additionally, the vegetation serves to buffer those structures that are widely spaced from one another. While the smaller scale and spacing of the historic cabins allowed for less grading and topography change, it also permitted a larger portion of the mature forest vegetation to be maintained in close proximity to the buildings. The larger scale of the newer structures in combination with construction techniques employed during the 1980’s and 1990’s led to the clearing of all vegetation from the building site and immediate surroundings, most noticeably the mature trees. Though seeding and replanting was implemented to help restore some of the natural vegetation, the size, age and species of the plants in the revegetated areas is not consistent with the surrounding forest. Particularly, grass species including Kentucky bluegrass (Poa pratensis) and Crested wheatgrass (Elymus sp.) were used in seed mixes, though they would not have been present on those sites prior to clearing.

Due to fire suppression and supplemental plantings, the vegetation throughout the Old NPS Housing Study Area is likely denser than it was in the period of significance, Though precise documentation of the forest progression in this Study Area is lacking. Comparisons of forest density in other developed parts of the Park, however, display a significant increase in density and it can be assumed that density has increased in this location as well (see Photographs R/10 and R/11 in the next section).

Though human traffic has had less of an impact on understory vegetation in this Study Area than in the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area, there are a number of areas that do display signs of overuse. These signs include a lack of grass and bushy understory species such as Elymus grass species, Oregon Grape (Mahonia repens) and Snowberry (Symphoricarpos oreophilus) close to buildings, roads and trails, though these same plants are prolific just a few feet away in undisturbed areas. However, it is likely with similar pedestrian activity in the Study Area during the period of significance, that this level of disturbance would have been present even then.

Buildings and Structures

Seasonal Employee Housing and Wood Vendor (HS-5.6.7.8.9.10)

This arrangement of small residential structures was built within a 4 year period starting in 1932 (HS-10 was built slightly later in 1939). Though they are not identical structures, their design follows a uniform selection of materials and use of scale which, combined with their close proximity to one another, has the immediate effect of a small-scale alignment of simple cabins placed in neat rows along either side of a quiet street. Representative of the Simplified Rustic style that was applied to the NPS service buildings during this time period, they remain unadorned and are deliberately void of the more elaborate details of the guest-focused structures (such as cut logs, decorative shingles, and large windows). The natural stone foundations and small entry stoops, painted weatherboard siding and simple gabled roofs reflect the basic tenets of the purity of the Simplified Rustic style. Though there might have been more traffic on the Main Access Road during the period of significance, the road between the cabins would have been a dead end, and would have received only limited, local traffic. The buildings have maintained their intimate relationship with one another, the contour of the land, and the surrounding forest, and only a few small scale features exist to remind one of the contemporary era. The most significant impact to these buildings has been the changes to viewed caused by the addition of the new Concessionaire Dormitories (Photograph A/4).

Ranger Dormitory (HS-4)

This building is isolated from the buildings in the rest of the Old NPS Housing Study Area by the surrounding forest and topography. Between the time of the construction of the Rim Road Lodge Bypass and the construction of the Manzanita Lodge in the 1980s, this structure would have been alone on the small spur off of the East Access Road. When it was built, however, it was located on the main road between the original Rim Road alignment and the now absent NPS maintenance area and housing facilities to the west. The road would have been busier, and the residence would have been more visible to the other NPS employees. Today, the Ranger Dormitory still has relatively high visibility to personnel, though it is due to the addition of the Manzanita Lodge and its associated parking area rather than due to through traffic. The Dormitory is still used for year-round housing and includes an original stone fireplace. Constructed later within the period of significance (1940) from funds resulting from the New Deal era, this slightly larger structure was meant to respond to the need for additional staff at the increasingly popular Park.
Seasonal Residence (HS-5)

Like the Ranger Dormitory, this building is spatially isolated from the other structures in the Study Area. This single-unit dwelling maintains much of its original exterior character and materials, and is still nestled in the topography and the forest, almost within sight of the line of smaller cabins to the south. In spite of its relative isolation, the presence of this residence on the entrance road does contribute to the overall sense of community in the Old NPS Housing Study Area.

Ranger Residence and Garage (HS-1, 3)

The first building constructed in the District was the Ranger Residence. The original structure was more elaborate than the previously mentioned cabins as it included exposed logs and a deep porch. However, this structure was destroyed in a fire in 1989. All that remains of the cabin is a stone foundation with steps within a cleared area of land where the building once stood. These features, however, offer intriguing yet obvious clues about the history of the site. Across the road is the Garage. Currently used as storage, this structure is listed as non-contributing in the NRHP nomination form. However, through the use of materials, scale and the building’s ability to harmonize with the natural setting, the Garage is compatible with the continuity of style and the residential scale of community.

Manzanita Lodge

Located across the road from the Ranger Dormitory, this year-round housing facility was constructed in 1984 and is an example of more recent construction in the Study Area. It is sited on a hill above a parking area, surrounded by forest which is beginning to show signs of recovering from the trauma of the construction process. Though the scale of the building is at odds with that of the historic structures, it is visually isolated within the village (except for the Ranger Dormitory). It is also shielded from the visitor areas by forest and topography. This location would have been consistent with the design strategies of the period of significance. The building does adopt some of the design language of the historic buildings, including the stone foundation, weatherboard siding and simple roof lines. However, the scale of this structure and other construction materials such as the asphalt shingle roofing are inconsistent with the historic style.

Concessionaire Dormitories (Ponderosa and Whispering Pines)

These large group housing structures were built in 1985. Though the buildings’ design features do reflect an attempt at the Rustic style, the scale of the structures as well as the materials used are not consistent with the style of the historic buildings in the Old NPS Housing Study Area or the other historic areas of the Park. Green metal roofing, massive log details and dormer windows are all meant to be reminiscent of the historic Rustic style, but are inaccurate representations of the architecture reflected in historic structures. The size of these buildings also makes them visible from visitor areas and from within the Old NPS Historic Housing Study Area. Combined with the large adjacent parking area cleared to accommodate the concessionaire residents, the resulting effect is one which disturbs the overall historic context.

Views and Vistas

As discussed in Topography and Vegetation, the knolls and forests bordering this Study Area served, during the period of significance, to create privacy and shield the NPS Historic Housing to and from the visitor areas. Not only was this seen as a way to enhance the visitor experience (by visually obstructing incongruous land uses), but the privacy it helped to create offered Park staff a means to escape the public realm and visitor bustle of the Park. These features are largely intact today, reinforcing this important aspect of isolation. However, the combination of the siting of the new Concessionaire Dormitories and their larger out-of-context scale disturbs the original intent of the views. As a result those larger non-historic structures are visible from visitor areas and people within these structures have views into the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area (Photograph A/5).
The Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area

Building in the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area was started in 1923 with the construction of the main Lodge building. Throughout the period of significance, visitor and employee facilities were expanding within this area to accommodate the growing popularity of the western Parks. The main Lodge building, sixty-seven Standard Cabins, fifteen Deluxe Cabins, a Recreation Hall and employee dormitory contributed to the sense of a mountain village, with the main Lodge as its bustling heart. Today, the Lodge remains the primary structure, but changes in circulation patterns (both vehicular and pedestrian), spatial organization, built features and activities have dramatically changed the way visitors experience the Lodge and have diminished the impact of the Lodge itself within the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area. Additionally, changes within the park as a whole have contributed to a reduction in the importance of the Lodge within the Park. The development of the Visitor Center and additional lodging opportunities outside the Park has transformed the Historic Lodge Study Area from the central visitor facility at the Park to a minor element and an experience for only a limited number of visitors.

Spatial Organization

The most dramatic change to the Lodge Study Area since the period of significance has been the removal of all but four of the original 91 Standard Cabins that once occupied the knoll to the southwest of the Lodge building. Originally, the three clusters of Standard Cabins were split to the north and the south of the main building creating, along with the Deluxe Cabins, a series of connected communities with the Lodge as their central hub. The physical and visual connection of these facilities likely would have created that sense of the village within the scenic forest that was a strong component of national park design in the period of significance. The activity of people moving among the cabins and between the various visitor facilities within the Park would have added to this feeling of an active, vibrant community. However, with the cabins removed and the Sunrise and Sunset Motel units placed at a greater distance from the Lodge, that unified village cohesiveness was lost. The motel units, with their larger size, concentration of visitors and LD/10 in Chapter 3).

Land use

Overall, land use within the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area has remained unchanged, with the primary focus upon visitor accommodation and facilities supported by administrative uses and supplemental employee housing. Though features such as the Horse Corral and parking areas have been moved or re-configured, their continued presence in the area is consistent with usage patterns from the period.

Circulation

Changes to the Lodge building itself and to the Lodge Access Road have altered the overall vehicular and pedestrian circulation pattern in the Study Area, with a particular effect on the visitor’s arrival sequence (Figure 4-1). Originally, visitors arriving by car or bus were able to use the road lodging opportunities outside the Park to the east of the Lodge and entered primarily via the building’s front façade. The Utah Parks Company buses actually pulled into a parking lane adjacent to the steps to the Lodge, unloading passengers directly to the front of the building. The Lodge Access Road did not link back to the Lodge Loop Road to the south as it does today, so visitors wishing to park in the parking areas south of the Lodge would have been forced to enter and exit by passing again in front of the Lodge. Today there is no vehicular access to the front of the Lodge, and a small turn-around with short-term “registration” parking has been installed just to the north of the building close to the intersection with the Lodge Loop Road. Access to the Lodge Access Road parking near the Deluxe Cabins and for the Sunset Motel is gained from the Lodge Loop Road to the south. The primary access for visitors to the main Lodge building is through the rear of the building near the parking area. Though parking has always been available at this location, it is unclear whether guests regularly accessed the building through the rear patio. The rear entry to the building moves visitors past several unsightly elements of the Lodge, including the employee dining area, the smoking patio and the restaurant dumpster (see Photographs LD/9 and LD/10 in Chapter 3).

The intent of the small registration parking area to the north of the Lodge is to encourage Lodge guests to utilize the front of the building for at least their initial interaction with the Lodge. However, a number of factors work to reduce the effectiveness of this registration parking area for capturing first-time visitors, including the overall vehicular traffic pattern (as dictated by directional signage outside the Study Area), the size and visual accessibility of the rear parking area and confusing signage (Photographs A/6 and A/7). When this parking area was installed, the approach of the Lodge Access Road was shifted further to the east of the original alignment, which brings traffic more to the side of the building than the front. This further reduces the visual importance of the front façade of the Lodge.

Closing off the road in front of the Lodge has also eliminated the front of the Lodge as a departure and arrival point for bus travelers. Throughout the
Photograph A/6. The Lodge Access Road as it approaches the Registration and Rear Parking Areas. Registration parking is ahead and to the left behind the trees and vegetation, the larger driveway circles to the right to the Rear Parking area.

Photograph A/7. Signage indicating registration parking area as separate from Lodge parking, which could create confusion for Lodge visitors.

Figure 4-2. Changes to the Approach to the Bryce Canyon Lodge with Realignment of Rim Road

Figure 4-2a. Inset.

Figure 4-2b. Inset.
period of significance, these bus tours operated by the Utah Parks Company constituted a large portion of the visitors to the Park, so this experience was an important part of any visit to Bryce Canyon National Park. The tradition of Sing-Aways (see Chapter 2) was linked with these bus departures, and was another element of the increased visitor and employee interaction that surrounded the Lodge around this time.

The administrative parking area occupies land that was left empty after the removal of many of the Standard Cabins. Although this parking area is not used by visitors, it is a highly visible feature within the Study Area, largely because it is located at the summit of the knoll near the entry road for the Standard and Deluxe Cabins and the Sunset Motel unit. Signage and features such as parking stops do indicate the space is used for parking, however the natural earth ground surface and irregular shape leave visitors with the impression that the space is unplanned. Its barren appearance coupled with the fact that it is seldom filled with vehicles has an overall effect of a lack of care or design that is not consistent with the rest of the Study Area (see Photograph LD/3 in Chapter 3).

The removal of the Standard Cabins has also had an effect upon the pedestrian circulation throughout the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area. Much of the network of sidewalks and paths that connected the buildings was also eliminated and portions of the area have been returned to unused open space (Photograph A/8). Several developed and social trails connect the motel units, the Lodge and the rim; however the overall pedestrian traffic has likely lessened due to the changed spatial organization.

In the 1970’s, the pedestrian paths through the complex of Deluxe Cabins were updated, widened and repaved with concrete. Although these wider walks do facilitate administrative functions (particularly cleaning and maintenance carts) and luggage transport, they do reduce the intimacy of the circulation throughout that area somewhat.

Insufficient documentation exists to determine the age or integrity of the social trails throughout the area. It can be assumed that social trails linking the newer motel facilities are contemporary to the development of those structures and that these trails were not present during the period of significance; however other trails – such as the one between the Deluxe Cabins and the rim – are more difficult to date. Ranger reports from the time do make mention of mitigation done on some unwanted trails within the area, but precise locations are not given. What is clear, however, is that social trails have always been a part of the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area landscape.

Topography

Minor changes have been made to the topography in the Study Area, primarily in proximity to the areas cleared and leveled for the construction of the newer motel units. These structures, with a larger footprint than the smaller Standard and Deluxe Cabins, necessitated the creation of areas of cut slopes with retaining walls as well as filled areas which have been seeded and replanted in an effort to return them to a more natural state (see Photograph LD/23 in Chapter 3). Although the clearing associated with Sunset Motel unit in particular has changed the topography immediately around the unit, it did not change the overall topography of the Study Area. The removal of the Standard Cabins from the knolls above the Lodge, however, has changed the way that visitors experience the topography throughout the Study Area. Once a part of the bustling village atmosphere, these knolls now function as open space and occasional parking; the landform now serves as a buffer or barrier, and is not an active part of the visitor’s experience.

When the Lodge Access Road was blocked in front of the Lodge and the registration parking area created, a new alignment was developed for the Lodge Access Road, and substantial grading was completed to create the flat space for parking. This resulted in a number of large retaining walls on the west side of the Lodge Access Road (Photograph A/9). The materials used in creating these walls were consistent with the Rustic style of the historic development; however they are again out of scale for the other retaining structures created during the period of significance. They are high enough to effectively prohibit pedestrian circulation across the area toward the Sunrise Motel to the northwest. This helps to further isolate the Motel unit from the Lodge. The space between the retaining walls and the Sunrise Motel was once the site of a number of Standard Cabins, and some small scale features remain to hint of this past land use, including hydrants, light poles and utility boxes.
Vegetation

Due to fire suppression and supplemental plantings, the vegetation throughout the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area is likely denser than it was in the period of significance, though precise documentation of the forest progression in this area is lacking. Comparisons of forest density in other parts of the developed area, however, display a significant increase in density and it can be assumed that this has taken place in the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area as well (Photograph A/10 and A/11).

In the areas where the Standard Cabins once stood, vegetation appears to be recovering; however a continued high level of human impact is slowing the return of understory vegetation such as native grasses (Elymus species) and shrubs such as Manzanita (Arctostaphylos patula). Although this slow return to a natural state may be inconsistent with disguising the remaining effects of the cabins’ presence, it is likely – given the activity level in these areas – that a pronounced level of disturbance would have been consistent with the historic condition.

A number of non-native or unusual shrub and tree species which were presumably planted around the cabins and Lodge have become an integral part of the landscape, even though their presence is not entirely “natural”. Some of these have even naturalized within the Study Area, with sprouts, seedlings and young specimens appearing in the near vicinity (Photograph A/12). It is not clear from the historic evidence if these species were planted in an effort to deliberately diversify or create an ornamental landscape, or if they were planted out of convenience or even carelessness. For the older, mature trees such as the Blue Spruce (Picea pungens), it could be assumed that they have been present since the cabins were installed. However, with other species such as the wild rose (Rosa woodsii), it is difficult to determine if they were present during the period of significance.

Photograph A/10. The North Campground at the time of its construction in 1935, looking toward the Rim (BCRA Archives ACC381_CAT3919 #8).

Photograph A/11. The North Campground today. Although this photo is taken from a different vantage point, the change in forest density is obvious.

Photograph A/12. A large Douglas Fir in the Deluxe Cabin cluster. This specimen was like planted when the cabins were built, however a number of younger trees in the area indicate that it has naturalized here.
Buildings and Structures

Bryce Canyon Lodge (HS-100)

The Bryce Canyon Lodge remains at the site chosen for it by Underwood and Hull in 1923. This location off of the plateau rim is consistent with the prevailing NPS policy of the time to keep the Park structures from interfering with the scenic qualities of the natural visual attractions. Just as distance, topography and forest cover assured that the Lodge would not be visible from the rim or below, these factors also combine to screen views of the rim and beyond from the building. It is possible, however, that the increase in forest density along the edges of the meadow immediately east of the Lodge has limited the sense of the rim’s presence (with small glimpses of the horizon) that might have been experienced in the period of significance.

In addition to the change in vehicular access, the roadway in front of the Lodge has also been narrowed, removing the old bus lane and increasing the size of the portico. The massive stone retaining walls, log-rail parapet and planters were installed in the late 1970’s and do not reflect the design materials or intent of the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District. A continuous strip of asphalt remains as a remnant of the roadway, but its original use has been lost, and its materials are inconsistent with its current use (as a walkway).

Much of the mature vegetation immediately surrounding the Lodge dates back to the period of significance. Photos of the Lodge show that many of the large pines present today were in place by the late 1930’s (Photographs A/13 and A/14). Though some of these trees were saplings during the period of significance they are now mature trees and therefore lend a sense of establishment and character to the landscape. Surrounded by mature vegetation the Lodge itself and the landscape context have a blended appearance that is consistent with the Rustic style (the building seems a part of the landscape) and intent of the Park designers.

Photographs of the front of the Lodge during the period of significance and later show two specimen Ponderosa pine trees near the building entry (Photograph A/15 and A/16). The visibility and distinctiveness of these trees made them an important part of the Lodge’s façade, as well as giving the building a sense of having been a part of the forest for some time. These trees were removed in the 1990s as a result of their threat to the foundation of the building, and were not replaced. Although other mature vegetation surrounds the Lodge building to help ensure its forest retreat character, the absence of the landmark trees does have a significant impact on the structure’s appearance. The entry sequence to the Lodge, which has been altered as described in “Circulation” above, means that many visitors never utilize the front of the structure. The dumpster and smoking area are some of the first things encountered by these visitors, and the hallway leading from the

Photograph A/13. The front of the Lodge circa 1930, before the campfire ring was removed (BCRA Archives Cope BRCA 2).

Photograph A/14. The front of the Lodge today. Several trees from the 1930’s image have matured, lending a more established feeling to the Lodge.

Photograph A/15. A montage of the Lodge with the two prominent Ponderosa pines in place (collected from BCRA Archives).

Photograph A/16. The front of the Lodge today from a similar angle with the prominent trees missing.
rear door to the lobby does not communicate the sense of grandeur that the main entrance was designed to evoke. Restoring the intended entry pattern to the building will have a significant impact upon the way visitors to the Park will experience the Lodge, and will contribute to the understanding of the Lodge as an historic structure with a value of its own.

**Deluxe Cabin Cluster (HS-200-214)**

This cluster of buildings remains much as it would have been experienced during the period of significance. Still catering to the more “elite” visitor, these cabins are among the most desired accommodations within the Park. The arrangement of the cabins in a loose grid, each canted slightly so as to avoid direct window-to-window alignment reflects the careful site planning typical of the period.

**Standard Cabin Cluster, Linen House and Pump House (HS-110-112 and HS 150-154)**

The remaining six Standard Cabins between the Lodge and the Deluxe Cabins were maintained to be representatives of the whole original cluster. Though they do maintain that architectural record, they no longer serve as visitor accommodations. Additionally, because they are arranged in a single line facing the Lodge Access Road, they do not represent the spatial arrangement of the original cluster of cabins, which was similar to the loose grid of the Deluxe Cabins (see Figure 4-2a). Their presence at the base of the knoll does, however, create a greater sense of enclosure to visitors along the Lodge Access Road and the pedestrian paths between the Lodge and the Deluxe Cabins. Because of the new uses of the Standard Cabins and their proximity to the Linen House and Pump House, they have become part of a new grouping of administrative structures within the area that would not have been a distinct unit during the period of significance. This mixing of visitor and employee facilities is consistent with the historic land use pattern.

**The Recreation Hall and Male Dormitory (HS 105, 106)**

These buildings are both in their original location, in close proximity to the Lodge, but separated from it by the base of the knoll and the visitor parking area. Their outward appearance has been altered little since the period of significance. Though both were originally used by Park and concessionaire employees, the Recreation Hall was also once used to present ranger talks to visitors. This use is no longer used and the talks have been moved to the Outdoor Theaters and the Visitor Center. Interpretive information could help to illustrate how the building was used in the past since the ranger talks were reportedly immensely popular during this time.

During the period of significance, a number of Standard Cabins surrounded the Recreation Hall and the Male Dormitory and were used for employee housing. The removal of these cabins not only changed the spatial relationship of the Dormitory and Hall to each other (the cabins helped to establish a larger unit of employee activity separate from the Lodge), but it also changed the circulation pattern that connected the buildings to the larger Lodge unit. The stepped walkway that currently connects the Male Dormitory to the Lodge’s Rear Parking area cannot be precisely dated, however, it does direct traffic to the side entrance to that building. Photographs from the period of significance show a path which actually directed traffic into the front of the building - which was designed as the logical entry point (Photographs A/17 and A/18). There is no trace of the original path today. There is also no formal path to the Recreation Hall - though there may well have been one prior to the removal of the Standard Cabins.

**Motel Units**

Though attempts were made in the construction of the two motel units to match the Rustic style architecture and thematic elements of the historic structures of the Lodge, their typology and scale are sufficiently out of place to keep them from being supporting elements.

**Views and Vistas**

Analysis of views and vistas can be found in the Spatial Organization, Buildings and Structures and Vegetation feature categories.
Small Scale Features

The majority of small scale features remaining from the period of significance relate to circulation and grading, including sidewalks, retaining walls and steps – though a few other unique items have also survived, such as hand-operated water pumps and fire boxes. The presence of these small details contributes to the overall historic atmosphere of the district. Newer small scale features, including electrical boxes, propane tanks and signage have, for the most part, been designed to integrate or hide within the historic landscape. More transient features such as garbage receptacles, ash containers, bike racks and fire extinguishers have often not received the same thoughtful attention. There is a lack of consistency in these items, and their design tends to not be in harmony with the Rustic aesthetic.

A fire ring was present in the meadow in front of the Lodge from 1928 to 1930; however its usefulness was in question until it was finally removed. No vestiges of this feature remain. There has not been a significant change in the conditions that brought about its removal (primarily cold evening temperatures and the impact upon the native vegetation in the area), and while it may have served as a gathering space and area for informative talks in the past, there are several other facilities within the Park that now serve that function.

Signage on the roadways and around the buildings has been changed over time to reflect changes in the layout, circulation and land use. These signs have typically been designed to maintain the Rustic character – often being made of wood or colored in a natural tone. Because the signs evolved over time, they can be inconsistent, confusing or misleading, even to experienced visitors.

A few small scale features remain in areas where the Standard Cabins were removed that hint at the historic conditions. Items such as electrical boxes, light poles and flat pads seem to float in the forest in certain areas, becoming clues for those interested in the history of the Lodge (Photograph A/19).
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TREATMENT AND DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS
Chapter 5
Treatment and Design Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to put forth a treatment plan for the historic cultural landscape of Bryce Canyon National Park that will preserve historic character by mitigating and preventing undesirable change and decay as well as addressing specific management issues with sensitivity to the historic context. The inclusion of management issues is critical for the success of this process, for historic preservation does not occur in a vacuum; continued visitor needs within the Park, as well as financial, maintenance and environmental concerns must be considered in addition to the significance and integrity of the landscape and its characteristics. Bryce Canyon National Park, like many other national parks, was not sited per-chance in a wilderness area; it was created as a showcase for that wilderness. The dynamic character of natural systems must be recognized right alongside the evolving needs of tourism and the changing theories of Park administration.

This final chapter of the Cultural Landscape Report will begin with a summary of the management objectives identified by Park personnel during the CLR process along with other existing planning and policy information that could influence the treatment approaches. The Treatment Philosophy section will present a primary treatment for the whole landscape and discuss more specific treatment recommendations in specific management areas. Next the section will discuss Overall Treatment Guidelines designed to assist in maintaining and improving integrity throughout the two Study Areas. Because many of the identified Management Objectives and concerns are shared between the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area, Overall Treatment Guidelines will be shared between the two Study Areas and respective Districts unless otherwise noted. Finally, Specific Treatment Recommendations will be presented in order to address particular issues found within each of the Study Areas.

Management Issues

The last General Management Plan (GMP) for Bryce Canyon National Park was completed in 1987. The document identifies a number of issues within the Study Areas, however in the ensuing twenty years, most if not all of the courses of action selected to address these issues have been seen to their conclusion. This includes the removal of the Standard Cabins from the area around the Bryce Canyon Lodge and construction of new dormitories for concessionaire employees in the Old NPS Historic Housing District as well as the rehabilitation of buildings in both Historic Districts to improve their functioning as visitor and employee lodging. Although the need for a new GMP for the Park has already been identified by the NPS, the results of this report reinforce the need for a new planning document.

The 1987 GMP did identify the need for additional housing for both Park and Concessionaire employees within and outside of the Park. Although the new dormitory structures were added to the Old NPS Housing Study Area, current Park personnel have indicated that they do not completely satisfy this housing need. A continued need for housing for seasonal and permanent employees is a significant issue for Park management. In on site discussions with the Park staff (June 2008), a number of Management Objectives specific to the Study Areas were identified. A number of these objectives are shared between the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area.

- A number of social trails have emerged in the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area, particularly trails that travel between the visitor lodging areas and the Rim Trail and the parking areas. Eliminating unnecessary trails by encouraging visitors to use established trails and restoring vegetation on the unwanted trails is a goal of Park management. The ultimate circulation pattern and trail recovery should also serve to help prevent new social trails from forming.
- Both the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area have been treated as fire suppression areas historically. Although fuels management for structure protection was not identified by Park personnel as a significant concern within the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area, it was recommended that fire would help the overall health of the forest here, particularly by reducing the size and density of the understory species such as manzanita. The forested knolls within the Old NPS Housing Study Area were reported to present a more significant fire threat to historic structures, due to a combination of topography and fuels present. Also of concern are hazard trees whose condition potentially threatens visitor safety and structural elements.¹
- Bryce Canyon is a Designated Night Sky Park, and maintenance and even improvement of the dark night sky condition is a critical element of any future development. Balancing the need for reduced light escape and glare with visitor safety needs is an important consideration to any existing or new development within the Park.
- Cyclic maintenance is necessary on the historic structures, particularly the Standard and Deluxe Cabins and the Residential Cabins. This includes exterior wall repair, painting and roof repair and resealing.
- The sewer line from the Bryce Canyon Lodge to the Sewer Lagoon is scheduled to be upgraded in 2008.

¹ Meeting with Bryce Canyon National Park Management Team (on site), June 2008.

Treatment Philosophy

Treatment of cultural resources is guided by the standards contained within The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (1996) and Director’s Order-28 Cultural Resource Management Guideline (1997). These documents outline four treatment alternatives for cultural landscapes:

- Preservation maintains the existing integrity and character of a landscape by preventing or reducing the impact of the passage of time. It includes maintenance, stabilization and protection, and precludes major additions, alterations or demolition.
- Rehabilitation maintains the integrity and character of a historic landscape, but allows limited additions or alterations to accommodate a compatible contemporary use. In rehabilitation efforts, it is critical to preserve contributing features and historic integrity.
- Restoration reinstates the form, features, and character of a cultural landscape as it existed at a specified period in history. In some cases, restoration can involve the reconstruction of missing historic features or removal of features built after the historic period. Restoration is only recommended when necessary to the public understanding of the cultural associations of a landscape.
- Reconstruction results in a newly created landscape identical in form, features, and details to a non-surviving cultural landscape or portion thereof as it appeared at a specific time period. Reconstruction of a whole absent landscape is only recommended when other treatment options fail to fulfill specific management objectives and will be undertaken only upon specific written approval of the director after policy review in the Washington NPS office.

Recommended Treatment Approach

The process for creating recommendations for treatment of a cultural landscape begins with selecting one or more of these four alternatives as the primary treatment approach for the landscape as a whole. This overarching treatment philosophy provides a framework within which recommendations for the treatment of individual features are made. These individual treatments may differ from the primary treatment, but they must remain consistent with and supportive of the overall treatment approach for the District.
Preservation is the overarching treatment for both the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area, with selected rehabilitation and restoration used when specifically needed within particular management areas:

- **Preservation**: the application of measures necessary to sustain the existing integrity of an historic property. Efforts focus upon ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features to protect and stabilize the property. Extensive replacement and new construction are generally not a part of preservation treatments. Upgrading of mechanical, electrical, plumbing and other code-required systems is appropriate with this treatment. Preservation is generally considered appropriate treatment when the property has distinctive materials, form and features that are essentially intact and when continuing use does not require extensive alterations to the existing historic structures or landscape features.

The extent of intact elements and land uses make the Study Areas for the Bryce Canyon CLR good candidates for preservation treatment. Maintenance and repair of landscape features has been the management approach within the Park for the last decade—although the limited definition of the Historic District boundaries studied here constrains and limits potential preservation efforts. The recommended treatment would focus on retaining all remaining historic, character defining elements within the Districts, though minor modifications to these elements to ensure continued use are possible, as long as the changes do not compromise integrity.

- Historic use patterns of the property will be maintained when possible and when necessary; new uses will be selected that maximize the opportunity to retain materials, features and spatial relationships.
- The character of the property will be preserved as much as possible, and intact or repairable materials or patterns will be retained rather than replaced.
- New additions and alterations will not destroy historic materials, features or spatial relationships that characterize the property. New development will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with historic scale and proportion, materials, features, and site planning.
- New additions or alterations will be undertaken in such a manner that, if these additions were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. Administrative planning, design and construction of new work will be properly documented for future research and analysis.

- **Rehabilitation**: the process of making a property compatible for another use through repair, alterations and additions while preserving features and characteristics that convey its historical values. Limited repair and replacement of existing features is appropriate when necessary for new or continued use.

Because the needs of visitors and staff within all national parks is constantly evolving and because continued use of historic landscape features is one way to ensure their ultimate preservation, rehabilitation is an appropriate treatment for some elements and sections within the Study Areas. Especially important are changes made to the landscape that enable continued improvement to human accessibility and ensure the ongoing ecological health and sustainability.

- Historic use patterns of the property will be maintained when possible and when necessary; new uses will be selected that maximize the opportunity to retain materials, features and spatial relationships.
- The character of the property will be preserved as much as possible, and intact or repairable materials or patterns will be retained rather than replaced.
- New additions and alterations will not destroy historic materials, features or spatial relationships that characterize the property. New development will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with historic scale and proportion, materials, features, and site planning.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Vegetation Monitoring within Developed Area

A lack of detailed vegetation information from the periods of significance within the Study Areas hampered this investigation and limited the ability to make specific detailed recommendations. Larger scale studies (often referred to in landscape ecology as the “landscape scale”), such as those done in recent years in the Park as a whole, fail to appropriately document the specific changes happening within the segmented and highly impacted Developed Area, including the Study Areas. Studies conducted at a smaller scale (often referred to by planners and landscape architects as the “site scale”) are able to capture the sorts of detailed changes that occur in such areas. Landscape ecologists refer to the “grain” of a study, which determines its ability to address fine or large scale patterns within the landscape. A small scale or fine grain, scheduled monitoring of the vegetation within the entire Developed Area of the Park should be performed by individuals with an expertise in forestry health and management. A regularly scheduled study, over the course of several years, will offer critical information that will assist in determining the actual effects of fire suppression, visitor traffic, and invasive species with respect to forest and meadow ecological health within the two Study Areas and their respective Historic Districts and other areas of development and intensive use. Such studies help to guide future planning and design efforts and offer important information related to Park natural interpretation.

Revision of the National Historic Register District Boundaries

The National Historic Register Nomination forms for both the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District and the Old NPS Housing Historic District were drawn up to include the historic structures in the district and exclude non-contributing, more contemporary development. However, the proximity of these boundaries to the buildings and the exclusion of the natural context that surrounds them present a problem for historic preservation in the future. Although the buildings have inherent value as examples of the Simplified Rustic and Rustic architectural styles and methods of construction, they also represent a larger pattern of community design that was an important part of National Park development during the period of significance. Therefore, it becomes important to preserve not only the buildings, but their context within the natural setting, including the topography, vegetation and natural systems. These natural features must be viewed as contributing to the period of significance because these natural features create the rustic setting for the buildings.

More recent development, not within the periods of significance, such as the Sunrise Motel and the Concessionaire Dormitories intruded upon the natural areas surrounding the historic buildings and impacted viewsheds and natural character. Although the appropriate studies were completed to assess the impact of these developments upon the Historic Districts, the tight boundaries drawn by the National Historic Register Nominations did not adequately protect the...
Districts from such negative impacts. Additionally, as the NHRP nominations focused solely on historic structures, the importance of the vegetation, landforms and natural systems surrounding the structures was not addressed, nor was the importance of the relationship between the context and the buildings. These relationships were compromised with newer development, and as a result the overall District lost integrity. Expanded boundaries will further protect the integrity of the Historic Districts by giving the natural features status as character defining elements that need to be protected and requiring future development in the expanded District to consider more carefully the broader natural context of the entire Study Area. Thus protected, the architecture and the natural systems will work together to more completely and accurately demonstrate the rustic landscape as a whole.

Revision of the Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District boundaries is proposed for the following expansion (Figure 5-1): to include the meadow in front of the Lodge and the tree lined edge along the Rim Trail to the south and southeast, the forests around the District to the Lodge Loop Road to the north and the Lodge Access Road to the west. This includes the knoll where the Standard Cabins were once located – although the structures are gone, the natural feature of the knoll and the forest still contribute to the overall character of the District as a forest village (the Lodge was sited at the base of the knoll rather than the top, for example, and the forest was retained even though development later occurred on the hill). The meadow in front of the lodge gives the lodge itself a sense of place by providing a natural setting with scenic value, albeit not the powerful vista of the rim itself. The forest surrounding the meadow is vital to defining the meadow as well as for shielding the Lodge from the rim and below (which was an important and deliberate consideration at the time of design, as discussed in Chapter 4). The forested edge should include sufficient depth of the tree canopy to protect the viewshed, but should not include the Rim Trail. The recommended vegetation study should assist in determining the precise location of the edge of the meadow and the forest boundary.

Figure 5-1.
Proposed Revisions to NRHP Boundaries - Bryce Canyon Lodge Historic District
The revision of the Old NPS Housing District boundaries is proposed for the following (Figure 5-2): to include the knoll to the west, which creates a sense of place for the whole District, to include the meadow to the east and the tree lined edge that surrounds the meadow, which helps to isolate the residential uses from the visitors (as recommended for the Lodge district, the recommended vegetation study should assist in determining the precise location of the edge of the meadow and the forest boundary). This helps to shield visitor views of administrative features in keeping with the notion of segregating uses - a goal of Park designers from the period of significance. Also included in the NRHP boundary expansion proposal is the area currently occupied by the two modern Concessionaire Dormitories (Ponderosa and Whispering Pines). These structures are not contributing to the historic character of the landscape. As was discussed in the previous chapter, their materials, scale and siting upon the land are incongruous with the Rustic and Simplified Rustic style of the historic landscape. Their construction was not consistent with the careful site planning doctrines of landscape architecture that characterize the period of significance. However it is the land upon which these dormitory buildings sit that has value as a potentially contributing feature within the period of significance – regardless of the presence of the non-contributing structures.
Overall Treatment Guidelines

These guidelines are intended to establish a consistent overall approach to site preservation and development for the Study Areas to be applied to all current and future planning and design efforts, including construction projects. These overarching guidelines should complement the Specific Treatment Recommendations made later in this chapter. They have been organized into categories similar to those of the inventory and analysis chapters, with recommendations for Land Use, Natural Systems, Small Scale Feature and Buildings and Structures.

General

• All work should be done in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (1996) including new construction, building updates, structural cyclic maintenance and environment management.

• Always treat the landscape as a whole and not only a sum of its individual parts. Protection efforts need to constantly examine the site at a landscape scale as well as addressing each separate site scale zone or feature within the landscape. The relationship of structures to their contextual natural features is a particular concern.

• Whenever alteration or addition is completed within these Study Areas, careful documentation should accompany the effort, so that it is always possible to determine what the historic condition was and what work is not contemporary.

Land Use

• Maintain historic land uses wherever possible, including visitor lodging, scenic recreation, administrative support and residential land uses. Avoid expanding land use to include uses not already supported within the Study Areas.

• Protect existing open spaces and natural systems, including forests and meadows, particularly those areas that provide buffers or shield conflicting functions from one another and maintain scenic quality including specific vistas for visitors’ appreciation, experience, and interpretation.

Circulation

• Avoid further alterations of the roadway patterns in historic areas, particularly narrow travel lanes.

• Whenever possible, use permeable or natural surfaces for paving in pedestrian areas. Stabilized soil treatments can be accessible and is in keeping with Rustic style park development. This material offers a more natural appearance and alternative to concrete or asphalt; thus its use would reinforce the rustic character of the historic landscape.

Where natural materials are deemed inappropriate, concrete is the preferred pedestrian paving material with asphalt typically limited to vehicular areas.

Natural Systems

• Overall management of the vegetation within the two Study Areas and the developed area as a whole should focus upon the ecological health of the forest and meadows and prevention of undesired fires, rather than upon restoration of the forest to a particular time period or historic character. Expert advice should be secured before action is taken to ensure that the most up-to-date theories on landscape ecology and forest management are followed.

• Areas which have experienced substantial degradation of vegetation and unwanted erosion due to human traffic should receive an appropriate revegetation treatment based upon the results of the vegetation study recommended above.

• Efforts should be continued to prevent further degradation of natural areas, including prevention of new or undesired pedestrian social trails, control of non-native or potentially invasive plant and animal species, and maintenance of appropriate native vegetation cover where erosion is apparent and a potential hazard.

• Revegetation efforts should exclusively use plants that are native to the immediate area and exclude ornamental, near-native, and non-native species. While it is possible that during the period of significance ornamental, near-native, and non-native plants might have been used for selective purposes, contemporary theories in landscape ecology support the use of native plant materials for ecological health. Additionally, maintenance of revegetated areas should be performed to ensure that the area maintains a similar density and composition to surrounding areas deemed as healthy by an ecological expert. Revegetation should be implemented as quickly after disturbance as possible to prevent exotic and non-native species from establishing a foothold on the site.

• Encourage the growth of native forest species in the areas between and around structures to enhance the feeling of a village nestled in an established forest. Any new construction should seek to disturb as small a footprint as possible, and reestablishment of the native forest around construction sites should include plants of a variety of sizes and ages, with a density that matches the healthy, undisturbed area.

• Fire management (fuels reduction) through selective thinning of trees and undergrowth is an acceptable practice throughout the historic areas. However, the overall pattern of tree massing, open wooded areas and meadows should not be altered. A detailed pattern of vegetation mass and void should be established by the previously recommended vegetation study.

• Any new project or construction should attempt to disturb, as little as possible, the existing topography. When necessary, retaining walls should be limited in height and length and faced with native stone in keeping with the construction materials and techniques indicative of Rustic style park architecture. Slopes related to new development should be a consistent grade with the existing topography so that they blend with the existing landforms and are not in contrast with them; regraded slopes should be revegetated according to the guidelines mentioned previously, and should be monitored for erosion.

• Whenever new buildings or features are necessary, use existing topography and vegetation as screening, and consider additional vegetation screening to protect historic viewpoints or shielding. This revegetation should follow the guidelines given as a result of the vegetation study recommended above.

Buildings and Structures

• Avoid removal of any contributing structure.

• New construction and features should be limited to those necessary for visitor access, interpretation, and management. Every effort should be made to ensure that these facilities are non-intrusive to the historic landscape context (both in terms of built elements and natural systems). All new construction should follow current theories and practices of landscape/ecological sustainability and reduce their impact upon the landscape of the Park as a whole.

• All new construction or uses should be evaluated by a landscape architect or architect (as appropriate) with a specialty in cultural and historical landscapes, or other appropriate cultural resource and preservation professionals. All new construction should consider the site on a landscape scale and should respond to these considerations appropriately.

• Avoid any changes that create a false sense of history or a mimicking of the Rustic architectural style that might be confused with actual historic structures. The Rustic style can be interpreted in its scale and, to some degree, form and materials but if representative historical features are used as inspiration for new construction it should be clear that they are contemporary additions; consider interpretive materials that explain them as new, address their use, form, and context. Seek expert architectural and landscape architectural consultation for new structures.

• Limit the use of chemical or physical treatments which may cause damage to cultural or natural resources.
• Thoroughly document any features, built or natural, that are removed from or added to the landscape. Maintain this documentation to be accessible to future projects, studies or inquiries.

• Routine maintenance should be performed in such a way that materials are replaced or recovered with a compatible, comparable material. Repairs to surfaces such as concrete or wood should be treated to match the existing material as closely as possible.

• New sidewalks or ground surfaces should match the color and scale of existing features, unless contrast with historic components is deemed necessary or desirable for safety or accessibility. Color treatments may be necessary to insure that new materials blend with the existing.

• In all cases of new construction it is advisable to examine design in a case by case basis using appropriate judgment that ultimately maintains or surpasses the existing level of historical integrity. Future planning efforts should rely on the expertise of historic designers to evaluate all the design considerations and guide design processes with success.

Small Scale Features

• Minimize the introduction of new site furnishings and other small scale features to only what is needed to meet the needs of visitors and staff.

• Evaluate existing small scale features as a whole for consistency and compatibility with the historic character. For example, select trash cans and cigarette disposal canisters which use materials and design motifs that are compatible with the character of the buildings and maintain that design language of features throughout the use area (Photographs R/1 and R/2).

• Any new small scale features added, such as directional signage, site furnishings, screening fences or utility features, should be carefully chosen so that they do not distract or detract from the historic features or landscape. This includes their overall design and material selection, as well as their siting or choice of placement. New small scale additions to the Study Areas should have consistency and be compatible within the existing Rustic style. In some cases, examples of historic details such as the wood directional signs may be reproduced for new projects; in other cases new materials can be introduced but these must be understated and not in visual competition with historic elements. Should new materials be added to the expanded Historic Districts, care should be taken to create a uniform design approach. The introduction of new materials must be done in conjunction with design consultation and an overarching concern for the notion set forth during the period of significance, that the built environment blend with the natural systems. Unity of design and overall consistency is paramount.

• The status of Bryce Canyon as a Designated Night Sky Park attaches a number of separate concerns for lighting and light fixtures throughout the Park. Many of the goals of Dark Sky management and historic design are similar, particularly regarding the use of small scale light fixtures—in manufactured lighting. The overall goal is to secure and maintain low light levels and preserve existing instances of darkness. The principles of Dark Sky management should be respected in new construction throughout the Study Areas; new fixtures should be selected that are in keeping with the character of the historic context and also meet stringent Dark Sky recommendations (such as full cut-off fixtures and pedestrian level lighting). Lighting fixtures not developed within the period of significance as well as historically contributing fixtures which contribute to light pollution should be removed, including non-cutoff fixtures such as globe lights. (See the NPS Management Policies 2006, The Guide to Managing the National Park System section 4.10 Lightscape Management for further guidance on lighting design).

Because lighting and safety is a concern in these areas, the Park should seek design expertise for replacement of these fixtures with luminaries that provide a minimal impact to the night sky while offering an acceptable measure of visitor security. Exploration of fixture style and standard height is warranted and must not distract from the Lodge and its historical context. Consistency among the fixtures is critical within both study areas (Photographs R/3 and R/4).

• Repairs to surfaces such as concrete or wood should be treated to match the existing material as closely as possible.

• Routine maintenance should be performed in such a way that materials are replaced or recovered with a compatible, comparable material. Repairs to surfaces such as concrete or wood should be treated to match the existing material as closely as possible.

• The status of Bryce Canyon as a Designated Night Sky Park attaches a number of separate concerns for lighting and light fixtures throughout the Park. Many of the goals of Dark Sky management and historic design are similar, particularly regarding the use of small scale light fixtures—in manufactured lighting. The overall goal is to secure and maintain low light levels and preserve existing instances of darkness. The principles of Dark Sky management should be respected in new construction throughout the Study Areas; new fixtures should be selected that are in keeping with the character of the historic context and also meet stringent Dark Sky recommendations (such as full cut-off fixtures and pedestrian level lighting). Lighting fixtures not developed within the period of significance as well as historically contributing fixtures which contribute to light pollution should be removed, including non-cutoff fixtures such as globe lights. (See the NPS Management Policies 2006, The Guide to Managing the National Park System section 4.10 Lightscape Management for further guidance on lighting design).

Because lighting and safety is a concern in these areas, the Park should seek design expertise for replacement of these fixtures with luminaries that provide a minimal impact to the night sky while offering an acceptable measure of visitor security. Exploration of fixture style and standard height is warranted and must not distract from the Lodge and its historical context. Consistency among the fixtures is critical within both study areas (Photographs R/3 and R/4).

---

Photographs R/1 and R/2. Two trash receptacles at use within the park. The plastic one on the left does not convey the sense of Rustic style or careful design desired within the Study Areas. The one on the right mimics some of the materials and design characteristics that would have been followed during the period of significance.

Photographs R/3 adn R/4. Light fixtures should be consistent throughout the park, including the Study Areas. These photos illustrate that though some similarities exist between fixtures, that there is also a great deal of inconsistency throughout the developed area. Photo R/3 is found near the Lodge and R/4 is near the Sunset Motel unit. Fixtures should be carefully chosen to fit in with the Rustic style character and to convey a unified design aesthetic.
Specific Treatment Recommendations

The Old NPS Housing Study Area

Screening the Seasonal Cabins in the Old NPS Housing District (Figure 5-3)

Long term planning efforts should consider the eventual removal of the Concessionaire Dormitories Whispering Pines and Ponderosa adjacent to the historic housing. The scale and style of these structures prevent them from ever properly integrating with the surrounding Historic Districts. In the event of their deliberate removal or unplanned demise, the site upon which the structures lay should be returned to as natural a condition as possible based upon the topography and vegetation of the surrounding areas. In such a case, housing options could include new structures located outside of the historic areas or new structures built in the same vicinity designed to exist in harmony with the small scale, historic, Rustic Style of the Study Area. Guidance on new construction can be found in the General Recommendations section of this Chapter.

Immedicate short-term recommendations, however, call for the establishment of a stronger visual and spatial barrier between the historic cabins and the larger “out-of-scale” dormitory structures.

- Reduce the size of the northern parking area adjacent to the dormitory buildings. The reshaped parking surface should create a narrower entry into the area with a narrow travel lane leading beyond the corner of the Ponderosa unit. Parking could begin approximately 60’ to the south with a single row of spaces adjacent to the building. This would remove between twelve and fifteen spaces from the lot.
- Speed control devices such as speed humps should be installed in the new, narrower parking lot entry. These devises should not be installed in the road approaching or adjacent to the historic cabins.
- That portion of the parking area being removed should be revegetated as recommended in the General Recommendations discussed previously. Seeding should be augmented with the installation of established trees of various ages and sizes in order to speed up the transformation of the area into a natural visual screen.
- The propane tank in the northwest corner of the existing lot should be relocated and screened from view. In its current condition, it is unscreened and highly visible from both the historic and modern living quarters. Screening fences used in other historic areas in the Park could serve as a model for this area. These screening fences should allow access to the tank as needed but offer visual screening of this utility to facilitate its blending with the natural surroundings.

- New construction must not interfere with the existing historic structures’ ability to convey a feeling of integration with nature and Simplified Rustic ambiance. The design of this new building should strive add to this overall feeling.
- The footprint of any new structure would have some latitude to extend beyond the dimensions of the original layout provided the scale of the building is appropriate. While the new building need not match the original historic structure layout, care should be taken to minimize the new building’s impact upon the land. Design considerations include the footprint of the building itself and the area affected by construction, storage or parking. As land might be disturbed in the construction process, revegetation is warranted as described previously.

The Site of the Historic Ranger Cabin (Figure 5-4)

A new residence could be constructed on the site of the former Rangers Cabin (HS01). This use is compatible with the historic condition in the Study Area and could help address the housing shortage that is frequently mentioned in management documents.

- An architect specializing in historic structures should be hired to design the structure to be compatible with the Simplified Rustic style of the Study Area. If adequate documentation and architectural drawings of the historic structure exists, reconstruction of the historic cabin could be warranted as determined by Park administration. In this case, the interior features of the cabin could accommodate current housing needs and even reflect a more contemporary design approach while the exterior would follow prescribed NPS guidelines so as to recreate the historic log cabin. If adequate documentation does not exist to reconstruct the cabin, a new design should be created which will strive to combine contemporary interpretation with the flavor and feeling of the Rustic style architecture of the existing historical structures. Consideration for small scale massing, simple utilitarian lines, and attention to proportions and materials that use the historic architecture as inspiration will serve as a critical guide for this endeavor.

Figure 5-3. Reducing Parking Area to Screen Seasonal Cabins in Old NPS Housing Study Area

Figure 5-4. Site of Historic Ranger Cabin
The Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area

There are a number of recommended treatments which are focused around the main Lodge building of the Bryce Canyon Lodge. The building’s significance as the historic heart of not only the Study Area but the Park as a whole overshadows the significance of the architectural style of the structure itself. Treatments in the past, however, were more focused upon preservation of architectural elements, rather than upon the user experience of the Lodge as a whole. After creating a number of closely related recommendations for the areas immediately impacting the Lodge experience, it became clear that what was truly needed was a Master Plan for the area which addressed vehicular and pedestrian circulation, architecture, viewsheads and small scale issues. This Master Plan should be the result of a team effort between Park administration and a landscape architect specializing in cultural and historic landscapes, that examines the following recommendations holistically, identifying how they are interrelated and how phasing might be planned to ensure that a rewarding experience is had by visitors throughout the lifetime of the plan.

The recommendations here that would be a part of this master planning effort would include changes to the arrival sequence to the Lodge, the realignment of the Lodge Access Road to the north of the Lodge building, the treatment of the Lodge’s façade and the removal of the Administration parking area on the knoll behind the Lodge. Other recommendations found here may also be deemed to be a necessary part of the master planning process – however, it is these first four which intricately weave together to begin to reform the visitor experience to match more closely that which would have occurred during the period of significance. Within each recommendation, the involvement of an experienced landscape architect is called for – however, the master planning process should not be overlooked, as it will ensure that the changes are congruent and work together to achieve the desired goal.

Bryce Canyon Lodge Arrival Sequence (Figure 5-5)

The re-routing of the Rim Road in 1958 and the closure of the Lodge Access Road in front of the main Lodge building in the 1990s significantly changed the sequence with which visitors first experienced the historic building. Restoring this sequence to a more historic pattern will help to bring more visitors through the front of the Lodge and thus provide a more historically accurate experience, emphasizing the Lodge “front” played to the relationship of the rim as a node of intense visitor activity.

- Alter signage on the Rim Road north of the Lodge to encourage Lodge visitors to approach the building from the north rather than the south. This more closely matches the alignment of the Rim Road during the period of significance.
- Consider increasing the size of the existing “registration” parking area at the north end of the Lodge Access Road. This parking area should visually and spatially draw visitors in and encourage them to park at the short term parking area and to enter the front of the Lodge for registration, information or even dining experiences. To minimize visual and ecological impact, the parking area redesign should be completed by a landscape architect with cultural and historic expertise. The parking area should be modified for ease in vehicular and pedestrian circulation and efficiency in automobile to pavement ratio. Other considerations include porous parking surface materials, screening, directional signage, and strategic placement of vegetation for shade or directing views.

- Eliminate the western entry/exit from the Lodge’s rear parking area. This will force traffic to approach the building from a more historically accurate angle. This sequence will bring Park visitors to the short-term registration parking area first, further encouraging them to use this parking lot (rather than the rear lot). Closing the existing driveway that connects the rear Lodge parking to the Lodge Loop Road would also provide an opportunity to restore vegetation along the roadway and further screen the undesirable view of the back of the Lodge from the Lodge Loop Road. Signage on the entrance to the Lodge and short-term parking as well as the long-term rear parking areas should also be installed to encourage proper circulation and parking patterns.

- Create a new shuttle bus stop near the southern corner of the front of the Lodge to replace the existing stop near the Registration Parking area (Photograph R-5). Moving this shuttle stop and returning bus traffic to the front of the lodge will bring more visitors past the front façade of the Lodge (even if they do not exit the shuttle) and will also more closely match the historic pattern of bus travel within the Park. Visitors waiting for the shuttle in this area will also help to bring activity to the front of the Lodge, bringing the main building more to the center of activity within the Study Area. The road in front of the Lodge would be open to shuttle traffic and Park service vehicles only. Techniques such as signage and radio-controlled gates could be used to allow shuttle access and prevent visitor vehicles from entering the area. A Shuttle Stop with signage and perhaps even seating should be created, providing interpretive opportunities. This stop would be similar in concept – though not necessarily in design – to stops found at Sunrise Point and the Visitor Center. Additional historic interest could be introduced by using a historic bus to creating a “moving museum” with interpretive materials about the significance of buses in the history of visitation at Bryce Canyon and other Utah National Parks.

- Wayfinding to the Bryce Canyon Lodge itself as well as throughout the Park in general would be improved by reversing the direction of the Sunrise Point Access Road to travel one-way counter-clockwise (rather than clockwise as is currently in place). This direction would further reinforce the historic north-to-south circulation pattern and would prevent back-tracking as visitors travel between the logical destinations along the rim. The reversal would also reduce some traffic on the Lodge Access Road in front of the residential area.

Photograph R/5. Proposed location for the new Bryce Canyon Shuttle stop - near the large tree on the left side of the photo. This would give visitors and excellent view of the Lodge as they rode the shuttle and as they waited at the stop.
Figure 5-5.
Proposed Circulation Pattern to Bryce Canyon Lodge

Figure 5-5a. Inset

Not to scale
Realignment of the Lodge Access Road (Figure 5-6)

The current alignment of the Lodge Access Road which connects the Bryce Canyon Lodge and its parking areas to the Lodge Loop Road is not the historic alignment. Although insufficient documentation exists to determine the precise original alignment, it is possible to create a new alignment which brings visitors into a sightline which permits a stronger view of the front of the Bryce Canyon Lodge. This realignment not only restores some of the importance of the front of the Lodge itself, but will also introduce opportunities to redesign the entire area for better visitor experience and historic interpretation.

- The Lodge Access Road realignment should remain within the area to the northeast of the Lodge already impacted by current non-contributing development such as retaining walls, steps, and the Sunrise Motel parking area. A landscape architect specializing in cultural and historic landscapes should be hired to determine this realignment which should take into account road sequencing, horizontal and vertical road alignment, views experienced while driving, and views of the road itself. Other site engineering considerations include balancing cut and fill, and the appropriate treatment of impacted natural areas such as slopes or built area such as parking areas, walls, and pedestrian walks. Paramount in this road design is provision for driving sequence; this sequence should follow landscape architectural doctrines set forth during the period of significance creating harmony and connection between the built and the natural environments. As such, the road might curve to better follow topographic form and views toward the Lodge would be framed with trees. The road itself should feel as if it was carved out of the forest and a post-construction revegetation program should seek to create this feel.

Designers of the realigned Lodge Access Road should consider starting the approach to the Lodge from the north end of the existing Sunrise parking area. This would allow the road to have a gentle sweeping curve as it approaches the north east corner of the Lodge. (Photographs R/6 and R/7). While this does not provide a 90 degree sightline to the Lodge, views of the Lodge façade would appear from a clear angle – in keeping with Rustic style site planning that often used angled approaches to buildings. The historic architecture of the Lodge and the natural setting of the surrounding forest would become deliberately showcased thus not only aiding in getting visitors to the front of the Lodge but also allowing for greater historic interpretation. This realignment will likely necessitate the redesign of the Sunrise Parking area which could shift to the north of the Motel. Treatments in this design should follow the General Recommendations outlined previously.

- The existing road bed should revert to natural open space and be revegetated as described above. Attempts should be made to install plants of sufficient size to serve as a screen for the north side of the Lodge building.

- The new alignment of the Lodge Access Road should be properly integrated into the pedestrian circulation system and include accessible paths from the Lodge to the Sunrise Motel unit, the Old NPS housing area and the Utah Parks Company Service Station.

- A reconfiguration of the existing Sunrise Motel Unit parking area will most likely be necessary with the changes to the Lodge Access Road realignment. Some expansion of the parking into the forest to the southeast may be acceptable, as this area has been heavily impacted by historic uses and may even have served as lower-density parking in the past. Efforts should be made to reduce new impact, however, and to keep the footprint of the parking area to a minimum.
Photograph R/6. View of the Lodge from the existing alignment of the Lodge Access Road. The temporary visitor parking begins immediately to the left of this photo.

Photograph R/7. View of the front of the Lodge from the approximate location of the realigned Lodge Access Road. Existing vegetation and retaining walls would be cleared, creating a clear view of the front façade of the structure.

Figure 5-6. Proposed Realignment of the Lodge Access Road North of the Lodge
Bryce Canyon Lodge Façade (Figure 5-7)

The new stairs and patio at the front of the Bryce Canyon Lodge installed in the 1990’s is non-contributing and compromises the integrity of the historic Lodge building. The current patio has regular maintenance issues which impact accessibility and force those with physical challenges to use the building’s rear entrance (Photograph R/8). Removing all of this treatment (patio, planters, lighting fixtures and standards, and steps) and redesigning the entry to the Lodge is recommended. This is a challenging endeavor that necessitates the consultation of a landscape architect with expertise in historic and cultural landscapes. Historic photographs and other documents should provide design guidance (Photograph R/9).

- The design should consider including a replacement of the two large Ponderosa Pine trees (Photograph A/15 in Chapter 4) removed from the front of the Lodge in the 1990s. Although replanting large trees in their original location is not a practical solution since they are too close to the existing foundation, new trees could be installed at an appropriate distance from the structure to provide a similar visual effect of the Lodge “tucked in the pines”; precaution used in the placement of these trees would mitigate their future ability to compromise the Historic Structure’s foundation. Replacement trees should be of the same species as the original (Pinus ponderosa) and should be installed at the largest size possible while still ensuring the viability of the individual plants.

- Small scale features should be considered in the patio redesign, particularly site furnishings (such as chairs, benches, tables, trash receptacles and ash containers) (Photographs R/10 and R/11) and paving materials and patterns. These elements should convey the same historical flavor as the architectural elements, should be consistent with each other, and should not interfere with accessibility or safety. Additional considerations for small scale features can be found in the General Recommendations section.

Figure 5-7.
Notes on Redesign of Bryce Canyon Lodge Façade
Photograph R/8. Steps up to Lodge patio area are not consistent either with historic aesthetics and materials or with the treatment installed in the 1980’s.

Photograph R/9. Photos such as this one, taken of the lodge in the 1930s, should be utilized in the process of redesigning the front entry to the lodge (BCRA Archives: BCRA 3897)

Photograph R/10. Site furniture on the terrace in front of the Lodge which does not meet the materials or aesthetic character of the Rustic style.

Photograph R/11. Furniture such as these benches on the terrace, made of natural materials with a “hand hewn” look more closely match the Rustic style. All site furniture in this area should be coordinated and should match in terms of style, scale and materials.

Photograph R/11. Furniture such as these benches on the terrace, made of natural materials with a “hand hewn” look more closely match the Rustic style. All site furniture in this area should be coordinated and should match in terms of style, scale and materials.
The meadow to the east of the Lodge has always been a visual and spatial focal point of the Lodge. Preservation of this meadow and its forest boundary is important to the integrity of both the Lodge building and the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area as a whole.

- Reconstruction of the historic fire ring is not recommended. The issues that prompted its removal during the period of significance are still relevant, particularly the low night-time temperatures and the sensitivity of the meadow ecology. Recreating the amenity to be in compliance with current accessibility requirements would probably necessitate the construction of ramps that would be difficult to blend into the historic context. The footprint of the recreated fire ring and related circulation would more than likely create an even larger impact upon the ecology of the meadow than the historic fire ring. More importantly, reconstruction is not warranted as the fire ring was present for only a short portion of the period of significance, and is not representative of the period as a whole.

- Because the fire ring plays significantly into a number of historic photos of the Lodge, interpretive materials, including signage with historic photographs, along the pedestrian trail on the perimeter of the meadow or near the entrance to the Lodge could provide information about how and when the fire ring was used and where interpretive talks are hosted today.

- The forest between the edge of the meadow and the rim, similar to other areas of the Park, has become significantly thicker in the decades since the period of significance. This transformation of the forest has occurred throughout Park development and was also occurring during the four decades that span the period of significance. Any attempt to return the forest to a past density which may have been present at an arbitrary date during the period of significance will not present accurately the notion of forest evolution and the range of densities that occurred during the period of significance. The forest here should be maintained as described previously in the General Recommendations. Landscape architects, national park designers and administrative staff from the period of significance were concerned, as they are today, with forest ecological health. Though methods of forest health maintenance and related principles of landscape ecology have changed from what they were during the period of significance, it is not historic practices, that should be adhered to it or preserved in this instance; it is the health and thus the character of the forest. The forest was generally thinner, during the period of significance, but views from the Lodge to the rim were not planned or desired. While selective thinning to maintain health is appropriate, no attempt should be made to remove this forest screen or to create “windows” cut out of the forest between the Lodge and the rim.

- The meadow directly in front of the Lodge, however, should be treated differently. Because the meadow itself is character defining (the Lodge was given special prominence by its proximity to the open views of the meadow) and because its continued existence is critical to the integrity of the other elements of the district, it is recommended that it be treated in a manner which returns it to a state similar to what would have existed during the period of significance. There are signs that the meadow has been gradually decreasing in size. Young trees (particularly Ponderosa pines) growing within the “boundary” of the meadow and encroaching groups of trees are signs that the forest is beginning to reclaim the meadow (Photographs R/12 and R/13). This natural process should be halted, and in many areas reversed to reclaim the meadow as open space in front of the Lodge. Young trees which have obviously become established within the meadow in the last 40-50 years should be removed in order to re-establish sections of meadow already lost to forest expansion. Mechanical removal should continue to be used to maintain this boundary if forest encroachment continues. This includes removal of many of the ornamental shrubs which have escaped from their original planting areas and established themselves along the pathways in the meadow, such as the Woods rose (Rosa woodsii). Any treatment, however, should be performed in keeping with best practices of forest management.
Administrative Parking Area

The Administrative parking area located to the northwest of the existing historic Standard Cabins is an adaptive re-use of land previously disturbed by the presence and removal of a number of Standard Cabins on the hill to the west of the Lodge (Photograph R/14). This unpaved parking area is sporadically used, and is highly visible to visitors throughout the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area. Removal of the parking and the revegetation of the hillside will not return the area to a more historic condition; however it will create a more natural environment and will better reflect landscape architectural design thinking and park service objectives held during the period of significance. Alternatively, the installation of an appropriately scaled, historically sensitive structure or structures upon the site would be consistent with the historic land use and the pattern of the forest village atmosphere. Possibilities for this site include providing needed additional employee lodging space (many of the standard cabins in this area were used as employee lodging), non-intrusive administrative functions related to lodging or additional visitor lodging facilities.

- If removal and revegetation is performed, the process should be completed as recommended in the General Recommendations provided previously. Ground surface seeding should be augmented with the installation of trees of various size and age to better reflect a natural, established condition.

- If small scale structures are erected, an architect specializing in historic structures should be hired to design the cabin-inspired structures and a landscape architect specializing in historic and cultural landscapes should be hired for site planning reflective of Rustic style site planning so that this new design is compatible with the expanded Historic District. Consideration for small scale massing, simple utilitarian lines and attention to proportions and materials that use the historic architecture as a guide is critical.

- Construction of new small scale structures should seek to balance cut and fill, protect remaining natural features, and minimize the impact of new construction. Design efforts must consider revegetation efforts and mitigation of the disturbance created by the existing parking area as paramount in attaining the forested village atmosphere created by Park designers within the period of significance. Previous recommendations regarding new construction projects that are addressed in other sections of this document should be followed.

- A landscape architect specializing in historic and cultural landscapes should be consulted to ensure that contributing circulation patterns, natural systems, and viewsheds are not negatively impacted by the new construction. Ideally new construction would eventually be recognized as supporting the period of significance.
Social Trails within the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area

As discussed in Chapter 4, it is impossible to determine which social trails date from the period of significance and which are more contemporary. However, it is clear that continued impact from existing trails and new trails is negatively affecting the ecology and the aesthetics of the forest and meadows in the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area. Although a certain number of unpaved, less formal trails between critical nodes are appropriate, it is also necessary to control pedestrian circulation in order to prevent continued damage. Duplicitous, unnecessary or confusing trails should be removed. Rather than utilize a single strategy for the reduction of unwanted circulation, a many-pronged approach is recommended, which combines trail design with informative and interpretative materials, revegetation and natural as well as man-made barriers.

- A design language should be developed for trails that are to be maintained, essentially establishing them as “official” rather than social, paths. This language should include elements that reflect the rustic character of the historic area. Suggestions for this language include the use of natural materials in signage, pathway surfacing, and pathway edge treatments. Clear intersections between unpaved and paved pathways should occur and in some cases native stone might be used along the edges of unpaved pathways to define their boundaries and make them clearly official. This edge treatment does not need to be a continuous outline along either side of the path but should be put in segments “here and there” in keeping with a more rustic design philosophy. This edging would provide a tactile and visual directional clue. This treatment would not only make the natural pathway clear it would serve to designate acceptable dimensions in path widths.

- Interpretive signage should be utilized to increase awareness about the impact pedestrian traffic has on natural systems that are “off trail” when of established trails. Not only does it present an opportunity to explain the design clues for established trails recommended above, but it is also a forum to discuss the ecology of the meadows and forests near the rim. Before and after photographs of highly impacted areas, simple trail maps and plant growth rate information can support this effort. This sort of prescriptive information can help to increase ecological sensitivity and help visitors to understand the importance of staying on designated trails.

- Wherever trails are to be eliminated, revegetation should be completed as described in the General Recommendations. These efforts can be augmented with physical barriers to keep visitors and other pedestrian traffic from disturbing the vegetation as it is being re-established. Natural elements such as rocks and tree limbs or trunks used as barriers provide a more natural feeling to barrier design that is in keeping with the Rustic style of the Park and these treatments may satisfy immediate aesthetic goals. However, often these materials are not interpreted by users as intentional circulation limits and they are frequently bypassed. Elsewhere in the Park, small scale man-made barriers (stakes and string) in conjunction with signage have been used explain that revegetation efforts are underway (Photograph R/15). This strategy can be taken a step further, with more substantial and obviously manufactured temporary barriers installed for as many seasons as necessary for solid reestablishment of the natural condition (Photograph R/16). Materials should be simple and visually unobtrusive in order to prevent them from being interpreted as historic but they should not distract from the historic character of the Study Area as a whole. Barriers should be planned in conjunction with informative signage described above. Eventually, as unwanted paths become revegetated, the worn treads of the trails will no longer be visible and vegetation will present a natural barrier to travel across the meadows. Once this process is complete and the trails have completely disappeared into natural areas, the temporary barriers can be removed. This will likely be an ongoing process, its ultimate success dependent upon the continued efforts toward the interpretive and educational programs.

Photograph R/15. An example of signage being used to deter pedestrian traffic on a recovering social trail near the Rim Trail.

Photograph R/16. A temporary barrier in use near the lodge in Zion National Park which provides an even more obvious barrier to pedestrians while vegetation is recovering.
Entry to the Dormitory (Figure 5-8)

The Male Dormitory building located to the west of the Lodge is accessed through a pathway with stairs that ascend from the Lodge rear parking area to the side of the dormitory. This asphalt walk and the pathway with stairs to the dormitory are not precisely dated and are not believed to date to the period of significance—though it is possible that some materials or portions of the alignment may be original. It is also possible that changes in vehicular and pedestrian circulation developed after the period of significance resulted in giving the pathway and stairs more prominence than it would have had historically. The path brings building residents and visitors through the side entrance—they are not there is no path, paved or otherwise, to the front of the structure (Photograph R/16). The architectural language of the building front implies that it was intended to be the entrance to the structure (see photograph LD/35 in Chapter 3). Even though documentation is unclear and there is some evidence that the architect was fond of this sort of sweeping walk, the replaced path material (asphalt) and the inappropriate connection to the side of the building leads to the recommendation that it be removed. A new path should be created to lead pedestrian traffic into the front of the dormitory. Access to the side of the dormitory should be maintained, though the path would ideally be a smaller “spur” path off of the main walk. With design of this new circulation system, a connecting path between the dormitory building and the employee recreation hall (Valhalla) should also be considered. Creating physical connection between these buildings will establish a spatial relationship thus reinforcing the interconnected village atmosphere exhibited during the period of significance.

- The alignment of the new paths should be planned and designed through consultation with a landscape architect who specializes in historic and cultural landscapes. The goal includes harmony with historic scale and materials while also respecting the natural topography and vegetation present in this area.

- Areas impacted by the former trail alignment or construction of the new trail should receive a revegetation treatment consistent with the General Recommendations, with the inclusion of the signage and barrier recommendations for social trails above.

- Currently, neither the Male Dormitory nor the Recreation Hall meets universal accessibility standards. The redesign effort should explore options which would improve accessibility within a historically correct design aesthetic.

- The new path system should be accompanied with appropriate signage indicating that this is a residential area, discouraging visitors from approaching the residential buildings.

Photograph R/16. The current entry bypasses the main building entrance (to the right in the photo) and uses the side entrance as primary building access. The original entrance should be reclaimed through the installation of a new pathway.
SUMMARY AND BROAD SCALE RECOMMENDATIONS

The treatments recommended here address many of the current issues faced by Bryce Canyon National Park, and attempt to provide guidance on how to approach future planning efforts. While a degree of flexibility has been deliberately built in to the recommendations, the authors acknowledge that future conditions and situations may arise which may not be readily solved using the techniques prescribed in this document. In such cases, it is always best to consult with a landscape architect with an expertise in historical and cultural landscape treatments. The intent here is to preserve as much as possible the Rustic Style site planning, architectural and landscape architectural elements that make the Bryce Canyon Lodge Study Area and the Old NPS Housing Study Area unique and historically significant assets to the National Park System.

Many of the findings from the Chapter 4 Analysis demonstrated that past preservation approaches were focused on architectural preservation with little attention to the landscape. Simply maintaining structures and their exterior features did not adequately preserve the character of a historic Districts or represent well the periods of significance. Landscape features should be viewed as equal in importance to the built features, because it is the union and harmony of the built and the natural features that make the Bryce Canyon Lodge and Old NPS Housing Districts significant. Comprehensive planning approaches are critical to the success of preservation of existing features and future development. Toward this goal, broad contextual landscape scale examination should be considered as well as the health of the natural environment. Even site planning and small scale projects at the Park should be conducted within a larger context of master planning that examines broad scale human and environmental systems. Not only will this help to preserve historic built features (both buildings and site elements) that remain at the Park but will continue to integrate the natural amenities which the Park was established in honor of.

Although many of the recommendations in this chapter are given for those historic districts within the Park that are recognized on the National Register of Historic Places, it is the opinion of the authors that treating these areas in isolation from the rest of the Developed Area is not as effective as it would be in treating the Park as a whole. While visitor amenity areas such as the Rim Trail and its vistas, the Visitor Center, the Bryce Canyon Inn, and the camp and picnic grounds may not qualify as National Register districts, as a whole they still represent many of the aspects of park planning and design discussed in Chapter 4 and continue to work together to convey a rustic, nature-focused experience. This holistic approach should be considered whenever treatments are undertaken in the Developed Area, and the Overall Treatment Guidelines given here would provide strong guidance for maintaining the unique character of Bryce Canyon National Park. Particularly, those recommendations aimed at establishing a consistent and rustic design language in the Study Areas should be expanded to apply to all visitor areas to enforce a visual and physical unity for the Park.

Finally, the authors would like to recognize that, although the establishment of a period of significance is an important tool for landscape and architectural preservation, the years that precede and follow these dates have all contributed to what Bryce Canyon National Park is today. The millennia of geological development that created the unique natural features of the Park, the native peoples who first witnessed the plateau’s wonders, the area’s first settlers and pioneers of early tourism should not be forgotten or under-valued simply because their presence pre-dates extant architecture or built elements. Likewise, the continued efforts of Park management to maintain and improve the quality of visitor experience have made it possible for millions of people to encounter the awe and beauty of Bryce Canyon. We hope our efforts here support theirs, and that the ultimate result of this study is an even deeper understanding of how significant the Park is within the history of National Parks in the United States, and how this history can continue to be represented, even as we meet the future.
### NATURAL SYSTEMS AND FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sagebrush Meadow</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Separates residential area from visitor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoll - Northwest</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Helps create intimate space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoll - Southeast</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Helps create intimate space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CIRCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Lodge Loop Road</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Portions of road follow historic alignment of the Rim Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>North Access Road - north of B-2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>North Access Road - south of B-2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>East Access Road</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Originally part of road to maintenance area to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>Historic trace road</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Originally continuation of East Access Road to maintenance area to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>Horse Trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>Trail from Concessionaire Dorms to Lodge Loop Road</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>Road to Concessionaire Dorms</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Contributing to edge of Concessionaire Dormitory Parking area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-8</td>
<td>Road to Manzanita Lodge</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>Trail From Manzanita Lodge to Concessionaire Dorms</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking area for Concessionaire Dorms</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Out of scale for District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking area for Manzanita Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Out of scale for District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trail to General Store Sub Area</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>No documentation exists of dates for this trail, though it could have been present in period of significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forested slopes of the knolls</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Density on slopes creates a fire danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sagebrush Meadows</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revegetated areas around Concessionaire Dorms</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Non-native species should be removed from this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of recent burn near Garage</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornamental plantings around Service Station</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Manzanita Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Single-Family Residence (HS-2)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>Ranger Dormitory (HS-4)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Seasonal Residence (HS-5)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6</td>
<td>Wood Vendor (HS-6)</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7</td>
<td>Seasonal Residence (HS-7)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>Seasonal Residence (HS-8)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9</td>
<td>Seasonal Residence (HS-9)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10</td>
<td>Seasonal Residence (HS-10)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-11</td>
<td>Concessionaire Dorm (Ponderosa)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12</td>
<td>Concessionaire Dorm (Whispering Pines)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-13</td>
<td>Service Station</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>Stone Wall</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIEWS AND VISTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Screening of buildings from view of Lodge Loop Road to west</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View of Concessionaire Dorms from Lodge Loop Road to southwest</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SMALL SCALE FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS-1</td>
<td>Wood directional signage</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-2</td>
<td>Traffic Sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-3</td>
<td>Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-4</td>
<td>Utility meter/box</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-5</td>
<td>Trash receptacle</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-6</td>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-7</td>
<td>Ring of fire wood</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-8</td>
<td>Picnic table</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-9</td>
<td>Clothes line</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-10</td>
<td>Propane tank</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-11</td>
<td>New stone curb</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-12</td>
<td>Fire Pit (Grill)</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-13</td>
<td>Metal drain cover</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-14</td>
<td>Stone steps</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-15</td>
<td>New Stone wall</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-16</td>
<td>Drain grill</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-17</td>
<td>Concrete curb</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-18</td>
<td>Concrete steps</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-19</td>
<td>Basketball hoop</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-20</td>
<td>Old stone curb</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BRYCE CANYON LODGE STUDY AREA

## NATURAL SYSTEMS AND FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoll - behind lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Creates sense of location for Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow - in front of Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Gives Lodge prominence in the landscape and sweeping views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CIRCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Lodge Loop Road</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Junction of Lodge Loop Road and Rim Road has been realigned and is non-contributing at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>Horse Trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Lodge Access Road - north and west of Sunset Motel Unit</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Lodge Access Road ended in a turn-around just west of Deluxe Cabins in period of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Lodge Access Road - east of Sunset Motel Parking Area</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Historically traffic passed the portion directly in front of the lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>Lodge Access Road - north of registration parking area</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>This alignment has been reconfigured since the period of significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11</td>
<td>Driveway to Administrative parking area</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>Sunset Motel parking lot</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13</td>
<td>Deluxe Cabins west parking lot</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>This is the approximate area of the historic turn-around, which may have also hosted parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>Deluxe cabins east parking loop</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>A turn-around with parking was located in the same area, but was configured differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-15</td>
<td>Abandoned vehicular road</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>This fragment represents the original alignment of the Rim Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-16</td>
<td>Registration Parking Area</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-17</td>
<td>Trail from Male Dormitory to Lodge rear parking</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Stepped asphalt trail enters side of the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-18</td>
<td>Trail from Standard Cabins to Administrative parking area</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>It is unclear if this trail would have been present before the remainder of the cabins were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Trail Description</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-19</td>
<td>Trail from Male Dormitory to Administrative Parking Area</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>It is unclear if this trail would have been present before the remainder of the cabins were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-20</td>
<td>Rear entrance to Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Although this entry has always been present, the current configuration and design is non-contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-21</td>
<td>Asphalt trail in front of Lodge</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>This is the remnant of the original Lodge Access Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-22</td>
<td>Central trail from Lodge to rim</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-23</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to Trail from Lodge to Rim</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-24</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to Lodge</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-25</td>
<td>Trail from Lodge Access Road to Sunrise parking</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-26</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to parking lot</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-27</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to parking lot</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-28</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise parking to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-29</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-30</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-31</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-32</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-33</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to horse trail</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-34</td>
<td>Trail from horse corral to Sunrise Point Access Road</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-35</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel to Sunset Point</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-36</td>
<td>Trail from Sunrise Motel &amp; parking to Sunset Point</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-37</td>
<td>Trail from Deluxe Cabins to Sunset Point</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-38</td>
<td>Trail from Deluxe Cabins to Rim</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-39</td>
<td>Trail from Sunset Point road to Rim Road</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-40</td>
<td>Trail from Lodge Loop Road to Valhalla</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C-41 Trail from Sunrise Motel area to rim
- **Condition**: Fair
- **Status**: Undetermined

### C-42 Trail from Sunrise Motel area to rim
- **Condition**: Fair
- **Status**: Undetermined

### C-43 East entry to Sunrise parking lot
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Non-Contributing

### C-44 West Entry to Sunrise parking lot
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Non-Contributing

### C-45 Entry to Lodge Rear Parking from Lodge Access Road
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Non-Contributing
- **Notes**: This alignment has been reconfigured since the period of significance.

### C-46 Entry to Lodge Rear Parking from Lodge Loop Road
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Non-Contributing
- **Notes**: This alignment has been reconfigured since the period of significance.

### C-47 Trail from horse corral to rim trail
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Undetermined

### Paved path from lodge south to path in front of Standard Cabins
- **Condition**: Good
- **Status**: Non-Contributing
- **Notes**: A path likely existed here historically, but size and materials have changed.

### Paths between Standard Cabins in two clusters near Lodge
- **Condition**: Absent
- **Status**: Removed with Standard Cabins

### Path to front entry of Male Dormitory
- **Condition**: Absent
- **Status**: Removed with Standard Cabins

### Parking Area for Standard Cabins north and east of Lodge
- **Condition**: Absent
- **Status**: Removed with Standard Cabins

### Sidewalks among remaining Standard Cabins and the Linen House and Pump House
- **Condition**: Fair
- **Status**: Contributing

### VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponderosa Pine forest community</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Continued fuels management recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-native or near-native plantings around structures</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Spread of non-natives and near-natives should be controlled to limit the species to their current locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revegetated areas near Motel Units</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Non-native species should be removed from this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornamental plantings in beds on Lodge terrace</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovering vegetation in former Standard Cabin locations</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large (presumably older) specimen trees near historic Lodge structures</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR #</td>
<td>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</td>
<td>CONDITION</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-42</td>
<td>Bryce Canyon Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-42</td>
<td>Bryce Canyon Lodge Façade</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td>Non-contributing items begin at line of historic brick on highest terrace level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-14</td>
<td>Pump House</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-15</td>
<td>Linen House</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-16</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-17</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-18</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-19</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-20</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-21</td>
<td>Standard cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-22</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-23</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-24</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-25</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-26</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-27</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-28</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-29</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-30</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-31</td>
<td>Deluxe duplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-32</td>
<td>Deluxe quadruplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-33</td>
<td>Deluxe quadruplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BRYCE CANYON NATIONAL PARK: BRYCE CANYON LODGE DISTRICT AND HISTORIC NATIONAL PARK SERVICE HOUSING DISTRICT

**CULTURAL LANDSCAPE REPORT 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Number</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-34</td>
<td>Deluxe quadruplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-35</td>
<td>Deluxe quadruplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-36</td>
<td>Deluxe quadruplex cabin</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-37</td>
<td>Valhalla / Recreation Hall</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-38</td>
<td>Men's Dormitory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-39</td>
<td>Sunset Motel</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-40</td>
<td>Sunrise Motel</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-41</td>
<td>Horse Corral shed</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>Propane tank</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>Utility Shed</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>Horse Corral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**21 Standard Cabins north and east of Lodge**

*Absent Removed in 1980’s*

**~50 Standard Cabins west of the Lodge**

*Absent Removed in 1980’s*

### VIEWS AND VISTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of view of Rim and beyond from Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of Lodge gained by guests arriving via the Lodge Access Road in front of the Lodge</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked views to Sunset Viewpoint Parking area from Lodge District</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View across meadow from front of Lodge</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>This view has been significantly impacted by the increase in density of the forest and the “creep” of the forest cover into the meadow itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Standard and Deluxe Cabins from along Lodge Access Road</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SMALL SCALE FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLR #</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE FEATURE</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS-1</td>
<td>Wood directional signage</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-2</td>
<td>Traffic Sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-3</td>
<td>Fire Hydrant</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-4</td>
<td>Utility meter/box</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-5</td>
<td>Trash receptacle</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-6</td>
<td>Manhole</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-8</td>
<td>Picnic table</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-11</td>
<td>Finished stone curb</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-13</td>
<td>Metal drain cover</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-14</td>
<td>Stone steps</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-15</td>
<td>Finished Stone wall</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-16</td>
<td>Drain grill</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-17</td>
<td>Concrete curb</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-18</td>
<td>Concrete steps</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-20</td>
<td>Rugged stone curb</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-21</td>
<td>Interpretation sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-22</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-23</td>
<td>Old Utility Valves</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-24</td>
<td>Metal culvert</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-25</td>
<td>Stone retaining wall</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-26</td>
<td>Hand Pump</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-27</td>
<td>Rugged stone treads</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-28</td>
<td>Universal Access Sign</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-29</td>
<td>Log edging</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-30</td>
<td>Rock culvert</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-31</td>
<td>Wooden post fence</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-32</td>
<td>Metal railing</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-33</td>
<td>Outdoor ashtray</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-34</td>
<td>Satellite antennae</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-35</td>
<td>Wood/Metal bench</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-36</td>
<td>Split log bench</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-37</td>
<td>Bicycle rack</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-38</td>
<td>Flagpole</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-39</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-40</td>
<td>Metal fence</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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