According to Park visitor statistics Gatlinburg, Tennessee rates as the most heavily visited national park in the United States; as a gateway community and the official entrance to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, its downtown landscape remains cemented in the minds of many across the nation. Through a context based visual analysis utilizing Maxwell’s two-way stretch theory, the researcher traced the origins and defining characteristics of this Gatlinburg aesthetic – the Tourist Vernacular – that evolved primarily through the work of one architect: Hubert Bebb. Through visual analysis, Bebb emerged as the key architect who, over the course of fifty years, not only created hybrids informed by the existing built environment of Gatlinburg, but inserted a new prototype and subsequent hybrids that came to define much of the downtown landscape. Bebb’s early work sits as a response to the buildings of the settlement school era, established in 1912. With precedents from this development, he augmented materials and forms to buildings in a time when government officials conceptualized and developed the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, authorized in 1926 and formally dedicated in 1940, an era characterized by a boom in construction as a result of increased tourism. His work is most particularly influential in the third quarter of the twentieth century when businesses and community leaders, including Bebb himself, shaped a place image consistent with visitor expectations.
Utilizing Bebb’s Tourist Vernacular, designers and business leaders have transformed the built environment in the last several decades. Correspondingly, the aesthetic forms serve as the basis for such visionary changes as “The Greening of Gatlinburg” and the Gatlinburg Vision Statement, alongside the completion of studies and guidelines that affect the physical characteristics and visual aspects of the downtown, calling for authenticity in the evolved Tourist Vernacular. Touching on historical influences, this analysis speaks to a series of stylistic genre in Gatlinburg’s mid-twentieth century commercial buildings, while also linking to work that continues the aesthetics and philosophies of Bebb’s architectural endeavors. The study shows readers glimpses of one community’s evolving architectural lexicon shaped largely by tourist needs and expectations, thus providing a useful approach to other recreational landscapes throughout the nation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:

THE MERITS OF A SMALL TOWN UPBRINGING:
THROUGH ARCHITECTURE, THE ARTS, LANDSCAPE, AND HISTORY

As the geographic focus of this thesis, Gatlinburg, Tennessee’s landscape is replete with a multitude of architectural forms, styles, and venue types. Inundated with tourists, a primary source of income, the city’s image, found to be shaped largely by one architect, represents a crucial factor in economic stability. Businesses that sell entertainment and the “Gatlinburg Experience” through design dot the downtown streetscape, such as historic bed and breakfasts, mid 1950s modern hotels, chain motels, quaint streamside restaurants, and even restaurant chains and fast food venues. Defined by key architects and community visionaries, the architectural styles, sense of place, and overall aesthetics that merge the urban form with the beauty of the Great Smoky Mountains all significantly contribute to and define a place image, necessary for marketing and selling a tourist town’s identity. Nonetheless, even a gateway tourist community such as Gatlinburg experiences shifting trends and evolving growth phases, at a heightened rate, as a result of broad national trends, historical events, regional expressions, and more locally informed design, historical influences, and events. Specifically, this thesis’ core research area centers on the evolution of Gatlinburg’s architectural forms into a unified aesthetic realized primarily through the work of one key
architect, Hubert Bebb, who linked to the past through predecessor architectural styles in the area and importantly shaping decades of design work through his Tourist Vernacular. Lining the streets of downtown, the commercial buildings all tell their own interpretation of various events that affected the local landscape through physical form, in details, and surface materials. An overwhelming number of them also tell the story of Bebb’s evolving style, illustrating his formal and stylistic shifts through the years and his impact on the local landscape. Its broad acceptance further confirms Bebb’s central and significant position as a locally prominent architect and as an avid Gatlinburg community member and booster. Through Bebb’s work, one can see his comprehension of the city’s character and his efforts to shift the buildings that form a critical part of that place image.

Research on the Gatlinburg area’s development determined specific events and influential architects and individuals, traceable through architectural form, that impacted Gatlinburg’s physical landscape. The study consists of three sample sets of buildings spanning 100 years. Most heavily focused on archetypes established during an initial phase of development, the researcher also addresses a later phase encompassing the three decades after the dedication of the National Park. This later period, also Bebb’s core work era, saw immense growth; during this time, available tourist lodgings and entertainment venues rapidly expanded and, heavily informed by Bebb’s work, the image currently envisaged of Gatlinburg by thousands came to fruition. Over time, Gatlinburg not only embraced its location as a gateway community but also heavily marketed its rich arts and crafts heritage to the immense number of tourists that passed through the area, and architecture became an important element in that image. As time passed, the built
forms shifted to accommodate changing tourist expectations and incorporate modern amenities and, at the close of the twentieth century, culminated in a resurgence of interest in locally relevant history as manifest through the built form.

A citywide effort to more explicitly define Gatlinburg’s historical and architectural heritage led to much research and, subsequently, locals organized various community groups to achieve the goals established as a result of those studies. Most of these studies centered on identifying what the community desired Gatlinburg’s aesthetic vision to be, and many of the buildings chosen that represented those ideals were designed by Bebb or clearly influenced by his work. The increased concern and activism on behalf of Gatlinburg’s aesthetic appearance continues still today as building owners and designers shape the ever-shifting landscape. Such a renewed interest in authenticity, both historical and architectural, has not only sparked the imaginations of local builders, entrepreneurs, long standing business owners, and residents, but also the researcher’s curiosity as well. This thesis undertook the question of whether a specific aesthetic solely identifiable with Gatlinburg exists at present, traced that form back to its roots, and also placed the architectural events and shifts leading to that form in a historical timeline.

Although the current work underway in Gatlinburg is inspirational in and of itself for its wide community acceptance and the vigor and passion necessary to institute such change, other factors pointed toward this area of research. I would not have found such an enthralling research topic had it not been for my mother’s and my move to Gatlinburg at the age of nine following my parents’ divorce, and my grandparents’ never ending effort to introduce me to all the city’s wonders—of both the natural environment and the
manmade form. Gatlinburg undeniably impacted my life, shaping my interests and character, and I extol the virtues of my portion of small town upbringing, especially as a burgeoning artist and designer blessed with the opportunity of being in an area so appreciative of the arts. From an early age, many of the buildings analyzed in this thesis, especially Bebb’s, are embedded in my mind, laden with nostalgia and childhood memories. In this way, this thesis takes on an autobiographical tone, but one deeply informed by rigorous analysis and processing of data through prescribed rubrics.

Gatlinburg provided a wonderful background that encouraged creativity and recognized the value and importance of artistic education. Public school programs and the Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts granted me exposure to an often-neglected realm of study, and the crafts-oriented tourism industry further cemented its importance locally, historically, and through the values instilled in community youth. Pi Beta Phi’s philanthropic settlement school intervention created this wonderful tradition of arts and crafts. With an architectural legacy shaped by Bebb alongside architects Barber and McMurry, the physical form of this institution now stands as a unifying factor in the community. Despite the 100 years that has passed since the school’s original inception, the original programs remain very influential in the lives of many locals, mine included. In my schooling, I recognized the importance of these long held traditional crafts, saw those values symbolically in the surrounding campus represented through built form, and felt the stability brought through such a physical connection to history. Now logically leading to the beginning of this thesis, a more comprehensive discussion of Gatlinburg’s
history and development, historic preservation, and heritage tourism, all frameworks of understanding for this building study, ensues.
CHAPTER II

THE SHAPING OF A TOURIST TOWN:
A CENTURY OF DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT STATE OF GATLINBURG

Gatlinburg’s history links inextricably to the past century’s development, continual rise in tourism, and the city currently struggles to find its place in a late twentieth century era of tourism focused on heritage. In the last decade Gatlinburg prioritized sustainability, craft heritage, and a locally authentic architectural aesthetic as key components of the city’s new tourism initiative, a strategy for drawing visitors commonly referred to as heritage tourism (Tyler, 2000). This relatively new realm of heritage tourism utilizes local history and culture to advertise and promote an area’s identity in an effort to attract tourists. As an increasingly popular factor in determining vacation locale, heritage tourism also provides a viable reason for the preservation of the built environment and local history (Rypkema, 1997).

Tourists more commonly select destinations such as Williamsburg, Charleston, and Savannah in connection with heritage tourism, but in actuality, small towns all across the United States depend on their unique identities and local histories as selling points to both visitors and residents. New Bern and Beaufort, North Carolina, and Franklin, Tennessee, present good examples of collaboration among communities, use of heritage tourism strategies, and strong preservation-minded philosophies. As towns with a small year-round population, tourism functions as a crucial part of the local economy. These cities strive for preservation of their unique histories and structures and market those
stories in appealing and authentic manners. Gatlinburg, Tennessee similarly utilized its distinct local heritage, history, and scenic beauty to its benefit; however, the area’s intense focus and dependency on tourism led to a more heavily processed, commercialized, and consumer friendly image (Van West, 2006). Through the lens of the built environment and its preservation, these connections among tourism, local history, and culture frame this study, all overlapping and materially visible in the Tourist Vernacular of Gatlinburg, shaped in large part by Hubert Bebb.

Preservation of the built environment provides a tangible and crucial piece of local heritage and history. With heritage tourism’s specific focus on an area’s given resources and history, preservation significantly contributes to local implementation through the physical embodiment of history (Rypkema, 1997). Preservation faces many challenges, especially in a society that seeks the most economically viable land use with little regard to aesthetic and cultural values, even more so in tourist driven communities. Mason and Page (2004) believe that the general public, city officials, and others who play a key role in development have only begun to realize preservation’s economic benefits. The cultural values inherent in preservation, the landscape itself, and in the commitments of local community members serving preservation purposes now receive more acknowledgment as well. In fact, many scholars view preservation as a social reform movement:

preservation arose as part of a broad effort among Progressive reformers to transform the nature of urban space- its aesthetic character, its social uses, what it signified to society, how it was used, and who controlled it- as a means of transforming society (Mason and Page, p.11).
The notion of architecture as an avenue that informs human interaction has been explored in a myriad of ways. Church architecture gives a good example of social and moral values informing design and vice versa, the Arts and Crafts movement during the period of progressive reform, and the Modern movement, in both its philosophy and visual association to such ideologies, also reflect social and moral connections to the larger realm of society (Hoffschwelle, Gelertner, Knowles, 2006). The progressive movement informed several structures in Gatlinburg during the city’s infancy and the over-arching theme of current work centers on the park and natural beauty, the city’s existing built inventory (strongly influenced by architect Hubert Bebb), and efforts to foster a more historically honest, aesthetically positive experience for tourists and residents alike. Preservation itself, as an act of choosing to preserve built heritage, sustains historical and ideological values through physical representation in the built form and the philosophical beliefs of those preserving, both of which profoundly affect the community.

Identified as a key factor that creates a community’s sense of identity and place, historic preservation provides the stability an ever-changing world lacks. Respect and appreciation for the built environment helps procure a well-established, stable identity and assists in any preservation endeavor. In recent years Gatlinburg residents and entrepreneurs have chosen to advocate these values and seek the means to physically re-manifest them in their hometown through architecture and design. The work of the Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation (a community activist foundation focused on improvements to the Gatlinburg area and National Park) illustrates this decision to
effectively change the downtown landscape. The foundation partnered with the city and chamber of commerce for development of the Gatlinburg Vision statement (2004), a document that addresses aesthetics, business development, the environment, heritage, quality of life, traffic, and transportation. Other planning documents include a recent draft of local architectural guidelines, the Hillsides and Ridges study (2007), and Priority: Gatlinburg: An Implementation Plan (2008) for the Gatlinburg vision to name a few.

Planning efforts also confirm a strong sense of place as a fundamental feature on which the community could shape an economically solid foray into heritage tourism.

Historic preservation and heritage tourism meet on the grounds of cultural and social importance, as both seek to conserve aspects of history primarily manifested in the built environment. Representative of local culture, traditions, community identity, collective and individual memory, these historical components, especially in the built form, define an area’s sense of place (Mason and Page, 2004). The increased focus on heritage has been attributed to modern society’s propensity for everything new and its dismissive nature for all things bound in tradition, even at the cost of history. That longing for newness costs people the very values and necessities they identify with in a locale: local history, heritage, and a sense of place. Lowenthal (2004) suggests that “beleaguered by loss and change, we keep our bearings only by clinging to remnants of stability, [h]ence preservers’ aversion to let anything go…” (p. 23), concluding that people desire permanence in some form, especially in a transient, ephemeral society. Orbasli’s (2000) work parallels Lowenthal and also links these notions to tourism as well. He discusses the inability to separate preservation (or conservation as he, and other
countries, term it) from its related economic and social issues. He states: “We must realize that maintaining structures means maintaining the desirability or continuity of a culture—we are in fact conserving cultures, not buildings” (p. 1). Certainly, in Gatlinburg property owners and designers alike helped cement the relationship between tourism and preservation through, among other forms, architecture.

Not only do people look for preservation in their own town, but they also travel long distances in search of what their lives lack elsewhere. Historically inclined tourists not only visit house museums and landmarks but also desire the experience of a sense of community and identity (Tyler, Barthel, Rypkema, 2000). In particular, they frequently seek a continuity or connection with the past, often experienced through the built form. These expectations should be met, as they prove crucial for any town with a tourist economy that hopes to capture the gaze of the modern, often historically inclined tourist. Sevier County’s realization of tourism benefits combined with heritage and local historic resources came slowly over years, not truly at the forefront until the turn of the twenty-first century. As one of the largest counties in the state of Tennessee, Sevier County experienced numerous changes over the past hundred years, as would be expected for many areas over such a time frame (see aerial figures 1 & 2). The county’s city of Gatlinburg transformed from a small, isolated, rural hamlet (despite industrialization and the incursion of the timber industry at the turn of the twentieth century) to the middle-class tourist mecca of today, an image that was heavily influenced at mid-century by the hand of architect Hubert Bebb and by other architects in turn influenced by Bebb’s work (Hardie & Williams, 2007, 1995). As the most visited park in the United states according
to 2007 park visitor statistics, the Great Smoky Mountains visitor numbers thus indicates
the importance of Gatlinburg’s image as seen by such a large number of visitors
(www.nps.gov/gsmnp, 2009). Gatlinburg’s unabashed dedication to tourist entertainment
and its geographic location as a gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park
differentiate it from many other tourist towns although other gateway communities across
the nation experience similar issues. These cities also grasp for an identity and search for
balance between nature and necessary accommodations in the same manner as
Gatlinburg. Howe (1997) sees gateway communities such as Gatlinburg as “portals to our
most cherished landscapes,” not simply as places for tourist accommodation, and as such
believes these areas should be carefully planned and developed (p. 6). The physical
connection between Gatlinburg’s past and the park is fraught with contradictions; the
park holds many historical programs and sites (despite careful selection and removal of
undesirable buildings) while the city itself constantly reinvents, markets, and advertises
itself for the tourist dollar. Architecture, central to this enterprise, provides the backdrop
for much of this tourist activity and thus to the codification of the place image as one that
leans on both the built and natural environments.

As the area’s primary economic base, Gatlinburg’s tourism demands attention in
multiple, seemingly conflicting directions: advertising Appalachian culture, rural
mountain traditions, pastoral scenery, the park’s history and heritage, while it
simultaneously provides a plethora of entertainment and shopping venues to satisfy every
visitor’s possible urge. The resulting built environment consists of an overwhelming
eclectic assortment of buildings (and architectural styles) that provide facilities for hotels,
eateries, and trinket shops. In the commercial core, these buildings with public faces suggest the site of greatest changes through time; they sit as three-dimensional documents of the efforts of many to commodify the community. Gatlinburg struggled to promote its heritage in various physical forms as the main strip of downtown Gatlinburg along the Parkway shifted and evolved to accommodate the escalating dependency on tourism since the turn of the nineteenth century. Through survey, research, and visual analysis, the researcher documented these forms, the area’s development and identity, as well as its historic and architectural context to identify local architectural phases, trends, and key architects. Lastly, the researcher traced Gatlinburg’s Tourist Vernacular and classified architect Hubert Bebb as the primary creator and proponent of the style.

Figure 1. Gatlinburg in the 1920s. Arrowmont digital archives.
Figure 2. Gatlinburg in the 1980s. Arrowmont digital archives.
Crucial for understanding how, why, and from what events the current face of today’s downtown Gatlinburg emanated, a historical context offers insight into what specific forces shaped the local landscape. Tourism exists in the city’s roots; since the late 1800’s outdoor excursionists and tourists visited for scenic qualities and escape from the hustle of nearby, more quickly growing cities such as Knoxville and Asheville. Arnold Guyot, a Princeton professor, created the first comprehensive map of the Great Smoky Mountains between 1856 & 1860, thus acknowledging this new area’s viability for logging, tourism, and other industries (Jones, 1997).

Tourism took many forms in the Smokies, initially associated with the perceived health benefits imbued in a natural setting as opposed to an urban, industrialized area. Health resorts proliferated in Southern Appalachia in the latter portion of the nineteenth century, with several in the vicinity of Asheville. The mountain air and natural springs drew tourists seeking cures for various ailments, particularly tuberculosis, with scenic beauty as an added incentive. Daniel Foute, a resident of Cades Cove (now located in the park), established Montvale Springs as one of the first of these health resorts in the 1840s (Pierce, 2000). Although the Smoky Mountains attracted visitors since the early nineteenth century with hotels and resorts located in more accessible areas, Sevier County only truly entered the picture as a tourist destination in the 1880s, with Gatlinburg following several decades later (Jones, 1997).

Due to the limited educational opportunities of mountainous regions, Sevier County overall contained fewer schools than any other county in Tennessee in 1910,
observed the State department of Education in Nashville (Jones, 1997). Two years later
the Pi Beta Phi women’s sorority founded a settlement school in Gatlinburg (see figure
3), which set the stage for another facet of tourism: the development and marketing of
Appalachian arts and crafts and thus a commodified mountain culture that could be sold
to tourists. It is important to note that initial interest in a national park coincided
chronologically with the founding of the settlement school. Settlement schools and the
progressive women who established them wielded an incredible influence on the
Southern region of Appalachia not only economically and in terms of education, but also
as preservers of local heritage and tradition. This influence can truly be seen today
through the schools’ impact on the local and cultural landscape (Becker & Jones, 1998,
1997), including its architecture. This preservation ideal, although applied now to
physical structures and commercial heritage, has come full circle.

After ensuring its stability, the settlement school embarked on its first true
revitalization endeavor of native mountain craftwork via a classroom setting in 1915. Pi
Beta Phi, and later its Arrowcraft shop (which marketed the school’s arts and crafts,
shown in figure 4) genuinely cemented Gatlinburg’s status and reputation as a local arts
and crafts community. When the new, highly visible shop opened in 1926, sales
immediately increased three-fold (Martin, 1997). Arrowcraft’s mail order catalog,
published in the 1930s, also extended not only its market, but also the presence of
handicrafts in Gatlinburg. Pi Beta Phi and Arrowcraft sold the school’s wares to other
sorority and community members which put the area’s Appalachian culture on display,
helped form the Southern Highland Handicraft Guild, and established what has become a nationally known arts and crafts institution—Arrowmont.

Although already in decline by the time of Pi Beta Phi’s settlement school, timber industries had secured several locations in the mountains of Southern Appalachia (figure 5), such as Tremont, Smokemont, Elkmont, and Crestmont by the end of the nineteenth century (Brown, 1990). It was not long after when visitors, primarily wealthy vacationers from Asheville and Knoxville, grew increasingly concerned over the devastation caused by the timber industries. Various organizations and interest groups formed in response to local (forest devastation, erosion, fires, etc.) and national issues\(^1\) surrounding the idea of a park (Jones, 1997). Originally established in 1910 as a social club, the Appalachian Club built cottages and the famous Wonderland Hotel (figure 6) near Elkmont; the

\(^1\) The Weeks act granted permission to the government to obtain land for the park and then the creation of the National Park Service in 1916.
organization would eventually establish the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association in 1923 and later defend the creation of the park.

By the second decade of the twentieth century, the logging industries’ railroads dramatically increased accessibility and thus travel to more ‘remote’ areas. In fact many companies brought vacationers in to certain areas, such as Elkmont, where a portion of the land above a small logging camp had been leased to the previously mentioned Appalachian Club, a group that also advocated creation of a national park. According to Brown (1990), one of the most important differences between the conservation association and previous interest groups was the economic nature of their goals; their main objectives hinged on the profits anticipated from a road through the park and the resulting increase in tourism.

Heavily advertised as the leading incentive for the promotion of the park, tourism created the impetus to preserve the land; ironically, logging, the very industry that nearly destroyed the region currently encapsulated by park boundaries, brought these tourists in
on their own railroads. A more beneficial, long-term economic impact on the area than logging, tourism became the driving force that would shape the landscape of the park and its immediate vicinity (Pierce, 2000). The National Park’s authorization in 1926, its subsequent dedication in 1940 (figure 7), the ensuing increase in accessible roads to and throughout the park, and Rebel Railroad in 1961 (which, after two name and ownership changes, became Dollywood in 1986) also brought steep rise in visitation and a larger variety of visitors (Williams, 1995).

Figure 7. Park Dedication, 1940. *Mountain Ways*, Gene Aiken.

National Park leaders, well aware of how development and tourism would likely consume the environs immediately outside its entrances, struggled to prohibit development directly near the park in both Gatlinburg and Cherokee (Williams, 1995). The park allocated land for a buffer zone, denied land leases for development of tourist accommodations, and tried to prevent the very type of tourist development that plagues the area today: “the hot dog stand, the soft drink stand, the gaudy filling station, the stand selling celluloid dolls and the bill boards from marring the natural beauty of our gates” (p. 140). These goals for streamlining the look of Gatlinburg clearly illustrated their mindset of visual and social aesthetics, also illustrated through the ‘necessary’ removal of residents from the park as well as choosing to keep only certain types of buildings as representations of the area’s history.
Many neighboring towns fought for exclusion from park boundaries to avoid losing their homes and communities such as Townsend, Pigeon Forge, and Wears Valley, some of the few who gained that right. Despite omission of several occupied areas originally proposed for inclusion in the park, the Great Smoky Mountains’ fourth removal was still the largest display of eminent domain to create a national park (Williams, 1995). Further placing in perspective, the North Carolina side, owned mostly by timber companies, only consisted of 401 individual tracts while the Tennessee side of the park encompassed 6,200 individual tracts of land (Jones, 1997).

Gatlinburg’s designation as the official park entrance with the selection of the Sugarlands community to site the park’s headquarters (main administration building built in 1939-40 by the CCC and designed by Knoxville architect Charles Barber) further boosted awareness of the Gatlinburg area and visitor volume (figure 8). The resulting development shifted Sevier County’s previous claim as one of the most economically depressed areas in Tennessee (Jones, 1997). The completion of Indian Gap Highway in 1933, a narrow gravel road between Gatlinburg and Asheville, also supplied another accessible tourist route to the previously quiet town of Gatlinburg. Thus given ease of access, despite the park’s best efforts, it ultimately lost the struggle over Gatlinburg’s aesthetics and

Figure 8. NP Advertisement Postcard, 1943.
types of growth. Gatlinburg’s tourist development encroached progressively upon park borders until forced to spill over into Pigeon Forge in the 1980s and then began working its way toward Sevierville (Hardie, 2007).

**Gatlinburg & Sevier County Development:**

*Shaping a Tourist Landscape*

Prior to the ever-invasive tourist gaze, Martha Jane Ogle’s farm and family settlement on the land currently occupied by the Arrowmont campus defined Gatlinburg’s modest beginnings. From the time of their settlement until the mid 1850s, White Oak Flats was the area’s proper name. An early developer from Georgia, Radford Gatlin purchased large tracts of land in the mid nineteenth century and opened a store on one of the parcels. He established the “Gatlinburg” post office in his store and the name became commonly accepted (Van West, 2007).

Sevier County grew steadily toward the close of the nineteenth century, heralding in an unprecedented 29% population increase between 1870 and 1880 (Jones, 1997). Despite this influx of residents and neighboring Knoxville’s industrialization and influence as an important city in the New South, agriculture remained Sevier County’s economic base. During the last two decades of the century, the nascent timber and tourism industries planted the seeds for a shift from that strict agricultural base. Consequently, Sevierville (a neighbor city of Gatlinburg) transformed from a crossroads village to a small town (Jones, 1997). As local transportation methods improved, the growth soon spread to Gatlinburg. The Sevierville Pike connected Knoxville and
Sevierville in January 1900 and was the county’s first hard surfaced road. Construction for the Knoxville, Sevierville, and Eastern Railway followed shortly behind. The KS&E railroad hugely affected Sevier County development, primarily in the form of greater ease of access to timber and tourism industries. Now much less at the local level, speculative businessmen machine logged large tracts of land as opposed to the smaller scale, selective cutting of local residents prior to this era (Jones, 1997). Architecturally speaking, logging created a need for lumberman’s camps and lodges, some of which evolved to accommodate pleasure visitors as well.

Development, not limited to solely reaping profits off the land, continued in a multitude of ways. Concomitantly, Tennessee’s public schools lagged behind national standards; the very early 20th century focused on educational reform, development, and infrastructure. The publication of Designs and Specifications for Public School Buildings by the public instruction department served as a guide for high schools and normal schools (for teachers) under construction (Jones, 1997) with improvement slated for existing school buildings when new ones could not be provided. At the turn of the century one-room log and frame schoolhouses proliferated, so that in 1900 79 existed in Sevier County that served over 7,000 students. Mission schools became a trend of this era as well with many established in

Figure 9. Pi Phi’s neighbor, up Baskin’s Creek.
Sevier County prior to the settlement school in Gatlinburg; the Juniper School (1900) by the Women’s Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church was the first of such mission schools (Jones, 1997).

The Pi Beta Phi Settlement School in Gatlinburg resulted from the national sorority’s decision to honor its founders and 50th anniversary with an altruistic project. Prior to Pi Beta Phi, the majority of Gatlinburg’s schools consisted of small, one-room structures (example, see figure 9) that only ran for three months of the year due to insufficient funding. Initially in an abandoned one-room schoolhouse, Pi Beta Phi’s future school development was secured through local families’ fundraising and their purchase of thirty-five acres from E.E. Ogle (Trout, 1984). In 1914 a larger schoolhouse was built and dedicated, quickly followed in 1916 by the Helmick House, more fondly known as Teachers’ Cottage (figures 10 & 11). Designed by two Pi Beta Phi alumni, architects Alda and Elmina Wilson, the building provided the first known architect designed dwelling in Gatlinburg (Knowles, 2006). Pi Beta Phi also established a branch of the settlement school in the Sugarlands community, ostensibly housed in a two-room classroom building with a stone teachers’ cottage. According to Jones (1997), 88 elementary schools existed by 1929, only 45 of which were one-room schools in 1900.
Growth of tourist development continued during this period and Pi Beta Phi’s efforts through their handicrafts and education of aspiring local entrepreneurs only contributed to what Gatlinburg offered its visitors. Local logger Andy Huff built the first tourist hotel in 1924; the three-story frame Mountain View hotel expanded on his 1916 lodge built for loggers (Jones, 1997). According to Van West’s Gatlinburg Interpretive Outline, the establishment of the Mountain View hotel followed by the Riverside Motel (1925) “demonstrated a volume of visitation heavy enough to support multiple lodging operations even during this early period” (p. 9). Enlarged a mere six years later, the Mountain View became Gatlinburg’s first major resort and luxury hotel (figure 13).
The Mountain View remained prominent in the downtown landscape until razed in 1993 for Fun Mountain, a hilltop mini amusement park that subsequently failed. Huff built many other tourist accommodations such as Huff’s Court, the Rocky Waters Motel, and Le Conte Lodge (Martin, 1997). Several hotels and resorts built on land that later became part of the park, such as the rustic Indian Gap Hotel in 1926 complete with cottages, were later torn down. As more accommodations were continually built, the types of tourist lodging also evolved. According to Jones, Gatlinburg locally held the earliest tourist facilities that easily accommodated automobiles, as examples, Huff’s and Everett’s motor court. Perry’s camp, the earliest cabin camp example, lies just south of Gatlinburg. The site boasted nine cabins, a restaurant, main office, generator house, hillside garage, swinging bridge, dam, stonewalls, water wheel, and stone paths (Jones, 1997). Hollis (2007) also states that the 1932 Rocky Waters Court served as the first established tourist cabin; built in a rustic log cabin style, many other pre-world war II
tourist accommodations followed suit from an architectural perspective through building style.

Concurrently, efforts increased for formal establishment of a national park. Congress authorized the creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1925-26, which spurred massive fundraising from both Tennessee and North Carolina. The 516,000 acres designated for the park, estimated to cost $10 million, spurred local fundraisers to amalgamate half the amount with John D. Rockefeller Jr. supplying the other half of the sum in February 1928. The newly created park boundaries would consume approximately one-third of Sevier County’s land through its southern section (Jones, 1997).

Local development and growth mounted despite the depression largely due to the nature of business in the area, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) work provided by Roosevelt and his New Deal, and the Public Works Administration (PWA), part of the 1933 National Industrial Recovery Act. According to Edsforth (2000),

at the heart of the New Deal reform program was a liberal commitment to make federally guaranteed economic security a political right for every American citizen. This ideological commitment was expressed in a host of New Deal programs such as social security pensions, federal unemployment benefits, federal deposit insurance, and federal farm price supports (p. 2).

Within months of taking office in 1933, Roosevelt, through innovative programs and policies, managed to begin reversal of the steep economic descent plaguing the nation (Edsforth, 2000).
Locally, Roosevelt’s political agenda, manifest in new construction of the chimneys campgrounds’ sewers, water system, park roads, and trails, all credited to the PWA, resulted in the employment of roughly 70,000 men in Tennessee alone through the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), the longest running New Deal agency responsible for these projects. Jones (1997) states that these men reclaimed forests and eroded farmland; fought forest fires; participated in flood control and soil recovery through dam construction; introduced new farming methods; and created most of Tennessee’s state parks. The recently founded park held seventeen CCC camp locations, four of which were located in Sevier County; one resided in Gatlinburg. Crews from these camps built many stone comfort stations throughout the park in the Rustic Revival style promoted in the national park service’s construction guidelines (comfort station example, figure 14).
As if this work did not effectively illustrate the continued growth and progress of the area, 95,000 tourists visited the GSMNP in 1935. As a matter of fact, Jones discovered a 1938 newspaper article that claimed: “Gatlinburg got as busy as the bees that buzz around its wildflowers” with $100,000 of new construction projects including a 500 seat movie theater, 50 tourist cabins, many private homes, a new weaving plant, and additions to established businesses. By 1939, the town also boasted several museums catered to tourists, including the Great Smoky Mountains Museum, the Mountaineer Museum, and the Barnes Cherokee Indian Museum. Additionally, in 1940 the newly established Arrowcraft shop sold the settlement school’s wares; it fronted Gatlinburg’s main parkway and housed the goods of nearly 100 women who crafted for the school.
Martin’s (1997) findings further reiterate these statistics: the Mountain View Hotel’s register illustrated that from 1927 to 1932, visitation increased almost 35% and represented a more diverse range of visitors and that a mere 93 listed structures resided in Gatlinburg in 1934, with 641 listed in 1942.

With the official opening of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1940 and the progressive era’s Good Roads movement (focused on establishing scenic tourist highways and improving rural life), Gatlinburg made its permanent mark in the tourism industry and the traditional crafts of Pi Beta Phi students and workers became an integral part of the city’s image. Increasing numbers enjoyed local scenic vistas and witnessed Gatlinburg’s quaintness; those tourists’ consumption of crafts and souvenirs and subsequent need for accommodations spurred an onslaught of building. The school itself experienced much growth during this period and the prominent Knoxville firm Barber and McMurry undertook design of the majority of buildings, additions, and remodels; the firm also contracted with the National Park for the Sugarlands Administrative Offices (1940, funded by the PWA). Barber and McMurry would go on to complete several buildings for Pi Beta Phi’s campus; these contained the same rustic and revival styles already in the park, thus providing an aesthetically cohesive image now reflected by the settlement school’s campus. Preservationists Van West and Knowles (2007) concluded that this relationship provided a link from the settlement school as a progressive era institution to one of the New Deal era (figures 15 & 16).
Despite the prominent increase in all aspects of the tourist market and local handicrafts, farming continued as the dominant vocation county wide in the early 1940s (Jones, 1997). The tourism and handicrafts presence only intensified, however, and governmental and institutional intervention further sped up the process. For example, two former employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority’s pilot Ceramic Research Laboratory founded Pigeon Forge Pottery in 1946. At the same time, Pi Beta Phi collaborated with the University of Tennessee Knoxville, conceiving the Summer School of Crafts in 1945 (the same year Gatlinburg incorporated as a city) and the first craftsman’s fair, sponsored by the Southern Highland Handicraft Guild, was held on their grounds a mere three years later. The Glades area, now known as the craft loop, transitioned from an agricultural community to a tourism-focused crafts’ community during this time as well. Land and shop owners made their own craftwork and organized to publish maps and brochures in the late 1930s. Pi Beta Phi extended their support through tourist transportation services to the newly transformed Glades area. Van West
(2007) claims this only further illustrates and reiterates the impact of this new market on the local landscape.

Also key to tourism during this era, both increased automobile accessibility and government assistance opened up Gatlinburg and the park to their full potential in regard to visitor access. Authorized in 1944 and intended to offer the Tennessee view of the park, the Foothills Parkway acted as a counterbalance to the Blue Ridge Parkway. Underway in 1951, the first section was finished ten years later, known as the Gatlinburg Spur. In the late 1960s the Gatlinburg bypass connected this spur with the main entrance of the park. Additionally, Eisenhower’s Interstate Highway Act of 1954 allowed many areas of southern Appalachia to be within a day’s drive of over two-thirds of the nation’s population according to Martin (1997). In the end, the completion of I-40 across the Great Smoky Mountains National Park to Asheville was, therefore, much more crucial to the tourist economy of all of Sevier County than the Foothills Parkway.

The ever-increasing accessibility through new roads and a focus on catering to the new middle class, automobile oriented tourist advanced what many scholars refer to as the “democratization” of tourism (Jakle, Sculle, Rogers, 1996). A tourism that was reasonable, accessible, and accommodated shorter visits became the norm; creating this environment yielded very specific effects on local landscapes for cities desiring to meet these needs. Gatlinburg accomplished this democratization through offering a wider variety of attractions, many of which were contrived and increasingly unrelated to their locale.
Marking a transitional period in Gatlinburg’s development, Van West (2007) claims that the scenic incentives for tourism were cohabiting with new attractions by the 1950s, some of which incorporated older, locally relevant themes and heritage, and some that altogether ignored their setting and context. This bifurcation, carried out in the designs for the various shops and tourist motels, suggested an architectural conversation among storeowners and political leaders, aided by designers to make concrete these various visions for the community. The Homespun Valley Mountain Village (1951) conveys a good example of this type of development, outside of more traditional, genuine craft shops and candy stores; this venue was specifically created for the sole purpose of attracting tourists (Hollis, 2007). Sated with old-fashioned barn dances, an operating moonshine still, and a general store for antiquated goods, Homespun Valley certainly exemplified the stereotyped tourist expectation of the mountain lifestyle. This was only the beginning of attractions that strayed further from perceived authenticity and relevance. Venues such as Christus Gardens (a biblical themed wax museum), The Haunted Mansion, multiple Ripley’s attractions, or the German Themed Ober Gatlinburg give a general idea of the types of attractions that became commonplace over the years in conjunction with less commercialized architectural forms. Martin (1997) elaborates on this theme and states “Victorian tourism provided an incentive to preserve nature while modern tourism would serve more as a catalyst for land development and environmental modification” (p. 128).

Initially, meeting the demands of the new middle class tourist proved much more economical than previous or more established visitor accommodation, which allowed
many local citizens to enter the market with reasonably priced tourist courts, restaurants, gift shops, and entertainment venues. Continually increasing the variety of tourist venues also extended the usual season, thus offering more employment opportunities year round despite their low wage nature (Howe, 1997). This new development ultimately required better infrastructure throughout the city. Important goals accomplished between 1945 and 1960 included paving highway 441, naming streets, creating crosswalks, regulating and locating parking, installing traffic lights, building a water treatment plant, a sewage plant, and instituting an advertising department for the city (Van West, 1997). These municipal improvements indicated the dramatic shift in land use after World War II and development continued until “nearly every available space in the floodplain of Gatlinburg filled up” (Martin, 1997, p. 253). With downtown Gatlinburg as the nexus, waves of residential, rental, and commercial construction washed over the neighboring mountainsides, with one key architect leading the way toward the eventual development of the Tourist Vernacular, as more fully discussed in the analysis section of this document (figures 17 & 18).
Residents, as a response to the blight of their scenic landscapes, formed Regional Planning Commissions in the 1960s in an attempt to alleviate some of the rapacious development and associated problems. However, these advisory agencies had no actual enforcement powers. Martin further elaborates on this point, stating:

in effect, zoning laws became the tools of developers in these communities. Consequently, even though planning commissions’ had honorable intentions, beautification plans and the ideal of preserving the rustic, mountain theme in development, they were in fact powerless to stop frenzied, unplanned development that destroyed the rustic character of these communities (p. 259).

Further illustrating the adverse effects of unplanned and unrestrained ‘progress,’ Gatlinburg and Pigeon Forge severely polluted the West Prong of the Little Pigeon River due to an inability to keep up with such rapid growth. From 1973 to 1979, the Tennessee State Department of public health instituted a moratorium on all future construction pending resolution of the pollution issue. When lifted in 1979, development ensued at an ever-increasing pace and continues to this day in regard to both cities (Martin, 1997). In this lack of regulation, individual property owners shaped architecture free from the subsequent discussions and decisions surrounding a single aesthetic for Gatlinburg focused around tourist expectations of an idealized past.

Currently, the city has reached its limits for growth capacity, tourist accommodations, and tourist entertainment (Hardie & Williams, 2007, 1995). Recent development uses measures that much more drastically impact the rural landscape and the
existing built environment. This thus affects Gatlinburg’s main tourist selling point and
the sense of place and community identity of the area known as “the most beautiful piece
of Tennessee” (Jones, 1997, p. 147). The primary tenets of the new vision for Gatlinburg
include regaining the older feel of Gatlinburg-through its sense of place and identity and
the Tourist Vernacular defined herein- combined with a sustainable initiative. Brown
(1990) reiterates this and states that “[in heavily visited areas], those elements of the
mountain culture which provided the human appeal are often retained only as museum
pieces in settlement schools or as show place remnants, such as in Cades Cove, TN”
(Brown quoting Edgar Bingham, 1990, p. 4). Regaining that older feel could prove
difficult when it comes to certain types of venues inhabiting downtown storefronts.
Ripley properties, whose built form appears purely as a result of branding instead of
vernacular influence, serves as a prime example, and, according to Hollis (2007), at the
recent turn of the century occupied more of downtown than any other single entity’s
holdings.

Even through this quick overview of development, primarily focused on
commercial structures, venue type, and infrastructure, Gatlinburg can be easily seen as
existing in a continuing state of transition, true at mid-century and in every decade since.
Whether new initiatives, more fully discussed in the next section (with some pertinent
documents located in the appendices and others cited in references), will take hold in the
long run and offer unification among residents, city officials, developers, and
entrepreneurs is still undecided. However, the mere creation and dedication to these goals
was the inspiration for this thesis and they offer a crucial viewpoint on the state of Gatlinburg today.

A Small Town with Lofty Goals: The Current State of Gatlinburg

Specifically, this thesis focuses on the architectural culmination of integrating sense of place and community identity with tourism. Through this research scenario, there exists the dilemma of defining Gatlinburg’s sense of place and community identity, a goal of many of the current initiatives aimed at bettering the city. In an effort to promote an authentic city image, this defining act becomes problematic in an area whose entire existence was founded on tourism and a mountain heritage re-created from vestigial remains of past traditions, both of which have since become stereotyped and heavily commercialized. The natural landscape holds much of what defines the area’s local character: the bucolic vistas with rolling hills and fields, distant mountains, streams, and farmhouses snuggled up against mountainsides or woods; and in the arts and crafts industry and heritage. Over the years, however, Gatlinburg’s architecture definitely took on specific, identifiable characteristics through its various phases of growth. The intent of this thesis is to document how architecture represents the overall image of Gatlinburg and the specific design language that manifested locally.

Gatlinburg currently works toward a more sensitive and successful means of integrating heritage into the downtown area. The recently established Architectural Guidelines, created through a collaboration between the city of Gatlinburg and Clemson University Master of Real Estate Development Program, advocates enhancing the
beautiful mountain setting, regional vernacular architecture, and history as a gateway to
the Great Smoky Mountains, as well as the use of the area’s “Mountain Village
Aesthetic” (Guidelines, 2008). “Developed to preserve and enhance the unique
architectural character of Gatlinburg’s main commercial corridor,” the guidelines also
“assist developers, builders, and architects in designing buildings that will reinforce
Gatlinburg’s mountain village aesthetic” (Guidelines, 2008, p.1). Throughout the
document, photographic examples of what the city feels to be successful and more
reflective of regional architectural styles are discussed alongside poor examples.
Materiality and siting of the building are heavily stressed, as well as avoidance of
homogenous commercial architecture.

Belief in an overarching regional aesthetic, an expanding pool of historic resources,
and a beautiful setting guides many of the city’s improvement projects, agendas, and
research currently underway in addition to these guidelines. For example, Carroll Van
West, the head of the Historic Preservation Program at Middle Tennessee State
University inventoried many downtown structures and his graduate students developed a
more complete list of National Register Nominations/historic districts that encompassed a
broader range of locally significant buildings (completed 2007). A historical Gatlinburg
interpretive outline resulted from Van West’s research and he also offered a few heritage
tourism workshops this past year.

A newfound desire for local businesses to go “green” culminated in the first
sustainable tourism summit held in the area in April 2008 in nearby Knoxville. As a
timely addition, this thesis nicely parallels the interests and goals for the area and will
offer further support for those goals, especially in defining a locally relevant architectural aesthetic. Additionally, Gatlinburg’s sustainable and heritage tourism initiatives have been more fully fleshed out in the past few years with many current avenues of implementation.

Local concern mounted over the years, especially during the highly economically productive 80s and 90s. The Sonoran Report in 1998 offered Sevier County residents some specific guidance to alleviate certain matters of concern. With such lofty goals, one of the biggest recommendations was establishing the Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation (GGF) that now represents various sectors of the local community. According to GGF’s website: “The Mission of the Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation is to advocate positive action and civic responsibility to achieve an environmentally sensitive and economically prosperous gateway community to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.” The neighboring city of Maryville, also a gateway community, pursued similarly minded goals in the early 90s. Through the Foothills Land Conservancy (a land trust, which is an organization that receives conservation easements on property) an inventory of properties neighboring the park was completed and since 1992 more than 6,000 acres of land has been protected (Howe, 1997).

The original report that called for the GGF’s creation foresaw the foundation as instrumental in the process of positive change for Gatlinburg and it, as well as the action plan later developed by GGF, outlined many key goals. These goals primarily fell into two categories: valuing the natural setting, and enhancing town character and appearance (see Appendix A for more detailed information). Valuing the Natural Setting’s key points
involved maintenance of Gatlinburg’s scenic and historical attributes, such as improving the Little Pigeon River’s water quality, obtaining protection on historic resources (through easements) or ownership of historic properties, exploring the possibility of land trusts for open spaces, and better planning of new, greener, more sustainable development that appeals to the nature oriented tourist. *Enhancing Town Character* specifically deliberates on the aesthetic details of Gatlinburg’s appearance. For example, this chapter analyzed the visual aspects of all vehicular approaches to the city and advocated switching local sign focus to park and nature oriented activities as well as streamlining their design (figure 19). Some of these recommendations were made as early as the 1960s/70s by local architect Hubert Bebb. Development of an “Urban Design Study,” the broadest goal, intended to offer principles/guidelines for Gatlinburg becoming a more sustainable community and illustrates the transformative effects of good design and community effort (example following these principles, figure 20). Another tenet of that plan includes comparing Arrowmont and the National Park to two bookends with the goal of improving everything in between to be just as aesthetically worthwhile (Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation Website).
The rapidly established Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation immediately began working towards these goals; local newspapers such as the *Mountain Press* and the *Knoxville News-Sentinel* praised the organization for the progress of specific action teams. The GGF website quotes the organization: “We understand that for lasting change to occur, the citizens of a community must agree about what they want their future to be and work together making it happen. The [Gatlinburg Gateway] Foundation and its partners are here to assist and encourage that effort.” The Heritage Marketing action team designed and published “A Walking and Driving Tour of Historic Gatlinburg and Vicinity” brochure complete with historical summaries and photographs of 42 various Gatlinburg sites available at all local welcome centers (see Appendix E for full document). Figure 20 illustrates the First and Lasting Impressions action team’s progress with aesthetic upgrades to city entrances and work continues on creation of a pedestrian mall. The Air Quality action team educates local youth and promotes clean air solutions and Green Power (support for renewable energy) for both residents and businesses. These
incentives are highly similar to the *Williamsburg-ing* of Chapel Hill where a unified design aesthetic for the commercial Franklin Street area was chosen. Here the effect of the overall streetscape and continuous façade are the key aspects visitors respond to. Additionally, this *Williamsburg-ing* has:

created an architectural character in the downtown area that is much easier to recognize and to deal with than are the more subtle elements of character present in most communities. In that regard, the illusion has become the reality (Lea, 1979, p. 19).

Not only does this article apply to the Gatlinburg community’s current efforts of working toward such a cohesive effect as that obtained by Chapel Hill, but also to the Gatlinburg aesthetic/Tourist Vernacular that evolved, primarily at the hand of Hubert Bebb at mid-century through its community-wide acceptance.

Additionally, the Museum of the Glades action team in 2002 was working toward the establishment of the Great Smoky Arts and Crafts Museum and Cultural Arts center, with a 100-year-old house donated locally and intended for the museum’s welcome center (Grimm, 2002). A public-private partnership jointly administered by the White House Millennium Council and National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Save America’s Treasures program officially sanctioned the project (Grimm, 2002). Local artist Jim Gray’s rendering of the new 21,000 square foot, three story museum unveiled the design in 2003. According to the president of the Great Smoky Mountains Arts and Crafts foundation, the style of the building, especially its combination brick and stone façade truly represents “Old Gatlinburg” (Grimm, 2003). This museum indicated the new
geo-tourism trend according to the commissioner of tourist development for Tennessee. Geo-tourism focuses on the “safer, back to nature type of experience that draws families together- including hands on activities and showing our heritage to their kids” says Whitaker (Grimm, 2003). Intended to occupy a 1.3 acre plot of land on Gatlinburg’s historic craft trail located on Glades road, the museum was to be very near two other historic crafts’ shops: Cliff Dwellers Gallery (moved from its original downtown location in an act of preservation) and the Alice Moore Gallery. This project not only represented new trends in tourism, but also the city’s endeavor to define a local architectural aesthetic.

Theoretical work by a combination of preservation and tourism scholars grounds the various tourism and heritage agendas brought forth by the GGF, the chamber of commerce, the Greening of Gatlinburg Initiative, and several other organizations and studies. As one of the primary incentives for developing this thesis and central to the future visual shape of Gatlinburg, these organizations’ goals of defining sense of place, an explicit architectural form/style, and outlining a set of principles for good new development, good business, and good environmental stewardship all informed the face of modern day Gatlinburg. The discussion of the city’s development, from the turn of the twentieth through twenty-first century offers but a glimpse of the forces at work shaping the city; however, that development combined with a joint local/regional historical summary places the structures proposed for analysis in context. Understanding the multitude of influences on the built form, key to finding and defining Gatlinburg’s architectural aesthetic or the Tourist Vernacular, remains the goal of this thesis.
Again, heritage tourism and historic preservation theory, as well as ideas on experience of place, are the foundation of current citywide efforts and have also influenced previous phases of development. The next chapter more explicitly explains those theoretical underpinnings of Gatlinburg’s evolving built environment and the formulation of this thesis as well as scholars instrumental in the development of this study’s methodology.

Summary: A Timeline of Gatlinburg Events:

- 1850s- White Oak Flats Settlement renamed as Gatlinburg
- 1912- Founding of Pi Beta Phi Settlement School
- 1926- New Arrowcraft Shop (with catalog in 1930s) & authorization of GSMNP
- 1928- State Highway across Smokies opens.
- 1930s- Shops of Glades area/historic craft loop published maps and brochures.
- 1931- Gatlinburg selected for GSMNP Headquarters.
- 1935- 500,000 people visit Gatlinburg, first telephones.
- 1939- Gatlinburg Tourist Bureau.
- 1940- National Park Dedication. Gatlinburg Chamber of Commerce.
- 1941- Bedspace in Gatlinburg ~ 1200.
- 1945- City of Gatlinburg Incorporated. School of Summer Crafts at Settlement School.
- 1946- GSMNP visitation again tops 1 million after 1943 low of 383,000 visitors.
- 1949- Bedspace~ 5,000.
• 1952- City Planning Department, City Advertising Department.

• 1960s- Formation of Regional Planning Commission.

• 1998- The Sonoran Report.

• 1999- Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation-“formed to bring about community based initiatives that will enhance Gatlinburg as a model Gateway community to the park.”

• 2004- Gatlinburg Vision Statement.


CHAPTER III
UNDERSTANDING THE GATEWAY COMMUNITY OF GATLINBURG

After discussing the historical and physical influences on the Gatlinburg area and the organization of this thesis, the theoretical underpinnings of many of those influences, ideas, and general history covered in the previous chapter will now more fully be discussed. Topics of particular note include: the economic pros and cons of tourism, tourism’s myriad connections with preservation and history, the benefits of those connections (economical, social, psychological, and environmental), a more complete explanation of how buildings need to meet certain social and psychological requirements, the perception of landscape and its symbolism, and scholarly influences on methodology.

Economics of Tourism

Studying Heritage tourism’s effectiveness in certain geographic locations increasingly proved it successful as an avenue of historic preservation. As a holistic movement encompassing town history and structure, heritage tourism’s resulting economic benefits provide numerous reasons in its support (Rypkema, 1997). On the rise overall, tourism now indicates status, much the same as how material possessions typically convey image (Urry, 2002). Progressively, people desire more interactive travel experiences that offer more than just typical sightseeing and shopping. Tyler (1994)
claims the importance of heritage tourism lies in the combination of historic preservation, tourism, and what he terms “experience industries,” defined as having interaction as a key element of the experience- with other individuals, the built environment, and local culture. As one of the leading incentives for creating interpretive cultural and historical experiences, this fact makes heritage tourism and preservation accessible on a larger scale and imparts historical viability and interest which ensures preservation in some form. Tyler also professes the industry’s rapid growth implies people’s interest and underlying need for more fulfilling, less homogenous travel experiences.

Interest in heritage and historic sites provides the needed incentive, especially from an economic perspective, for preserving an area’s unique structures and heritage through historic preservation. The idea of a profitable historic property appeals to many investors and entrepreneurs, which thus explains the rise in popularity of house museums, bed and breakfasts, and adaptive use projects that further contribute to the historic presence of their town’s community identity. Brink (1998) discusses positive statistics for many areas that strongly link tourism and heritage with the preservation of their historic built environment, such as increased business revenues. Several challenges coexist with the positive aspects of successfully implementing heritage tourism into a local community such as: maintenance of the building’s authenticity and presented heritage, preservation and protection of resources, ensuring that sites hold interest, and finding fit and balance between tourism and the community (Brink, 1998). With such struggles applicable and visible to Gatlinburg, much work has been done to move the city towards that balance. Defining a regional or local vernacular, enhancing Gatlinburg’s local
character and sense of place, and preserving unique resources are now current priorities according to documents such as the Gatlinburg Vision Statement, Priority Gatlinburg Study, and the Architectural Guidelines for the Commercial Corridor. These documents go into specific detail on aesthetic, architectural, environmental, and business improvements. For example, through its mission statement, addressing aesthetics, business development, environment, heritage, quality of life, and traffic and transportation, the Gatlinburg Vision Statement claims:

We are vibrant community that honors our mountain heritage and embraces our responsibility as the gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. We are a community that is dedicated to living up to the natural beauty of our location by assuring that the built environment compliments the natural environment. We are a nationally known premier mountain destination and resort and the entrance to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. We will continually strive to be a community that cherishes and protects the natural beauty of our environment and works proactively on a local level. We are a Southern Appalachian community that is proud of our unique heritage, and respect and preserve the rich legacy of our ancestors (2004).

Many of these notions run through several of the documents mentioned above, further weaving a consistent goal and image of Gatlinburg into current efforts.

Heritage Tourism and Place Experience

A 1990 pilot program for various cities in Indiana, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin resulted from increased interest in heritage tourism. The program monitored the problems and successes of a unified movement of heritage tourism and preservation in certain locales (Mooney-Melvin, 1991). All areas that see heritage tourism as either a
preservation incentive or a means of enhancing their local economy need to be aware of some possible negative impacts, many revealed through the study. Problems of over-use/capacity for use, over-commercialization, inconveniencing local residents, and false representations/commodification of history and heritage arose as concerns. Mooney-Melvin concluded that heritage tourism can be successfully and sensitively employed when a compromise is reached defining the limits of tourist accommodation. These programs can offer successful models of comparison for Gatlinburg for achieving a balance and threshold of accommodation.

Barthel (1996) further elaborates on the complexities of heritage tourism in connection to preservation. Barthel discusses history’s rising commodification and how it has become simply a new profit-making scheme in many ways as opposed to being respectfully interpreted history for its own sake. Seeing commercialization of the past as an obvious extension of modern consumer culture, she defines this consumption as serving a different purpose: a purpose strongly grounded in American culture’s propensity for nostalgia and also the belief that “consumerism still carries with it the shadow of moral and spiritual longings unmet and unsatisfied by modern society (Barthel, 1996, p.118). Revealed as the key idea, these modern consumers now look for something different than what other, more typical consumption offers them. Again a valid point for Gatlinburg, when business owners, builders, scholars, etc. consider the image chosen for advertisement, available products, as well as that of the built form.

Barthel describes the meaning and identity people apply to historical objects, souvenirs, memorabilia, or other items and how those items serve a purpose
psychologically in regard to identity formation. These items then yield a tangible connection to a positive memory of a place or event in the past, which further illustrates how peoples’ need for connection link these broad concepts of history, commodification, and consumption. Media influence affects the process of commercialization and homogenization of history as well as the creation of “heritage machines” — where local history and landscape is enhanced or entirely invented for profit. This is not to say successful examples do not exist, but rather that motives can easily cause instances of heritage tourism to go awry. The city of Santa Fe serves as a good example of what a mutually supportive relationship between preservation and tourism can create. Desiring their city to be a tourist mecca, much like Gatlinburg’s own goal, community leaders chose the face of their town through “speculative restorations, select preservation projects, and the removal of overt signs of Americanization,” thus transforming, depending on your point of view, the city into “a proto-Disney, Spanish-pueblo fantasy, or sustained a vibrant regional architectural tradition in the face of modernism” (Wilson, 2004, p. 185). Taking the Santa Fe study as a cue, increased emphasis on various elements of the Tourist Vernacular/Gatlinburg Aesthetic could easily have similar results through community-wide collaboration.

Rypkema (1997) further elaborates on the opportunities historic preservation offers to smaller towns, specifically offering the example of the crafts-oriented mountain communities of western North Carolina. Rypkema stressed the overlap of the crafts community with historic preservation; how the historic buildings provide an added layer of authenticity and ambience for the businesses they house. The crafts community of
western North Carolina provided $122 million annually at the time of this study, a significant economic contribution. Retail stores located in historic structures supplied the key venues of crafts sales and were also strongly linked to tourism. Rypkema also noted that “the experts in the craft industry recognized that using the quality and character of western North Carolina’s historic resources is the best reflection of the quality and character of western North Carolina’s crafts” (p. 21). Honesty in products and place reinforces overall authenticity when a strong, connective relationship exists. Furthermore, relationships such as these where the use of a historic building truly reinforces the image and goals of the enterprise it houses only enhances a town’s distinct character.

Ward (1998) approaches the concept and experience of place more from a marketing perspective. He discusses the broad concept of place selling, promotional strategies used to attract visitors, provides specific case studies as examples, and makes the case that motives are a key factor for selecting travel destinations. Ward states:

In the late 20th century, it is well known that many post-industrial cities are busily investing in ‘high culture’ as a deliberate promotional strategy, to draw in tourists and encourage business investment. Over a century ago, British cities were…spending large sums on much the same material things: libraries, concert halls, art galleries and museums. Yet the motives then were very different, concerned more with demonstrating the success of industrial civilization…(p. 3)

Although not the primary goal, enticing tourists was certainly perceived as an added benefit. Similarly aligned with these ideas of sense of place, place experience, and tourism, Tuan’s (1977) work deals with the constructs, interpretation, and means of experience itself: physically, mentally, and psychologically. Tuan takes various concepts
relevant to designers, architects, and planners, such as the nebulous notion of sense of place, and breaks them down into their experiential components to better understand how such perceptions of space and place are formed. Urry (2002) also discusses place experiences, but terms them “pseudo-events;” he defined these as inauthentic, contrived attractions that substitute for reality to the tourist. He explains the reasoning for this is tourism’s voyeuristic and intrusive nature, so reality must be staged as an act of privacy. This statement then suggests as a valid assumption that these pseudo-events naturally result from the “social relations of tourism and not from individual search for the inauthentic” (p. 9).

Suvantola (2002) builds on Tuan’s premises and applies them to tourists from a humanistic geographer/post-structuralist perspective. Tourism, extensively studied by scholars across many fields, lacks an interpretation of perceptual formation; Suvantola attempts to fill this void in previous scholarship. He claims that “place experiences are integral to what tourism is about and such concerns have been central to sociological research on tourism;” his book expounds by “treat[ing] the topic of tourist’s experience of place in such a way that the concern with structures of meaning precede the analysis of personal meanings” (Suvantola, 2002, p. 3). In simpler terms, the post-structuralists look for why something was experienced a certain way; humanists look for the meaning of experiencing something a certain way (Suvantola, 2002). This combination proves crucial because, although tourism exists in many ways as a form of consumption within the

---

2 A humanistic geographer uses qualitative methods to understand how people perceive places and rejects econometrics—the statistical measure of human behavior. Post-structuralists believe that self-perception plays a critical role in one’s interpretation of meaning.
confines of pre-defined constructs, the internalized, individualized experience often still fulfills a dream or wish wherein that personal meaning and means of experience is very important. By defining the concept of “referential totality” Suvantola’s scholarship explores how new experiences, such as those achieved as a tourist, become “assimilated,” familiarized, and then finally hold meaning. In towns devoutly maintaining tourism as the primary economic base, understanding how a tourist perceives sense of place would be beneficial (as opposed to how they were intended to), especially recognition of the impact of architecture on that sense of place and overall experience.

The various means of experience can also be tied not only to buildings but to the visual aesthetics of a landscape as well. Berleant (1992) calls for a redefinition of landscape because of its typical perception as nature, as something separate from us, as a container for living; this definition needs broadening and a reduction in its amount of inherent objectification. He believes “that there is an aesthetic aspect to our experience of every environment, the commercial strip as much as the bucolic landscape, … [I]ke the inclusiveness of nature, this does not confer an automatic endorsement; it raises the greater responsibility of developing critical judgment by determining the aesthetic value of an environment against the successes and fulfillment of that experience” (Berleant, 1992, p. 11). Balancing tourism and landscape and understanding aesthetics is highly relevant and especially applicable to Gatlinburg. With nature as a town’s primary draw, the unique beauty of the area can no longer attract people if removed to create hotels and shopping outlets to accommodate them. Not only important to appreciate the aesthetic

Referential totality is defined as: everything in the subjective world exists only as having reference to other things and to us, and thus we must construct the references before these things hold value for us, p.15.
influence and value of landscape experience, but an understanding of some of the underlying forces at work that led to the formation of the modern landscape offer much insight as well.

*Landscape Perception*

The 1787 National Land Survey’s initial system of organizing and platting off land into square mile plots covered the vast majority of the United States from the Ohio River to the Pacific Ocean. Not meant to implicitly dictate settlement formation or city development, Jackson (1994) claims the grid most efficiently, equitably, and simply distributed land. Although intended for further refinement by residence and community planners, many locales used this grid as the basis of their settlement pattern. The grid formation often determined the layout of modern transportation related infrastructure, and in the mid twentieth century, highways intersected at various points across the country in a similarly inspired formation. Time passed, the pace of road construction increased, and roads of the past generation no longer respected the initial system of organization, local topography, or the existing built environment. In short, “[the modern road] is creating its own architecture: short-lived, eager to conform to the new type of traffic and to discard its old symbols and any hint of history” (Jackson, 1994, p. 9). This focus on vehicular accessibility changed the face not only of the urban layout, but building design and means of access, and the ways in which daily tasks are performed.

The initial grid system itself might not be too applicable to Gatlinburg, but the immense focus on vehicular accessibility certainly contributed to the development of the built environment. Gatlinburg strives to maintain downtown’s walkability, yet another
old urban concept again in favorable light, while the rest of the city and surrounding areas struggle to accommodate the intense visitor traffic. Bypasses and an infinite number of road widenings take their own toll on the local landscape as well. For example, in the Gatlinburg area, one of the most comprehensive road widening projects (and straightening) of late has been Veteran’s Boulevard on behalf of Dollywood’s patrons. It connects Dolly Parton Parkway in Sevierville to right outside the spur (a roadway entering town that is park territory) leading into Gatlinburg. To be specific, the new road ends in front of one of Dollywood’s ticketing houses in Pigeon Forge. Highway 321, the road taken from I-40 outside Asheville after passing through Foothills Parkway, has also undergone a more gradual two-lane addition that leads into Gatlinburg. Both of these projects wielded a profound effect on the visual character of the surrounding environment; mountainsides have been carved back, extensive infill for grading and straightening of roadway, and in certain instances, entire hillsides were removed altogether. In response to these transportation projects, homogenized, commercial development has sprung up in many areas. All of these changes rely on the perception that abundant land resources eclipse any sense of land conservation.

The notion of land abundance for personal property persists still today, stemming from the seemingly infinite land speculation of the pioneer days. This mindset has permanently penetrated American society, visible through modern means of planning and designing: in the vast amounts of free-standing structures, lack of compact neighborhoods integrated with existing environment and downtowns, and the size of many homes, office complexes, and other sprawling commercial ventures. In the time when land truly was
abundant, enough space existed for all the necessary community components, therefore plots were not usually reserved for a plethora of specific, community minded purposes. The transience and temporality of American society also held strong through the centuries. Americans today are all too aware of the quickness with which new structures of a very finite life span consume the existing landscape (Jackson, 1994).

Jackson also believes that among the problems plaguing our modern landscape, part of the issue lies in clinging to the notion of a compact, thriving urban community while simultaneously longing for the more private, romanticized, rural lifestyle commonly perceived as the truer American ideal. The single family dwelling then consumes more space to ensure autonomy and seclusion in response to these innately contradictory goals, thus contributing to sprawling development patterns. The ubiquitous homogeneity of the American landscape resulted in a lack of ‘sense of place’ in the truer sense of the original, Latin rooted phrase. The Latin term genius loci meant that a spiritual guardian provided much of the atmosphere or unique qualities of a place. The phrase implied celebration and ritual, which throughout history, architecture often embraced. Formulation of a sense of place now often relates more to ritual events and associated memory than the physical location or significance of a space. This serves as the common means of uniquely identifying with a community and its modest, perhaps vernacular built environment, when unremarkable architecture can’t speak of sense of place in its own right (Jackson, 1994). This new interpretation of sense of place also gives an explanation for homogenous, commercially driven, uninspiring landscapes as well and is applicable to cities across the nation.
Historically, society privileged the landscape and built environment over the road. However, in the time since the automobile’s invention, the pendulum swung in favor of the car and its accessibility and thus the modern landscape has been dictated by privileging the cars’ needs over all others. Which inherently holds more value: a sense of place or the freedom the vast network of roads brings?

The answer will come when we define or redefine the road as it exists in the contemporary world; when we recognize that roads and streets and alleys and trails can no longer be identified solely with movement from one place to another…roads no longer merely lead to places; they are places (Jackson, 1994, p. 190).

The extreme versatility of the modern landscape yields certain fundamental flaws; eventually a decision will be necessary on what ultimately holds more weight to society.

Continuing the theme of landscape meaning on another vein, cultural geographer Wilbur Zelinsky (1973) studied the effect of individualism on the cultural landscape and the resulting impact on the built landscape. The notion of individualism, particularly embraced in the United States, represents a recent cultural development; until the past couple centuries, tradition had dictated people’s behavior. After industrialization and the modern era, this philosophy of individualism rests hand in hand with modernization in more advanced countries (Zelinsky, 1973). According to Zelinsky, our intense focus on individualism resulted in the doctrine of Materialism through three primary means of expression: the Frontier myth, Protestant Ethic, and the Success ethic. The role of the frontiersman implies a lone man surviving against the wilderness and the unknown; American culture still clings to this vision particularly strongly. The search for the
“vanished settlement frontier” manifests itself in many ways, not only in the physical landscape but often metaphorically. The Protestant ethic is founded on spiritual salvation and its parsimonious material manifestation. Lastly and similarly, the Success ethic hinges on the importance of individual success seen through the American way of constantly striving for material success and accomplishment. The problem lies in specifically defining what constitutes success, accomplishment, and happiness. Romanticized, idyllic, unclear goals result in a rootless individual who seeks identity through other means: through material objects, by identifying with various clubs, political, and religious organizations, etc., culminating in multiple and various homogenous groups of individuals. According to Zelinsky (1973):

[We] pay a heavy psychological price…for freedom and prosperity [through] a constant sense of insecurity. The American is born into an uncertain place in an unstable society, never quite sure of his identity thus transcending into an associative temporality with our built environment (p. 43).

The enormous proportions of American homes by universal comparison also stem from these notions. The intense cultural focus on not wasting time thus resulted in a perfection of quick and prefabricated construction methods that allowed for an evolution of specific building types to meet our cultural transience and haste. The physical manifestations of this transience inflicted a marked effect on the American built environment, especially visible in tourist towns as building styles and trends change at a heightened rate. Zelinsky (1973) more clearly illustrates with the following:
[T]aking the house and grounds as a single entity, there is the starkest kind of contrast between the American’s attitude toward his private bubble of space and that toward all public spaces. All self-respecting householders spend an inordinate amount of time caring for yard and garden and on keeping the interior as antiseptic and spotless as human ingenuity can manage. But public spaces, including sidewalks, thoroughfares, roadsides, public vehicles, parks, and many public buildings reveal a studied neglect and frequently such downright squalor that it is difficult to believe one is encountering a civilized community (p. 93).

This temporal dilemma functions in two important ways: in understanding the rootless individuals in need of a stability that many preservation scholars believe the built environment itself can provide and also that such a consumer based, standardized, super-efficient means of building affected commercial building as well as residential. The capitalistic agenda of garnering the most tourist dollars combined with cheap and easy construction is manifest in downtown Gatlinburg seen through poorly built/designated storefronts, tacked on historically irrelevant stylistic details, and an encroaching uniformity because of the economy of standardization. Local organizations currently work to overcome many of these issues.

Jay Appleton (1990) further delves into landscape meaning and experience from a different perspective: by analyzing how human beings experience space and inherent meanings of spatial configurations in conjunction with the importance of individual memory. Scale, context, and prediction (where certain features are concealed/revealed and can invoke specific responses) are conceptually very important regarding the human experience of landscape; drawings illustrate his work through different scenarios. Appleton discusses how many landscapes and most structures innately hold prospect/refuge meaning and also symbolically represent their functionality to observers.
Additionally, simply challenging the imagination or invoking curiosity can be achieved through the “deflected vista:” where a route of travel is realized but broken regardless of medium (whether natural, architectural, or otherwise). All relevant to modern planning and design, perhaps re-embracing these concepts will effect a change in the built environment, whether urban or rural.

Although landscape meaning and perceived symbolism offers a critical viewpoint necessary to consideration of Gatlinburg, meaning and symbolism can also be given or manifest through certain building forms, styles, or other actions that affect the physical environment. The era of progressive reform embraced the idealistic notion that architecture could influence society and the morals held by its members; Gatlinburg’s story and progress would not be complete without a more detailed summary of this social reform movement. The arts and crafts culture reveals yet another important facet that informed Gatlinburg’s built environment, as well as Southern Appalachia’s history, with various elements hybridized that reappear throughout the rest of the century. This topic too was touched on in the previous chapter, but more fully discussed here, especially in social and cultural aspects and comparisons.

Arts and Crafts Culture

Previous scholarly works set the stage for preliminary research on the development of a widely recognized image of Appalachia by highlighting settlement
schools, a trend at the turn of the twentieth century. Despite the fact that Appalachia was indeed relatively isolated (for geographic region, see figure 21) and contained many poor, uneducated mountaineers, the vision of Appalachia presented to American Society was largely exaggerated and romanticized, and thus provided the impetus for the progressive social reformers of the time. Very popular during the Progressive Era due to revival/implementation of ‘local’ arts and crafts in connection with slower, simpler ways of mountain culture and society, the settlement school movement also coincided with the national Arts and Crafts revival.

The settlement schools of Southern Appalachia evolved out of a combination of the Progressive social reform movement (and its initial urban social settlements) and the Freedmen’s schools (a similar movement that provided education for blacks) of the South after the civil war (Becker, 1998). The primary agenda of settlement schools aimed to educate the needy in isolated mountain regions, their education consisted primarily of vocational, agricultural, and domestic sciences, as well as the re-teaching traditional native crafts and other aspects of their own culture. These teaching methods helped improve the mountaineers’ quality of life through provision of practical experience applicable to a rural agricultural economy (newspaper acknowledgment, figure 22). The goods produced from such craft programs provided cash income for a struggling
economy and helped maintain the school; common to many settlement schools, this craft production became generally known as “fireside industries” (Becker, 1998).

Whisnant (1983) and Becker (1998) wrote pivotal works analyzing this imposed, (often perceived as contrived) arts and crafts culture and its very marketable products. These two scholars delved deeper into the creation of a stereotypical, commodified mountain culture and the various influences on the creation of that culture as presented to the larger realm of society. Although based on some true traditional skills, settlement schools imposed new ideas or improved much of what was marketed. Many of these improvements centered on aesthetics and increasing marketability. Despite these changes and the monetary incentive, the image of mountaineers crafting in their spare time through traditional means proliferated. That image represented continuity with an ancestral past and heritage without the effects of the industrialized era.
Through the willingness of local participation in this program and its economy, the settlement schoolteachers defined the identity of the local people and an area.

Particularly interested in these impacts and the timing of this cultural intervention, Whisnant states:

[for such a conception of social change to be imported to the southern mountains, cloaked in a mantle of romantic and cultural revitalization, and legitimized for the general public at the very time when the region was undergoing convulsive social, economic, and political upheaval [early 20th century’s massive industrialization] became an enormously important fact in its history (1983, p.16).]
Orabsli (2000) feels that the crafts industry requires flexibility and adaptation; it evolves to reflect various aspects of contemporary lifestyles while still providing a link to the past. In his mind, historic buildings are of a similar tradition, believing that “the value of craft that has gone into each building represents human value” (p. 185). The social and psychological implications represent society’s overarching need for continuity—with their past, their town, their environment—and that continuity’s role in people’s comfort, stability, and formation of identity. However, regardless of the nature of crafts in the area, the crafts themselves, settlement school workers, and the facilities housing both played a pivotal role in the development and evolution of a Southern Appalachian identity.

Hardie (2007) also looked at the presentation of mountain culture, though in a different media. She addresses Dollywood’s themed space and its packaged presentation of mountain culture that is part fantasy and part documentary. Dollywood is Tennessee’s most popular attraction and also Sevier County’s largest employer (p. 24). Hardie discusses the disorienting nature of the park, a characteristic also distinctly visible in the surrounding landscape of Pigeon Forge and Gatlinburg outside the theme park. She claims:

Dignity- the prerogative…of the natural landscape- isn’t sensible to the tourist. The landscape itself loses its evocative potential…precisely as the tourist experiences the indignity of a man-made landscape. … The loss that might be attributed to residents—of home or semi-secluded locality, across the decades is reassigned to the tourist (Hardie, 2007, p. 31).

It is interesting here to see her interpretation of Dollywood’s impact on the area’s image and sense of place. The dizzying effect of the theme park and nearby area attractions
provides a sharp contrast to most advertisements; the images chiefly capitalized on
portray the beauty and serenity of the area and especially the National Park. Gatlinburg is
not excluded from the applicability of her analysis simply because Dollywood is located
in Pigeon Forge; on the contrary, it contains many smaller scale attractions that induce a
similar effect.

In Gatlinburg, the image of Appalachian culture is packaged and sold in varying
forms depending on venue. However, the exploitation and commercialization of that
culture resulted in physical manifestations that differ from other examples of more
sympathetic, genuine interpretations of local history and culture, whether imposed or not.
Orbasli (2000) offers an optimistic outlook: if Gatlinburg would focus on its natural
resources and specific local history, he feels that the variety achieved over the years
would confer an appealing depth that new structures lack. With much of its mid-century
architecture influenced by Hubert Bebb’s work, Gatlinburg holds a unique aesthetic that
could certainly be enhanced through selective design decisions. He notes that the tension
between old and new and authentic local culture versus marketed local culture can
optimally play a definitive role in sense of place. This will prove interesting for the visual
analysis portion of this study as there are multiple influences: local, national, commercial,
etc. The variety in form, type, and style is, however, part of Gatlinburg’s image and
landscape and should be analyzed as such, keeping motivations in mind.
Visual Analysis of Cultural Landscapes

Several scholars influenced this thesis’ methodology; scholar Robert Maxwell provided the most useful lens through which to view the building sample set and context. Maxwell (1996) analyzes the formalities of architecture as a public art claiming that its location, often precariously balanced, lies between abstraction and representation/functionality. Architects, in their media, must yield to social conventions substantially more than other art forms. The process of invention and acceptance for new architectural forms entails appealing much more to the common assumptions of rational, socially acceptable, functional, traditional architecture. Fleshed out in his book, Maxwell’s two-way stretch theory illustrates how and why architectural forms are not easily altered and the general process that works for the acceptance of these new forms. Because of the importance of context, location, and style as factors and the fact that architecture stands as a long-lasting art—and an expensive, highly used, and visually apparent art form in society and culture at that, much more caution is shown. The two-way stretch theory explains how most new architectural types, or hybrid forms, become accepted because they simultaneously reference the past and the future. These hybrids do not completely abandon commonly accepted forms or values, but rather expound, re-interpret, and re-contextualize historical precedents. Maxwell asserts that:

If architecture was always determined by function and economy, it would tend towards an anonymous uniformity, yet in practice it betrays considerable variety from one country to another and from one designer to another. To the extent that the physical determinants are important, they are already varied by different cultural components. To the extent that each case is unique, it is already contaminated by cultural universals (Maxwell, 1996, p. 87).
Maxwell also correlates his philosophy with architect Emilio Ambasz who described the architectural process in a traditional world in the 1960s. He felt new architectural forms could only be developed in reference to what has come before them. The architect does not create in a vacuum and new work will undoubtedly reference existing work. Specifically, Ambasz saw a hierarchy, whereby a new form followed a set process. The new prototype referenced an existing standard before being accepted or absorbed as its own type, after which, when enough time had passed, it would culminate in a stereotype and the loss of original value as an archetype. Maxwell claims “we exist in a dialectical space between innovation and the recuperation of values…suspended between past and future, neither of which do we truly know, but only as hypotheses, interpretations” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 10). According to Coleman (2005), scholars of various fields study the connections between past and future and the variety of ways that interweaving between realms manifests physically and the resultant impact those physical manifestations of history and culture have on daily life. He also feels that too many architects and developers produce buildings far too un-extraordinary that offer no creative interaction or inspiration. To further reiterate:

Although architects now typically neglect social forms in their architecture, social scientists and anthropologists continue to study them for clues to how individuals and groups occupy spaces and relate to artifacts. The ongoing patterns of life that link past and future with tradition and innovation form an intelligible web that individuals and collectives both make and find themselves within. Architects once gave tangible form to these settings, but with the shift of architectural concern to a nearly exclusive preoccupation with arbitrary beauty, the appeal of such problems has diminished to the point of nearly withering away (Coleman, 2005, p. 13).
Heath (2001) documented the evolution of the Massachusetts mill town of New Bedford using an extensive array of visual materials including: maps, building plans and elevations, landscape plans, photographs, as well as personal recollections/memory. The ways in which he chronologically analyzed the built form and its changes over time through use of visual documents provides insight and a useful model for studying similar visual materials. His comparison of different sources provided different perspectives to his research as well; for example, the blueprints illustrate the architect’s original intent while photographs more accurately depict what was built and the surrounding context. Importantly, Heath’s definition of sense of place linked the concept inextricably with memory and local identity. Cultural and regional expressions serve as key elements in Heath’s concept of “Patina of Place,” defined as cumulative layering of tangible and intangible qualities such as weather, smells, sounds, colors, contours, patterns, etc. rendered in physical form. Heath claims that these forms simultaneously carry much more meaning that that of purely physical space. “Place is more than geographically definable space…it is a mental construct different for each of us and tied, from youth, to personal experience” (Heath, 2001, p.178). Heath’s work is especially relevant to this study, as my childhood memories not only inspired this work but provided valuable insight on Gatlinburg’s built environment, its character, and further illustrated the depth of influence Bebb’s work wielded on my memories of home. Heath’s work provides a way into Maxwell’s “two-way stretch” but both rely on investigations based on visual evidence.
Alison Isenberg (2004) provides an additional model for analyzing another form of visual evidence—postcards from her era of study. Isenberg analyzes several avenues of evidence, one of the primary sources being hand lithographed postcards. The postcards not only show the streetscape but reveal the idealized image city and town planners as well as local businesses desired for the community. Commercial artists at the time colorized these photographs by hand and tidied them so they were more cohesive and visually pleasing. These artists reinforced the beautification of urban life and promoted the ideal of downtown Main Street. “It was in the post-cards that the link between downtown improvements and advertising reached its fullest fruition—in the purposeful manufacture and dissemination of the image of a streetscape of entrepreneurs presiding over a beautified commercial corridor” (Isenberg, 2004, p. 44). Isenberg’s analysis of the postcard image, (a desirable, aesthetically pleasing image) offers a model in undertaking the visual analysis of a collection of Gatlinburg post-cards, which constitute much of the data for visual analysis, and other promotional materials and brochures.

In addition to her examples of visual analysis, Isenberg also provides a framework for understanding how and who is shaping the downtown landscape. She feels that regardless of whether or not the concept of Main Street was ever truly authentic, its creation remains authentic because it represents a chosen hierarchy of values. In other words, the “fact [is] that what Americans choose to do with their downtowns is an authentic statement of the nation’s values and its visions of the future” (Isenberg, 2004, p. 315). She illustrated this notion in her study through the review of women’s initial role in aesthetic elements of the streetscape, planning, and maintenance, and their belief in the
positive effect of a clean, visually ordered and cohesive downtown. She does not see the overall problem here as a desire for profits and development, but rather one of human initiative and the form it takes.

Rose (2001) provides a broader means of analyzing visual data. By seeing images on multiple levels, she believes larger insight can be gained regarding visual culture. She stresses that not only is the image important for illustrating or supporting textual information, but that meaning lies in the image itself as well. She discusses the sites of an image: production location, the physical limits of what the image itself contains, and the image’s location in regard to interaction or audience. She also develops another analytical facet that she terms modalities or levels of interpretation. The notion of composition offers itself as an example of modality, wherein layout, colors, and other formal qualities are evaluated.

Jakle and Sculle’s (2004) methodology in their visual analysis of signs’ roles in the American landscape also offered insightful forays into classifying and interpreting visual information. Specifically the analysis of signs as a reflection of aspects of culture, such as consumerism, community identity, or other values that were deemed collectively important, offered a framework for viewing certain characteristics of the landscape. Through their work, they study different types of signs of course, and different goals and associations obviously exist between the analysis of a billboard and its imagery as opposed to that of a small town’s bed and breakfast. The over-arching theme persists that despite the variety in type, signs, as well as the visual environment in general, exist as important factors in the association and acknowledgment of place meaning. Additionally,
because of signs’ assertiveness, they are deemed very important as a visual cue to such place meaning.

All of these works weave together the general concepts central to this thesis of tourism, preservation, historical connections and authenticity, psychological needs, and the value of landscape and the built environment and give a broad scholarly context that leads the researcher by example. This study parallels portions of the methodologies previously mentioned as well as the work of other scholars discussed. The next chapter delves into details of the study itself, its composition, and means of completion and provides another brief overview of the researcher’s intent.
CHAPTER IV

THE TOURIST VERNACULAR AND THE TWO-WAY STRETCH

The Great Smoky Mountains, the most highly visited of all of the National Parks, attracted tourists to Tennessee as early as the late nineteenth century despite its geographic isolation. Gatlinburg serves as the Park’s official gateway, the city itself a quite popular tourist destination. Tourism increased in parts of southern Appalachia and Gatlinburg much more steadily as railroads for the timber industry industrialized the area and brought accessibility and accommodations to the locale. As awareness of the area increased, due to tourism and rallying for designation as a National Park, the state also acknowledged the area’s deficiencies in educational opportunities. To rectify this situation, the Pi Beta Phi sorority launched a large-scale philanthropic effort and founded a settlement school in Gatlinburg in 1912. As the school stabilized and its program grew, its focus shifted from general education to reviving and enhancing local arts and crafts and industrial education. With students’ output marketed as the chief product of the effort, Gatlinburg became synonymous with handcrafts and folk art, despite its nineteenth-century agrarian roots. Downtown development rose in response to increased tourism and accommodation needs; this economic growth significantly responded to the arts and crafts aesthetics espoused by the school, with many shop owners selling local artisan’s wares. These events set the stage to truly cement Gatlinburg as a tourist
town by the end of the third decade of the twentieth century, as well as conflating the quaint notion of crafts and folk art with the image of the city. All that was left was the development of a consistent visual aesthetic for the variety of architectural forms located downtown.

Limitations

Through survey, research, and visual analysis, this study sought to document the area’s development and identity, as well as its historic and architectural contexts to identify local architectural phases and trends, and determine when Gatlinburg’s mountain village aesthetic developed, herein labeled the Tourist Vernacular. Chronologically, the study began with the founding of the Pi Beta Phi Settlement School in 1912 and ended with the buildings constructed in the three decades following the dedication of the National Park in 1940. The settlement school period truly marked the beginning of consistent downtown construction and the three decades following park dedication experienced heavy developmental growth during which the formation of the built environment shifted and evolved, paralleling the creation of Gatlinburg’s identity. Based on these notions, this time period defined Gatlinburg’s perceived image, and the architectural form and styles of that period physically represent the city’s newly established identity.

Geographically, the study included buildings on the main frontage of Parkway or River Road, beginning with the Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts campus near the intersection of Cherokee Orchard Road, Parkway, and River Road, up to Historic Nature Trail Road (previously Airport Road), approximately one half mile; refer to the
Gatlinburg map shown on the next page. Inside these study boundaries, the researcher undertook a more detailed building/structural survey of seminal buildings constructed between the mid 1930s and 1970, the defining era of Gatlinburg’s image, including an assessment of scale, form, style, materiality, and other visual features that brought the tourist image into the material world.

Figure 23. **Gatlinburg Map: Locations of Buildings Proposed for Study.** Image created by author using google maps.

1-Arrowmont Campus    4- Smokyland Motel    7-Candy Kitchen/Cliff Dwellers    10-Maxwell’s Restaurant
2-The Village          5-Brass Lantern       8-Trader’s Mall/Midtown Lodge    9-Gatlinburg Civic Auditorium
3-Baskin’s Square      6-Gatlinburg Inn
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Resources

The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, in conjunction with the Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts and Pi Beta Phi established a digital database to outline the history of the Progressive/settlement school movement, leading up to the inception of Pi Beta Phi’s school in Gatlinburg. The site includes some of the school’s preliminary history as well as archival photos from several teachers illustrating the development of the school and some of the surrounding area from 1912-1930’s. Later years provided a sizeable amount of postcards of the area that were analyzed for similar trends or notable architectural differences in lieu of extensive historical photographs; they offered the bulk of visual information in combination with current photographs. Together these sources provide a crucial context for how the new tourist landscape of Gatlinburg took shape in the early and mid twentieth century.

Using current photographs, the researcher scrutinized the strong design trends over time, explicitly identified buildings that maintained both presence and integrity in the Arts and Crafts aesthetic/Tourist Vernacular established in the community, and noted the current building trends, if any, that echoed the originally defined tourist image of the city or earlier building forms. In undertaking this work, the researcher reviewed National Register nominations for more specific building and site information and insight on stylistic choices where available. The analysis primarily relied on the review of current images to determine persistent stylistic trends in local buildings.

From this work, the researcher aimed to identify the vision for Gatlinburg as expressed through architecture and how this vision contributed to the transformation of
the downtown landscape. The data was reviewed and used to illustrate how much the recent work undertaken by the city correlates with what the study reveals. Additionally, the Anna Porter Public Library’s small collection of archival maps from 1937-1953 locating local businesses and families before the area’s commercialization was also helpful as well as some promotional travel brochures.

This researcher undertook the question of when Gatlinburg truly started to define its own tourist aesthetic and sought to identify specifically what that aesthetic represented, the elements that comprised it visually, and identification of the main proponents of the style. In accordance with Maxwell’s “Two-way stretch” theory, the investigator explored changes in visual elements/components of building style and form to illustrate how building archetypes in Gatlinburg transformed, leading to hybrids that defined more modern ideas and aesthetics in the local tourist vernacular. The researcher analyzed building form and style through review of a structure’s form, style, scale, materials, and decorative elements and then charted the information into visual matrices and spreadsheets for analysis. Following this detailed study, the researcher shaped an interpretation of the local tourist aesthetic based on the architecture introduced into the town, linking back to the prototype-hybrid-archetype model introduced by Maxwell. In doing so, she identified the characteristic features of the local tourist style and traced its evolution over several decades. Images of the proposed buildings for study are presented on the following three pages.
Images of the Proposed Buildings/Complexes for Analysis:


2-The Village Shopping Complex- 1968-1970

3-Baskin’s Square Shopping Center
4-Smokyland Motel- 1950

5-The Brass Lantern Restaurant-1968

6-The Gatlinburg Inn- 1937

7- Ole Smoky Candy Kitchen ca. 1965 & Cliff Dweller’s 1930s
Local maps courtesy of the Anna Porter Public Library show spikes in development (by locating existing shops and accommodations) that correspond with the chosen periods of analysis, and thus helped provide a basis for choosing certain buildings and structures to map chronologically and analyze. I chose my sample set of buildings based on the period built, the presence of stylistic references, and their continued, primarily unchanged presence and visibility from the main parkway through Gatlinburg.
These buildings serve as the most representative examples in the area of style, form, and physical expression of history; however, they are not by any means the only examples of the form, type, and styles discussed hereafter in the analysis. In order to apply Maxwell's two way stretch theory, a small set of buildings that have garnered particular historical significance in the area represent the initial development trends. They were chosen from the period of development between the settlement school and the park's inception for comparative analysis.

Historical photographs and postcards, when available, were reviewed as well and included in the research database. Examples of the types of features analyzed include materiality, color, style, detailing, height, setback, etc. The persistent focus on elements commonly reviewed in establishing architectural guidelines, whether on the local level or for becoming a National Register District, heavily influenced this study, yielding specific features for concentration. Each building was taken apart visually according to the spreadsheet and chronologically documented through various available visual materials when applicable; recognizable trends will be documented and placed in context. A few documents that helped place these structures in a historical and current context were: the *Gatlinburg: Priority* statement outlining the overall vision for the city and a process to achieve those goals, Hillsides and Ridges study (focused on protecting important viewsheds), the Gatlinburg Vision Conference, the “Greening of Gatlinburg” program, and initially proposed architectural guidelines.

Again, visual analysis was a crucial element in analyzing/looking for changes or patterns in building form/type, architectural style, type of tourist venue, and reviewing
site and landscape considerations. The visual analysis was strongly influenced by the methodology of Maxwell, Rose, Jakle, and Sculle as discussed in the literature review. Maxwell’s approach served as the core methodological influence, however, Jakle and Sculle’s analysis of meaning and connection to ideas of place through everyday objects such as signs was insightful considering the nature of downtown Gatlinburg and the overwhelming presence of such features. Jakle and Sculle’s work allowed for more understanding of how the commercial strip of downtown Gatlinburg is perceived and the meanings various aspects of that visual landscape hold.

All of these resources were combined into a research narrative that better illustrated the evolution of Gatlinburg’s built environment during the late 1930s – 1970s, highlighting the work of Hubert Bebb as a central part of that evolution. This work also placed current work and goals into a more scholarly context, posed questions on how those current efforts will effectively change Gatlinburg’s architectural presence, and what social and cultural meaning is behind the conscious decisions to improve Gatlinburg. The materials that formed my research narrative provided a more complete context for understanding the various influences on the area, in particular, the relationship between tourism and local development/decision making, and, in turn, the face of the most visited area in downtown Gatlinburg and its resulting architectural aesthetic.
CHAPTER V
SENSE OF PLACE VS. PLACE IMAGE

A reminder prefaces this section: sense of place refers not just to physical structures comprising the city, but more to an area’s native unique qualities, stylistic modes of expression, variety and quality of local businesses, and attributes of the local landscape. The nebulous notion of sense of place encompasses all the previous ideas and gathers them together as defining features of an area. Place image, while influenced by similar concepts, ultimately hinges on marketability. Cities nationwide hold specific place images in the minds of many, immediately calling to mind visions of various parts of their local landscape (whether real, romanticized, or imagined) or feelings of nostalgia just by mention of their name. Place image can make great use of an area’s natural sense of place when marketing and development are sympathetic to an area’s original character, but the greed for profit can often take precedent.

It is necessary to first more clearly explain that Gatlinburg’s built environment has long toiled between two polarities: that of solely accommodating, enticing, and entertaining tourists and the more typical commercial and residential development struggles that plague most towns. Recent efforts have attempted to overcome the two, through the belief that good design can solve them simultaneously and will not only bring in tourist revenue but also provide a better environment for residents. As a welcome avenue of improvement, this newfound insistence on the benefits of good design and
preservation followed a century of dichotomous pursuits. From the turn of the twentieth century, tourism’s role in the local economy earned it desirable locations downtown for many venues regardless of the influence of aesthetics and thorough design considerations. Historically, the settlement school’s defining models of the built form are commonly perceived as native to the area, thus naturally contributing to Gatlinburg’s sense of place, although other typical vernacular forms pre-dated these structures. With initial school buildings, built for speed and efficiency, the first long-standing structure represented larger social trends and the modern design conventions associated with those norms. Imported to the Gatlinburg landscape through the settlement school’s example and educational training, a built form came to the forefront of local development. This early influence already aimed at improvement—of local building trends, educational opportunities, arts and crafts training, and thus created a more marketable image for the city overall. As time passed, built form and local craft products shifted at an amplified pace in response to increased visitation. The images sold by business were continually updated and remarketed, heavily focused on offering the most aesthetically pleasing modern interpretation of antiquated handcrafts and accommodations with all the modern conveniences.

Throughout this analysis, building forms of both types are discussed—those built representing more local, vernacular form versus those solely created to build a desirable image. Hybrids inevitably resulted, merging the two forms, where imported or place image oriented buildings then yielded a strong enough influence to shift local built form and style. These shifts eventually led to broad acceptance of new forms, which not only
tourists, but residents as well came to identify with. This assimilation of architectural forms and styles, through combining sense of place and place image further illustrates the effectiveness of utilizing the two-way stretch model and how it is specifically manifest in downtown Gatlinburg’s landscape. This tension between sense of place and place image persisted through all the periods reviewed in the following analysis (and continues still today), and serves as a core defining aspect of Gatlinburg character.

Gathering and Organizing Data: Method

Analysis for this study involved composition of a more in-depth historical context of the Gatlinburg area’s settlement and discerning influences on city development, with intense focus on the four decades between 1930 and 1970. Historical photos and archives, local history books, an architectural inventory, and other scholarly works on the local area and Appalachian culture revealed similarities in types and styles of structures and this pattern indicated to the researcher important events during the development of the city and the historical buildings that still hold a strong presence in the built environment today. Background information combined with research on Gatlinburg’s current fueled the researcher’s curiosity and desire to define the architectural aesthetics of the Gatlinburg tourist vernacular and identify its inception, manifestations, and current influence, if any. To accomplish these goals, the researcher made several visits to Gatlinburg for documentation of various buildings, overall development, and streetscapes. Three sample sets of buildings resulted from these visits: the time of settlement school until 1949, 1950-1970, and development in the past 15 years (1994-2009). Once photographed several times individually and in context, the
researcher placed the representative buildings in a spreadsheet to define various building features. When available, historical photos and National Register nominations accompanied research as well. A photographic document of the surveyed building was also created as a partner document for visual reference.

More specifically, the researcher organized spreadsheets (example shown in figure 24) to consider the building and site characteristics in accordance with how the newly written local architectural guidelines would potentially review them. The additional photographic document supplies necessary views of the buildings (photographs taken by researcher), includes any relevant historical photos or postcards, and streetscape comparison views where possible, as documented in Ed Trout’s *Gatlinburg: A Cinderella City*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gatlinburg Inn:</th>
<th>1937 755 Parkway</th>
<th>Building Analysis</th>
<th>Building Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1/2 Significant setback to accommodate large amount of green space/landscaping and parking. Enclosed by cast iron fencing/rock wall.</td>
<td>Original bid is 3 bays, East addition is also 3 and near addition that mimics east in detail and style so to be hidden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatlinburg Inn:</td>
<td></td>
<td>windows vary in placement and size between floors and buildings on street facing facade. More variety here than in previous bids. Windows are fixed, first floors are 2nd light, 2nd 23'light, and dormers are painted, smaller light windows. Updated, enlarged since original: see Historic phase.</td>
<td>Varying roof heights and projections. The 1937 main building (South facade faces Parkway) has a side gable roof with two large projecting front gabled dormers. The virtual expansion of the 2nd floor is broken up by a projecting front that extends from south facing facade and angled L-shape extension, creating a porch. Additionally, that extension has a front gable with chimney and is of a different height than the rest of the building. The east addition is a gabled roof with 3projecting gabled dormers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wooden shingles</td>
<td>stone foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Sample Spreadsheet for The Gatlinburg Inn.
These spreadsheets began the researcher’s organized search for common physical features such as building form, roof type, materiality, detailing, etc. These features provided necessary data for the comparison of building trends from all three periods. In addition, the researcher reviewed current efforts and Gatlinburg’s goal of defining the town’s aesthetic and the heavy promotion of that image as advertised today.

Defining the Archetypes and Hybrids of Downtown Gatlinburg:
The Settlement School

Various historical events and building trends, both local and national, shaped the overall aesthetic of downtown, however, Pi Beta Phi’s Helmick House (Teacher’s Cottage) set the stage for much local development. As the precursor to downtown Gatlinburg and its commercial development, based on the methodology set forth by Maxwell the Teacher’s Cottage, or Helmick House (see figures 25 & 26), also serves as the archetype for Arrowmont’s initial development and for this early era of the town as well. The first known architect-designed dwelling in Gatlinburg, the Teacher’s Cottage laid foundational influences for many structures in Gatlinburg (Knowles, 2006). Built by two Pi Beta Phi alumnae in 1916 in a minimalistic Arts and Crafts style with bungalow form, the cottage forever marked the local landscape through its provision of current amenities, thus illustrating the modern lifestyle advocated by progressive social reformers of the time.
Not only did this building reflect a contemporary lifestyle through materiality and features, it was much more deeply indicative of the founding principles of the settlement school itself. With a poured concrete foundation, weatherboard sheathing, running water, a bathtub, and the first furnace in Gatlinburg (Knowles, 2006), the 10-room cottage held household demonstrations and functioned as a residence. Demonstration houses existed as an essential aspect of progressive social reform at the turn of the century; rural examples such as Pi Beta Phi stemmed from a more urban form known as a settlement house that aimed to better poor, often immigrant, workers.

The style and form of this one and a half story bungalow speaks to a broader architectural movement whose philosophy was well aligned with the progressive social reform movement and thus Gatlinburg’s Pi Beta Phi Settlement School: the Arts and Crafts Movement. According to Gelernter (1999), the Arts and Crafts style (also referred to as Craftsman and Organic) exemplified social reform agendas and came to be heavily associated with the movement. Emanating from revival styles, primarily the Gothic, these forms clearly spoke out against the Industrial Revolution, mechanization, and their
perceived inherent social evils. From this viewpoint, machine-made items particularly alienated the worker/operator socially and from the goods made. Many architects and designers felt they circumvented such dehumanization and anti-social mores through handmade products and furniture and virtues of the architectural form (Gelertner, 1999). It stemmed logically then, that the humanizing nature of handmade products and honesty in design would lend an influence socially, thereby making the claim that architecture and design of this type could be the catalyst for change the reformers desired to see in society.

Such an extensive repudiation of the Industrial Revolution was in play long before Alda and Elmina Wilson designed the Helmick House in the sleepy town of Gatlinburg, but all of those original philosophies were central to those that founded settlement houses and schools across the nation. Not only did the Helmick House and later structures on the campus reflect these ideals of honesty, democracy, family values, and architectural integration with nature, the cottage’s form and style more fully expressed the school’s craft based education (woodcrafts and weaving primarily formed the basis of Gatlinburg’s marketed image) was more fully expressed through such form and style. The Teacher’s Cottage, as the oldest remaining building constructed by the settlement school (Knowles, 2006), scarcely hinted at the development that soon followed, both on campus and off.

It would be more than 20 years before the settlement school campus would feel the hand of an architect again. In response to the inception of the settlement school and its first permanent structure, the firm Barber and McMurry completed many buildings and renovations both on the school’s campus and downtown. Barber and McMurry, a
locally and regionally prominent firm from Knoxville, received regional acclaim for a plethora of residences completed in the Knoxville area in the June 1930 edition of *Southern Architect and Building News*. The origins of this firm are securely tied to the area historically through the lineage of partner Charles I. Barber. His father, George Franklin Barber, settled in Knoxville in the late nineteenth century where, according to Jones (1997), he established one of the nation’s most successful architecture firms and employed roughly thirty draftsmen and twenty secretaries. Barber’s firm circulated mail order catalogs of his work, primarily of the Queen Anne style, his designs the first nationally available prefabricated mail order houses (Jones, 1997).

Barber and McMurry’s large sample of homes in Knoxville garnered acclaim in several styles. The firm’s local popularity and longstanding reputation led to several projects on the Arrowmont/settlement school campus as well as designing the Sugarlands Administrative office for the Park Headquarters in 1940. When the term of their local career drew to a close, the firm had completed seven buildings and three renovations, seven of which were on campus. Despite the large sample to choose from, the most representative and relevant buildings to this study are: the Arrowcraft shop (1940), the Sugarlands Administrative office (1940), Stuart Dormitory (1941), and the Ruth Barrett-Smith Staff house (1952).
The Arrowcraft Shop (figure 27), Sugarlands Administrative Building (figure 28), and Stuart Dormitory (figure 29), built within two years of each other, more clearly illustrate visually formal commonalities amongst themselves and in referencing the Helmick House archetype already established. The strongest link to these buildings’ precedent comes through scale and type: each is of a modest size with simple, minimal detailing on what appears as a residential structure even if not. Barber and McMurry acknowledge a broad revival influence (and are skilled in executing many revival styles), though their buildings fit the description of Colonial Revival or Rustic Revival rather
than paralleling their predecessor’s Craftsman essence. All three of these buildings, in addition to the archetype, make use of similar exterior sheathing materials such as wooden clapboards, shingles, and sandstone veneer. All are well suited to harmonize with their sites; this is partially due to landscaping, but the buildings’ forms also do not fight with their surroundings, which further blur their edges. Natural and native materials abound, with similar attention to details, material transitions, and joinery among the buildings. Note the extreme similarity in overall form of Stuart Dormitory to the Sugarland Administrative Office for the National Park. The Administrative office utilizes, however, local limestone quarried on the North Carolina side of the park and several other native materials as opposed to the shingles that sheath the dormitory (Jones, 1997). The administrative office’s roof is side-gable with attached shed roof forming a porch, of three-bay linear, winged form, with classical symmetrical organization and subtle colonial references exemplified by the porch colonnade, all defining features of this building. These overt similarities between the two buildings distill the original form introduced in the landscape and provide a strong visual connectivity between the park (also a new era of reform) and the settlement school.
The Arrowcraft Shop (figures 31 & 32), although a commercial building, maintains the same scale of Stuart and the Administrative buildings (figures 28 & 29) through material transitions on two wings of the building, which thus break up the form into similarly sized units. The Arrowcraft Shop indicates the further evolution of style (visible even from previous versions of the shop), materiality, and the built form through its prolific use of slate shingles, wooden shingles, and stone veneer. These three buildings in combination represent the unity of the initial architectural form, style, and philosophy of the settlement with that of the New Deal era and the National Park’s stylistic derivations. These influences culminate in the Ruth Barrett-Smith Staff House of 1952 with its asymmetrical, layered form of varying roof types (hips, gables, and dormers), L-shaped plan, and projecting partial screened-in porch (figure 30). The well-sited building hugs the softly sloping hillside it is placed on and is sheathed in shingles, a popular and heavily used material at that time. Extensive landscaping framed by organic, curvilinear sandstone walkways enhance the building’s rusticity. The projecting dining addition (1989) on the west end even further carries the building from its Colonial Revival roots.
Influential Movements of Settlement School Period Archetype

After the previous discussion of stylistic influences and variations in the past four buildings, the roots of those styles prove helpful in a more complete understanding of the landscape. After World War I, buildings across the United States, especially residential and more rural structures took on picturesque forms, which were perceived as much more light-hearted than the moral dictums espoused by previous progressive reformers (Gelernter, 1999). Furthermore, the precursors to the Rustic style advocated by the park began to merge during the National Park Service’s formative years of 1916-1942 (McClelland, 1998). The principles of landscape design and architecture set forth resulted from much collaboration between landscape architects, architects, engineers, and park coordinators in addition to gardening and naturalistic design movements. Evolving from principles of American landscape design, informal naturalistic design rooted in nineteenth-century gardening and landscape preservation came to dominate park form.

The primary gardening influences derived from Andrew Jackson Downing’s writings and philosophies and Frederick Law Olmstead, Sr.’s examples and philosophies of urban park design served as exemplars. Highly applicable to national park design, Olmstead’s six principles for landscape design in public parks addressed scenery, suitability, sanitation, subordination, separation, and spaciousness (McClelland, 1998). Downing’s writings and promotion of various styles, such as romantic Swiss and the Scandinavian, proved influential as well.

The intense focus on simple structures that blended well with their environment, utilized natural, local materials, often with picturesque qualities came to be referred to as
Rustic, and also became the signature style of the National Park. Elements of the Shingle (materiality) and Richardsonian Romanesque (form and materiality, such as arches and stone) styles were clearly visible in the Hybrid form. The Rustic style, however, was a fusion of more than just these two architectural movements. Designers assimilated Japanese architecture and landscape design, the Bungalow form and Prairie styles, and naturalistic gardening into the multi-faceted Rustic style. According to McClelland (1998), “plantings erased the lines between the earth and constructed features, returned construction sites to their natural condition, and overall enhanced the natural beauty of the parks,” while “naturalistic effects-including the roughened, irregular character of stonemasonry walls, the battering of boulder foundations to give them the appearance of having sprung naturally from the ground, and the overscaling of architectural features in mountainous areas” thus expressed and defined the salient characteristics of the style (p. 5).

These principles became more firmly cemented as the park service continually used them in different parks across the nation; however, the public works projects of the 1930s truly brought this style to the forefront of public awareness. McClelland states “the design principles, process, and practices of the National Park Service were institutionalized nationwide in the development of state parks in the 1930s” (p. 7). Projects now had master plans, which the National Park Service approved for Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) work, in a similar manner as architects and engineers do today. Since WPA and PWA projects aimed to employ people indefinitely, labor-intensive forms and styles were possible and heavily encouraged due to the large
availability of manpower (Gelertner, 1999). The comfort stations, camps, bridges, administrative offices and other buildings in the parks physically embody the New Deal’s social philosophy, much as settlement schools manifested the progressive reform movement. The Gatlinburg area holds many resources of both these types as well as representative examples of the more commercial sector and modern philosophies.

**Defining the Archetypes and Hybrids of Downtown Gatlinburg:**
*The Commercial Sector’s Craft Shops and Hotels*

While the settlement school campus and National Park unfolded, subsequent development on what would become the downtown strip conveyed another view of the local landscape. The Cliff Dwellers shop (figures 33 & 34), constructed in the early 1930s serves as the archetype for craft shop development and other commercial venues. Louise Edward Jones, local artist and etcher and a noted American Impressionist (Historic plaque files, Gatlinburg Planning dept.) built the shop. He donated land for the United Methodist Church designed by Barber and McMurry built directly behind the original Cliff Dwellers and now listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Cliff Dweller’s shop was deemed so important that it was relocated out to the historic Glades crafts loop in the mid 1990s (less than five miles away) instead of being demolished to make way for a new building housing Mayfield, Old Time Photo, Magnetworld, and Pizza Hut (figure 35). The new complex bears striking formal and stylistic resemblance, albeit simplified, to the original Cliff Dwellers’ shop, such an extreme act of preservation still not common in Gatlinburg.
The Cliff Dwellers still employs locally consistent materials in the stone veneer and sandstone walks, but designers tailored the overall effect to achieve a stylistic presence that demands visitor attention. The store harkens to the Rustic style on the first floor, but breaks from the typically restrained use of that and the Colonial Revival style. Instead, the form’s details refer quite explicitly to the picturesque inspired Mountain Chalet/Swiss style. The decorative gable detailing and imitation spindlework (figure 36)
on the second floor fused with ample use of wood shingles as sheathing materials further enhance the Swiss reference. The first floor of the building speaks more to the Rustic style/medieval aesthetic with stone veneer and exposed, heavily projecting beams. The formal, three-dimensional layering and variety is indicative of all the influential styles: Picturesque, Rustic, and Craftsman ideals.

Review of the Cliff Dwellers’ form logically leads to archetypes of the lodging industry, the second most dominant building form after the shops and eateries of downtown Gatlinburg’s landscape. The first four hotels (see figures 37-44) constructed truly defined an image for tourist accommodation in Gatlinburg: the Mountain View Hotel (1924), the Riverside Hotel/Motel (1925, 1937), the Gatlinburg Inn (1937), and Hotel Greystone (ca.1941).

Figure 38. Mountain View Hotel, 1952.  
Figure 39. Postcard View, Mountain View Hotel, 1962.
The owners rebuilt the Mountain View in 1924 and again in 1937, enlarged from the original lumberman’s lodge of 1916. It was one of Gatlinburg’s premier hotels until demolished to make way for Fun Mountain in 1993. Construction of the Riverside
followed shortly after the Mountain View in 1925. Built by Stephen Whaley, the Riverside originally served as a 20-room boarding house with no private restrooms and stood adjacent to a cornfield according to the historical marker essay reviewed at the Gatlinburg Planning Department.

The three-story Mountain View, visible with shingles and stone veneer (figures 37 & 38), presented itself at one of the main intersections in downtown Gatlinburg. The hotel’s site, sloped and hilly at the corner of Parkway and 441/Spur leading to Pigeon Forge historically and currently lends great street frontage for any venue at that location; it was especially beneficial for the automobile oriented upgrade of the hotel in 1937. A postcard from 1966 illustrates how the Mountain View’s various additions found sites up the hill, tucked into the surrounding landscape. The building’s central bay, side gabled and flanked by front gables, gives the result of an overall cross-gabled form. End bays projecting from the façade farther than central bay break up the overall elevation. A shed-roofed later addition, visible in a local artist’s watercolor rendering provides a more dynamic entry. The addition also has a pyramidal tower with small windows, signage, and clock. The style of the building still hinges most heavily on materiality; its stone veneer and rustic shingles remain consistent with local trends. The Mountain View’s detail also lies in the logical, rhythmic organization of the building’s form and features. Stone posts rested on a retaining wall formed a recessed front porch in between end bays that alluded to the simple organization of the Rustic style and its more restrained, colonial tones.
The original finished only a year after the second Mountain View in 1925, The new Riverside (1937) historically had a much larger parking area and landscaped turnaround (figures 39 & 40). Currently, a strip of shops block most of the hotel from direct Parkway view, although the original intent was to maintain that large street frontage. The Riverside’s minimal detailing of simple louvered, painted wood shingles in front facing gables, stone veneer, and colonial/classical organization illicit the more traditional building style of Gatlinburg. However, an updated Riverside, visible through many historic postcards, resulted from owner Bruce Whaley’s 1953 remodel, completed by Hubert Bebb. Bebb received a variety of commissions for many additions and building facelifts in the 50s and 60s and, according to Trout (1984), the remodeled Riverside offered itself as a good example of the Gatlinburg version of 1950s modern utilizing “stone, stucco, heavy timber, large expanses of glass, and clean lines” (p. 121).

The Gatlinburg Inn (figures 41 & 42) appeared next chronologically after the Mountain View and Riverside Hotels in the downtown landscape. This historic inn signaled an important moment in local and social history as well as architectural prominence. According to Aiken (1983), the Inn held the first city offices, the first large press printed newspaper, the organization of First National Bank, and the first heated, filtered pool in Gatlinburg were all part of this complex. The Gatlinburg Inn relies most heavily on formal and material variety as key aspects of its style. Elements of the Rustic style, present through the stone veneer, wood shingles, and wooden clapboarding, contrast with the more Colonial style present in the simple porch posts (added in the 50s with the overhang) that harmonize with the building’s original layout and repetition. The
stone veneer on the first floor, the projecting L-wing attached to the west end of the building on the south elevation, as well as the stone fencing and retaining wall all enhance the building’s rustic aesthetic. The underside of the flat roof’s exposed beams provides additional visual interest. The modillions visible under the roof eaves further indicate initial attention to detail and more traditional influences; the open, unboxed eaves with exposed common rafter ends add to the traditional details. The buildings added later for increased accommodation yield a Dutch Colonial feel due to consistent use of dormers and gambrel roofs (figure 42). The Gatlinburg Inn’s form and style visually transitions from the large heavy forms of most hotel structures of this period to the lighter, layered forms of the 50s and 60s.

The last of the four archetypal hotels is the Hotel Greystone (ca. 1941, figures 43 & 44). The 46-room hotel unmistakably emulates the Riverside Hotel, perhaps partly explained by the fact that developer Dick Whaley’s father established the latter facility. The plans of the two buildings and their roof forms are almost identical, the Riverside with a projecting bay on the west end and consistent, uniform roof ridge height not present on the Greystone. Organization, materials (stone veneer, wooden sheathing in gabled ends) and heavily recessed entrance with stone supports visually represents the persistence of tradition in vernacular building form and style and is also indicative of the local nature of development at this point in time as well. The Greystone Heights subdivision evolved from the vast amount of land located behind the hotel; the hotel and subdivision serve as two reminders of Gatlinburg’s special character (Historic Marker Essay, Gatlinburg Planning Dept.).
Continually updating their image, these cornerstone hotels shared the market for tourist accommodation and shaped the visual landscape consumed by tourists. The early 50s boom in visitor numbers brought improved infrastructure, a city advertising department, zoning ordinances, and, most important for this study, remodels and additions aimed at tourist convenience swept through the city (Trout, 1984). For example, 1951 brought telephone service to these four historic hotels, cable television came a mere two years later, and community restrooms and shower facilities became a thing of the past (Trout, 1984). One resource illustrates the overt attempt to capture the tourist gaze and their dollar:

The Greystone’s description of its amenities vividly painted a picture of a resort for the idle rich: “Artistically designed, in dignified stone, it is one of the South’s truly beautiful hotels. Heavily wooded hills are its background, while in front lies a wide and spacious lawn, all terraced and landscaped for beauty and enjoyment. Here you can lounge about as you wish, enjoying a grand view of the Great Smokies, sun-bathing or hiking over private trails that reach the top of the hotel’s 50-acre mountain property in the rear. Guides are available for fishing or hiking, anywhere you care to go” (Hollis, 2007, p. 191).

Trout confirms the importance of this seasonal market; 90% of local businesses depended on tourist dollars for income in the 50s. This provided a very strong incentive for businesses to maintain a good image, keep up with local styles and trends as time progressed, and stay informed as sources of architectural and stylistic influence shifted.
Architectural Influences on the Commercial Archetype

Although Barber and McMurry contributed to the Gatlinburg landscape with several buildings that offered consistent, traditional references, another architect’s work much more heavily affected Gatlinburg’s built environment: Hubert Bebb. Bebb trained in engineering at University of Colorado and rounded out his abilities with an architecture degree from Cornell. Cornell’s traditional program, established in 1871, stemmed from Beaux Arts ideals (Gelertner, 1999). Initially founded in the mid-nineteenth century, the first architecture schools often employed teachers who had taught at the Ecole de Beaux Arts in Paris. With a heavy focus on rational planning and historic accuracy pertaining to style and form, such traditional programs assisted in the wave of revival styles sweeping the nation at the turn of the century. Bebb originally worked for Armstrong, Furst, and Tilton in Chicago in the late 1940s before his move to Gatlinburg in 1950 ostensibly to retire. By 1955 Bebb and Olsen had established a thriving practice and two more firm partner exchanges later, Community Tectonics was incorporated in 1966 with an office in Gatlinburg. According to UT School of Architecture essay, “the firm’s name reflects [Bebb’s] philosophy: tectonics is defined as ‘the art and science of creating structures which are both functional and visually pleasing.’” After more than fifty years, the firm Bebb established is still going strong (Knowles, 2006).

Despite Bebb’s traditional background and love for the colonial styles, (apparent in some of his early buildings), his philosophies echoed Frank Lloyd Wright’s focus on harmonizing with the landscape through all aspects of design. Wright synthesized rational planning with the picturesque aesthetic, which he accomplished through specific visual
devices that blended with the Midwestern prairie landscape. Bebb’s work exemplifies very similar principles in a different environment; examples of his designs that better represent his aesthetic will be presented later in this section. Much as Wright did, Bebb also explored new building technologies to the fullest, his designs often characterized by a “unique split-ring roof truss system, steep rooflines, wide overhangs, cantilevers, and an early use of steel beams” (UT School of Architecture essay). These new materials and building technologies, combined with Bebb’s aesthetic philosophies, provided the means for such a fluid integration between the built and outside environment in the Gatlinburg area. Summarized on the next page is a timeline citing when various architectural resources of Gatlinburg were built and by whom, when known. This timeline serves as a recap for those structures previously discussed and also as an introduction to the vast amount of Bebb’s work through a list of projects in the Gatlinburg and surrounding area.
An Architectural Timeline:
(includes additional buildings by key architects that provided a stronger case for my conclusions)

1912-1949:
• 1916- Teachers’ Cottage, Arrowmont Campus, Alda & Elmina Wilson. (Figures 26-27)
• 1924,1937- Mountain View Hotel, Hubert Bebb. (Figures 13, 38, 39)
• 1925-Riverside Hotel. (Figure 12)
• Early 1930s- Cliff Dwellers shop, built by Louise Edward Jones. (Figures 34-36)
• 1937-Riverside Motor Lodge built by Steve Whaley, 1953 Remodel: Hubert Bebb. (Figures 40 & 41)
• 1937- The Gatlinburg Inn, built by R.L. Maples. Figures 42 & 43)
• 1937- Buckhorn Inn & Guest Houses, Bebb. (Figure 47)
• 1938- 1st United Methodist Church, Barber & McMurry.
• 1940- Arrowcraft Shop, Arrowmont Campus, Barber & McMurry. (Figure 28)
• 1940- Sugarlands Administrative Office, Barber & McMurry. (Figure 29)
• 1940- Arts & Crafts Building Renovation, Arrowmont Campus, Barber & McMurry.
• 1941- Stuart Dormitory, Arrowmont Campus, Barber & McMurry. (Figure 30)
• 1941- Hotel Greystone. (Figures 44 & 45)
• 1945-United Methodist Church.
• 1948- Jennie Nicol Health Clinic Building, now Arrowmont Business Office, Barber & McMurry.

1950-1970:
• 1950- The Smokyland Hotel, Bebb. (Figure 48)
• 1952- The Ruth-Barrett-Smith Staff house, Barber & McMurry. (Figure 31)
• 1955-57- Gatlinburg Civic Center/Mills Auditorium, Bebb. (Figures 52 & 53)
• 1959-Red Stock Barn Renovation, Arrowmont Campus, Barber & McMurry.
• 1959- Clingman’s Dome Tower, Bebb. (Figure 50)
• 1960s- Twin Islands Hotel, Bebb. (Figures 58 & 59)
• 1965- Ole Smoky Candy Kitchen, Bebb. (Figures 64 & 65)
• 1965- Trader’s Mall/Midtown Lodge, locally built, visually similar to Bebb’s work. (Figures 62-63)
• 1968-70- The Village Shops (27 shops in total), Bebb. Last few completed in 1982. (Figures 60 & 61)
• 1970- Turner Building & kiosks along parkway in front of Arrowmont, Bebb. (Figures 54-57)

1994-2009:
• Ripley’s Aquarium (Figure 76)
• Legends by Max
• Lineberger’s/Wax Museum Complex (Figure 72)
• Smoky Mountain Brewery & Restaurant (Figure 74)
• Cherokee Grill (Figure 73)
• Cliff Dwellers replacement Building. (Figure 37)

Recent examples of Trotter & Associates work:
• Maxwell’s Seafood (Figure 70)
• Tanger/Five Oaks Shopping
• Gatlinburg Fire Department
• Bubba Gump Shrimp
• Fairfield Inn & Suites
• Walter’s State Community College Sevierville Addition
• Smartbank (Figure 71)
• Sevierville Blockbuster
• Creekside Wedding Center
• Cherokee Lodge Condominiums
• Pittman Center Elementary
• Anna Porter Public Library
• Marketplace Mall
• Hilton Garden Inn
• Citizens National Bank, Gatlinburg
• Gatlinburg Package Store
• Clarion Inn
• Bent Creek Village
Bebb’s Architectural Influence continued: those italicized included in visual analysis:

Motels: Remodeling & Additions

- Bean Station, Fred Harris
- Bearskin, Mrs. H. O. McGiffin
- Belle Aire, Brownlee Reagan
- *Brookside*, Paul Cox (Figure 66)
- Capri, James Maples, Pigeon Forge
- Center, Mrs. G.P. Reagan
- Clearwater, L. Luedtke
- Cloverleaf, F. Hales
- Cooper Court, Fred Cooper
- Cox’s Gateway, Bill Cox
- Creekbend Court, Harmo Ogle
- Creekstone, Jack Ogle
- Dudley Creek, John Ogle
- Fox, Luke Bettis
- Gillette, Carl Gillette
- Greystone, Tolbert Reagan
- Hemlock, Charles Cates
- Huff Number One, Jack Huff
- Huff, Jim Huff
- *Johnson’s Court*, Mrs. L. N. Johnson (Figures 67 & 68)
- King, Otha King
- Langdon’s, A. B. Langdon
- *Le Conte Creek*, Louis Reagan
- *Le Conte View*, Oakley (Figure 49)
- Manor, Clifford Dixon
- McAfee’s Court, Pigeon Forge
- Mountaineer, Hall Sayles
- Mountain Breeze, Wayne Ogle
- Ranch, Hal Reagan
- Rawlings, Rush Rawlings
- Reagan, E. E. Reagan
- Rendezvous, George Weaver
- Skyland, E. B. Reagan
- *Smokyleand*, Mayford Clabo, Brownlee Reagan
- Talley-Ho, Victor Talley, Townsend
- Terrace, O. R. Medlin
- Willow, Ruben Reagan
- Zoders, Wallace Zoder

Restaurants Remodeling & or Additions:

- Hays House
- Hobies Cooper Still, R. L. Maples
- Howards, Howard Wilson
- Jansens
- Jim’s Rib House, Jim Haverstick
- Loomis, Jeanette
- S & M Restaurant, Stuart Reagan
- Sweden House, Now “Smokies, Reagan

Commercial New Construction:

- Apartment Building, Guy Line
- Apartment Building, Ralph Maples
- Bales Carpentry Shop
- Butler’s Farm Market
- *Candy Kitchen* #1 & #2, Davy Dych (Figure 64 & 65)
• Color Tree, The, Bud Lawson
• Denton Drugs
• Doctors Buildings, Dr. Hill, Bryan, & Rutledge
• First National Bank
• Forbidden Caverns, Entrance Building
• Gatlinburg Laundry
• Gatlinburg Real Estate Office, Cosby
• Huskey’s Market, Emert’s Cove
• Mountain Press Building
• Newman’s Supermarket, Pigeon Forge
• Polly Bergen Shop, Bud Lawson
• Professional Building, Sevierville, Norman Burchfiel
• Rawlings Cleaners
• Sevier County Bank, Pigeon Forge
• Shillings Clinic
• Sky Lift Concession, next to Gatlinburg Inn
• Speculative House Plans, Claude Conner & Denton Kilpatrick
• Ticket Offices, Chucky Jack Theater
• The Village, Gerding & Dych
• Wadley’s Dental Clinic
• WSEV TV Studio

New Restaurants:
• Black Bear Inn
• Butlers, Henry, Pigeon Forge

• Green Pigeon, Pigeon Forge, Charles Connor
• Holiday, Benton Reagan
• Sky Room Restaurant, Maples Roy & Ralph
• McAfee Restaurant, Pigeon Forge
• Pancake Pantry, Gerding & Dych @ Village entrance

Craft Studios-Schools:
• Arrowmont Crafts School, including Weaving and Pottery Studios
• Cove Handicrafters Shop
• Glass, Jane, Studio
• Huskey, C., Craft Shop, Emert’s Cove
• McDonald Pottery Studio
• Pigeon Forge Pottery, Douglas Ferguson
• Prater, George, Studio, Morristown
• Ward, Don, Shop and Finishing buildings
• Woodcrafters & Carvers Shop, Matil & Maclean
• Woodwhittlers, Shirl Compton

Commercial Remodeling or Additions:
• Bank of Commerce Offices, Morristown
• Barber Shop, R.L. Maples
• Cole, Homer, Antique Shop Addition to Motel
• First Federal Savings and Loan, Sevierville
• First National Bank
• Honey-Bee Shop, Walter Hall
• King Lumber Company, Sevierville
• McCarter Lumber Company
• Newman’s Market
• Ogle & Ogle, Attorneys, Sevierville
• Ruble’s Department Store, Newport

Churches:
• Centenary Methodist Church
  Addition, Morristown
• Laurel Springs Church, Cosby
• Liberty Church, Cosby
• Lutheran Church
• Roaring Fork Baptist Church
  Addition
• Trinity Methodist Church,
  Morristown
• Unitarian Church, Knoxville

Municipal:
• Gatlinburg Chamber of Commerce
  Building
• Gatlinburg Civic Auditorium
• Gatlinburg Post Office and
  Additions
• Morristown Central Business
  District Development
• Morristown Downtown Skymart
  (Canopy-Walkway)

• Morristown Hamblen Library
• National Park Service, Clingman’s
  Dome Tower
• Orins, Preliminary
• Sevier County Hospital & Library
• Seymour High School & Additions
• U.S. Government, Housing for
  Appalachia at Berea Kentucky

Hotels & Inns:
• Alexander Hotel, Oak Ridge
• Buckhorn Inn & Guest Houses
• Gatlinburg Motor Inn
• Mountain View Motor Inn
• Riverside Hotel/Motel

Pool Additions:
• Chalet Motel
• Cooper Court
• Gatlinburg Motor Inn
• Huff Motel Number 2
• Johnson’s Motel
• McAfee’s Motel, Pigeon Forge
• Mountain View Hotel
• Riverside Hotel
• Rocky Waters Motel
• Skyland Motel

New Motels:
• Chalet Motel, Edward Guest
• Countryside Motel, Edward Guest
• Creekside, Max Watson
• Cub Motel, Creed Proffett, Cosby
• Holiday Hill, Roger Pratt
• Huff Motel Number 2, Jack Huff
• Ledwell Motel, Roy Ledwell
• Mize Motel, Sevierville
• Mountain View Motel, Jack Huff
• Newman Marshall Motel, Sevierville
• Pine Cliff Motel, Virgil Ogle
• Rocky Waters, Ralph Lawson
• Sidney James Motel, Roy and Ralph Maples
• Twin Islands Motel, Luther Ogle
• Waterlure Motel, Claude Conner
• Watsons Court, Hugh Watson
• Whaley Motel, Dick Whaley
• Woodland Motel, Hugh Clabo

*As well as 60+ new residences and additional home remodels and additions listed in Community Tectonics bulletin.

Figure 46. An Architectural Timeline, including Bebb’s influence in Gatlinburg. Courtesy of Community Tectonics.

**Visual Evidence for a Developing Prototype**

Bebb’s philosophies meshed well with the stylistic and historical precedents of Gatlinburg; his building’s harmonized well through materiality and stylistic reference in relation to the established archetypes. The ample work in Gatlinburg demonstrates the evolution of Bebb’s work into a matured style and form. This architectural lineage begins with his first building in the Gatlinburg area, the Buckhorn Inn. Built in 1937, the Inn earns renown for its extensive meditative grounds and gardens and, of course, its historic original structure. Although a well-executed example of traditional Colonial-Revival style, the Buckhorn is certainly consistent with other area trends. It references both the commercial archetypes and hybrid forms from the settlement school period and does not allude to the sweeping changes in architectural form about to occur. The porch colonnade on the rear of the building overlooking the lawn particularly harkens back to other
colonial precedents, with such connections visible when compared to the Riverside and other precursors.

Over the next twenty-three years, Bebb completed a prolific amount of commercial and residential work in Gatlinburg and neighboring locales (see figure 46, the residential portion of work is beyond the scope of this thesis). Several buildings clearly represent the signature characteristics of Bebb’s work, an architect who most certainly defined a large portion of downtown Gatlinburg’s landscape through his own legacy of buildings and the work of successor firms. Several representative examples of his work stand as both archetypes and hybrids.

As an example of Bebb’s initial hybridized form, the Smokyland Hotel (1950) demonstrates his initial breaking away from more historicized and traditional styles (figure 47). The main reception building’s layering of multiple front gabled roof forms
physically mirror the mountains’ profile, while the expansive use of stone and large plate glass windows materially links and blurs the building’s edges with the landscape. The windows simultaneously lighten the building’s visual weight, opening the interior up to the world the building is intended to harmonize with. The modern aesthetic, visible in the asymmetrical roof lines, large plate glass rectilinear windows, and overall form represents a transition; the rustic materials are still widely used but on increasingly less traditional forms.

These features physically characterize Bebb’s core philosophies: to create work that complements the landscape in both form and materiality. Bebb accomplishes his architectural goals through a language evolved from the Buckhorn to Smokyland; a much more modern aesthetic with its large, rectilinear windows, cantilevered balconies, and dynamic roof form guides the new hotel. The Smokyland, seen through the *two-way stretch* approach, refers most strongly back to the archetypes through materiality and philosophy of the built form and site. Comparable to the Smokyland, the LeConte View Motor Inn’s form speaks similarly with a steep, complex roof form, stone veneer, and cantilevered balcony (figure 48). Fewer windows, however, increase the visual weight of this building.
Shortly after construction of these two buildings, Bebb began to design in a more contemporary, streamlined rustic aesthetic; his firm Bebb and Olsen completed the extremely modernistic Clingman’s Dome Tower in 1959 (figure 50). Although still utilizing stone veneer, the structure completely transcended typical naturalistic design approaches, common in park architecture before the Mission 66 program. The 375-foot long concrete spiral ramp provided a universally accessible 360-degree panoramic view of the Great Smoky Mountains (McClelland, 1998). The new observation tower broke with the more subtle, naturalistic, and conventional building traditions of the national park and replaced an outdated 1920s frame structure.
Although upon first glance it would appear this structure completely breaks with those traditions, Bebb’s solution could be characterized as a simple, graceful, and honest form that complemented the natural terrain more abstractly than many previous park structures. Built as part of the park’s Mission 66 program focused on planning better facilities, more efficiently maintaining roads, constructing visitors centers, etc. during the 1950s and 60s, the new tower expressed the program’s new, modern goals (McClelland, 1998). This Mission 66 program embraced modernism stylistically and in material advancements such as glass, concrete, and steel; the Sugarland’s Visitor’s (figure 51) center weaves the mission’s objectives with those of the new aesthetic. Not only was the park embracing a decisively more modern form, but Bebb’s work also became more dynamic through exaggerated, sometimes stylized forms, and consistent use of a combination of modern and rustic materials.

Built at mid-century between 1955-57, the civic center and Mills Auditorium embody Bebb’s transformed architectural style (figures 52 & 53). Further distilling the initial archetypal forms, these buildings interpreted previous trends in an extremely innovative way, thus truly stretching the limitations of the hybrid term through the more maturely developed expression of Bebb’s personal style. This huge, multifacility complex, although clearly classified as modern through form and materiality synthesizes those modern characteristics with not only the original Craftsman style Helmick House/Teachers’ Cottage but the Rustic and simplified Colonial-Revival style archetypes of the later period as well, especially the hotel precedents.
The size of this complex allowed for a layering articulated three-dimensionally of functional uses, visible in the exterior through the extensive asymmetrical overlapping of various forms and shapes, often characterized by modern work. However, the low slung, hipped roofs, despite their contemporary standing seam metal covering clearly derived inspiration from national Arts and Crafts/Craftsman ideals. Many roofs on this form with deep overhangs further indicate that stylistic reference (figure 53). Details remain simple and ornament minimal; the transition of materials on the building provides visible ties to the material trends set in place (stone veneer). The tooled concrete block with metal trim not only visually breaks up the large vertical space, it serves as the material link between historic references and the modern influence, represented both philosophically and physically on the form.

The stone veneer present on the lower portion of the building and retaining walls, enhances the organic, undulating form and siting of the building and offers several moments where landscaping is integrated with the built form. Widely used as a material
in Gatlinburg, the presence of stone veneer often characterized Bebb’s work when juxtaposed with more modern materials and design features. The use of large windows throughout this design often wrap around the building’s corners, like many of Frank Lloyd Wright’s and other modern designers’ details, or accentuate a projecting form or continue a rhythm or pattern such as that established by the columnar supports of the entry portico. In this way, they provide some of the building’s ornament and character.

As a city building, Bebb removed this project from the exaggeration and attention grabbing colors of some of his commercial work (shown later); he designed a more dignified and sophisticated building representative of his personal architectural philosophies (of formally and materially drawing inspiration from environmental context) and what the city desired as an image of Gatlinburg. Broadly accepted and employed, local entrepreneurs felt the style of his work enhanced the beautiful mountain landscape. The extensive number of buildings completed in the Gatlinburg area indicated his popularity: 15 new motels, 40 motel remodels or additions, 65 local residences, with many commercial and restaurant venues, churches, and a smattering of other work (see figure 46, excerpted from Community Tectonics bulletin). His architectural vision came to be the city’s image as well, through this civic center and auditorium complex, the chamber of commerce building, and Gatlinburg post office and later additions. Bebb not only defined a local style in the downtown landscape; he shaped Gatlinburg’s municipal image as well.

Bebb’s work culminated in the 38,300 square foot Emma Harper Turner Building (figures 54-57), necessary for the campus’ conversion from settlement uses to a
permanent arts and crafts school. Viewed alongside thirty-four other project proposals at the fraternity’s national convention in 1954, the sorority formally selected proposal for the new Arts and Crafts effort (Arrowmont) as the new philanthropic effort eight years later (The Founding of Arrowmont, 2006). When Pi Beta Phi defined Arrowmont as a new institution dedicated solely to arts and crafts education, with the original school functions placed in capable hands of city officials, the sorority incorporated a facility to accommodate classes, gallery space, and offices. The new school’s name and guiding principles honored their settlement school roots and the original initiative as well as the new initiative of Arrowmont (Arts and Handicraft: The Founding of Arrowmont). The board of governors desired a building that would bring those principles, now centered around nationally and internationally promoting arts and crafts education, to fruition. In response, “Bebb conceived a large central building complex of studios, gallery, library, and auditorium whose varying rooflines were nestled against a hillside where ceramic kiln furnaces could be fed by natural air drafts” (Knowles, 2006).
The Turner building’s form cascades down a gently sloping hill just off Parkway in the center of the Arrowmont campus, mimicking mountains that provides the building’s backdrop (figure 57). Replete with a dichotomous mix of concrete block, sandstone veneer, metal shingles, and copious windows of varying forms and arrangements, the building more completely merges the early campus archetype with the commercial forms downtown and thus illustrates the evolution from archetype to hybrid to prototype. Not only is the form indicative of the two-way stretch, which links the Turner building to both past and future, but Maxwell’s archetype-hybrid-prototype model comes full circle within Arrowmont’s campus, both philosophically and through the physical form.

Exposed steel purlins and rafters speak to the honesty of structure and material and desired simplicity as part of the progressive movement’s and settlement school’s interpretation of social mores into built form. Juxtaposition of traditional materials such as sandstone, one of Bebb’s trademarks, with contemporary steel supports and concrete block help to characterize Bebb’s new architectural language. Used in direct contrast with each other, the materials offer added visual interest and break up the monotony of what
otherwise would be a large flat surface elevation (figure 53). Aesthetically, varying window sizes and placement aid with this visual composition as well through following the roof eave lines (with both large and clerestory windows); these windows provide rhythm and repetition throughout most of the building and focal points at specific locations such as the entry (figure 54 & 55). The windows are primarily large and expansive – modern with mullions allowing lots of natural light for studios. In places they reflect the form of the portion of the building they are located in; awning windows along the front (north) façade under a deep overhang for classrooms and clerestory windows in several other locations give further illumination.

The northwest corner is also a good example where large spans of the stone veneer meet at chimney projection on a very large flat surface; the array of windows (seen in figure 55) draws attention to roof form, the material transition itself, and breaks up the space visually into three parts, thus drawing the eye around the corner of the building under the eave. The transitions between materials further accentuate certain focal points or sweeping gestures of the structure layered through three-dimensional form. Although Bebb employed large amounts of glass, the deep roof eaves and stone veneer yielded greater energy efficiency in trapping and releasing solar energy at various times of the day. The Turner building earned Bebb an award of Merit in 1973 from the American Institute of Architects; energy efficient school designs currently distinguish Community Tectonics (the firm he established), now run by two of his associates (Knowles, 2006). Bebb’s founding principles remain influential in local practice and with
the firm even today with the Turner building as an exemplary realization of those principles.

The Turner building is a manifestation of multiple historical precedents; both on and off the Arrowmont Settlement School campus, those precedents’ hybrid forms, resulting from the local culture (primarily arts and crafts), and the philosophies that informed each style and architect therein all contributed to this building’s final form. Philosophical links tie these movements together much more strongly than their visual characteristics. The focus on simple, honest form, structure, and design, harmonization with the landscape (through materials with all but modernism), and belief in architecture’s influential abilities on social behavior are central to the craftsman, rustic, modern, and now Bebb’s prototypical aesthetic, later hybridized and realized as Gatlinburg’s Tourist Vernacular.

Bebb completed much more work in Gatlinburg than the limited presentation here of course. Much of his new commercial projects as well as remodels and additions line the streets of Gatlinburg, even today. Although the Turner and Civic Center buildings truly mark the inception of an architectural prototype, the majority of Bebb’s commercial work appeared more as a hybrid- either between previous styles and the new prototype or between the new form and the stylized, sometimes thematic and superficial nature of tourist oriented commercial venues. With a few already discussed, such as the Smokyland and LeConte View Motor Inn, additional examples provide a more representative view of what the overarching aesthetic is.
The Twin Islands Motel (figures 58 & 59) demonstrates the compromise between Bebb’s true style and the exaggerated, more playful forms he developed for some of the downtown commercial strip. This building (and overall complex) still has a very distinct modern feel with, again, the dynamic roof form and careful siting and landscaping to increase the hotel’s unique presence and natural materials further blend the building in with its natural and man-made surroundings. A steeply pitched hipped roof and cross-gabled balcony in conjunction with the picturesque river setting more explicitly reference the Swiss or Chalet style, but is modernized with varying, exaggerated angles, projections, and heights.
As a marketing ploy, buildings along the downtown strip at this time (and currently) chose to mimic very distinct Picturesque or Revival styles. According to many local historians, the Village was the first explicit attempt at choosing building style based on marketability and tourist appeal; it was also a product of Bebb’s firm (figures 60 & 61). The historical sketch provided on the Village website states that the property owners defined a thematic design concept for the 27 shops located in the heart of downtown Gatlinburg: they chose “Old World” (www.thevillageshops.com/story.html), a general term that gave artistic license to incorporate many nostalgic, picturesque revival forms. Accordingly, the search began for interesting, historic building materials, preferably re-used from places slated for demolition. The first eighteen shops were finished in 1970, the remaining nine in 1982, and advertises itself as Gatlinburg’s most beautiful shopping complex (www.thevillageshops.com/story). As seen in photos, the Village complex provides a distinct style and subsequent sense of place; however, the modestly scaled, overtly Tudor, Chalet style, and Post-Medieval English informed shops are not locally relevant in the least.

Other builders and property owners followed suit, the Trader’s Mall/Midtown Lodge building arrangement uses an urban mixed-use form in a combination picturesque, modern mountain aesthetic complex. With the builder’s goal of creating a holistic design integrating the site with hotels and shops to form a complementary and dependant relationship, stylistically speaking, materiality played a crucial through the heavy use of brick, board and batten cladding, wood shingles, and stone veneer. The layering of forms and materials provides much visual interest that is further enhanced by historic appearing
lighting, landscaping, and connective stone footbridges. The Midtown Lodge is clearly similar to much of Bebb’s work of the 1950s-1970 (figures 62 & 63), while the shops themselves pursue a different stylistic avenue the concept is very similar to that of the Village shops.

The Ole Smoky Candy Kitchen located next to the Cliff Dwellers original site (figures 64 & 65), also a Bebb design (he designed both stores), is another commercial venture that typifies the hybridized tourist vernacular form of Bebb’s prototype. Small, and locally well known, the building is marked by Bebb’s signature materiality, though company branding and brighter colors present a different side of his aesthetic and enhance visitor appeal. The Candy Kitchen’s low profile, large stepped back side-gable form roof with deep overhangs lowers the viewer’s eye to the rest of the building and the ground line. The street façade is primarily glassed in with stone end supports, and a decorative stone retaining wall also helps tie the building more effectively to the site. Large expanses of glass balance out the weight of the roof form while overall stylistic
focus is on the stone veneer and store branding. A large projecting glassed in bay on the east end where taffy is made and visible to the street and pedestrian traffic adds to the store’s formal variety as well as its angled set back from the street.

![Figure 64. Ole Smoky Candy Kitchen](Image)
Photo taken by author.

![Figure 65. Ole Smoky Candy Kitchen, view across Parkway.](Image)
Photo taken by author.

Bebb’s profound effect on the landscape was not isolated to his own work; local architects and builders followed by example in both the more commercialized hybrid form and Bebb’s more authentic personal style, further cementing those forms in the landscape through their own contributions and interpretations. The Brookside Inn and Johnson’s Court offer two more visual representations downtown of holistic designs well integrated with the landscape in this rustic meets modern aesthetic. Each more strongly manifests a certain characteristic of the style; the Brookside’s form and materiality more closely parallel some of Bebb’s original designs while the Johnson’s Court concentrated on utilizing landscape to blend and blur the buildings’ forms (figures 66-69).
Not only did Bebb define a prototype, he introduced new forms into the Gatlinburg landscape. The self-contained, syllogistically themed Village shopping complex was the first of its kind locally and inspired many other similar complexes. The Midtown Lodge and Trader’s Mall complex was already discussed, but later examples persist such as Baskin’s Square (figure 69), Reagan Terrace Mall, and Fountain Plaza.

Many of these building trends continued and Bebb’s original designs still heavily influence buildings being built today. A local firm by the name of Trotter and Associates is the source of much of this continued influence; Tom Trotter, the principal architect, trained under Bebb. Jim Coykendall, another former associate of Bebb, still works locally.
as well. Much of Trotter’s work settles into the two veins of Bebb’s signature style, municipal facilities and banks primarily used the more restrained, authentic interpretations of the prototype, thus maintaining consistency of city image for more than forty years. The newly established Smartbank is one example of this work; see Figure 71. Trotter has also completed several buildings of the hybridized, more tourist-oriented form; a significant example of this hybrid, Maxwell’s Seafood (figure 70), alludes to both the Craftsman and Prairie styles. Several key features of Maxwell’s exude characteristics of those styles such as the stepped back gabled roof (where peak extends farther than the eave), exposed roof rafters, extended beams, and battered piers and columns throughout the premises. However, the steeply pitched roof and variation in façade and form present a more modern interpretation with locally consistent building materials.

Although Trotter developed his own style that evolved from his educational training, own preferences, and Bebb’s influence, as the previous examples show, he also continued working with the hybrid and prototypical forms Bebb established. The large, holistically designed shopping complex idea, first conceived with the Village, also
continues to define the landscape currently. Trotter designed the Marketplace Mall for
downtown, not far from the Village. Calhoun’s Village, built in the past fifteen years, is
yet another example of continuation in this type.

Although some new work is in keeping with the previously mention building
trends, there are also many buildings that persist in a periodized eclectic or themed
manner. Much of the new work, whether of locally informed design and materials or not,
more heavily accentuates the stylistic characteristics, primarily through detail and
ornament, of the form. An obvious, eye-catching style has become commonplace in
downtown Gatlinburg.

The Lineberger’s Seafood/Wax Museum complex (figure 72), as a new complex,
illustrates locally attributed architectural trends through stylistic and formal qualities.
Although composed of similar materials as those used historically, the Lineberger’s
design’s overall feels much more contemporary as opposed to the usual Rustic, Chalet, or
Stick influences. This u-shaped building complex has clean lines, warehouse style run of
windows, and general lack of period informed details. Focus still remains on materiality; the building also provides a sense of enclosure and shelter similar to many other complexes, such as the Village, Trader’s Mall, or Marketplace Mall. As an analogous restaurant example, the Cherokee Grill (figure 73) fuses local style with corporate image. Heavily weighted battered stone columns, extended and exposed rafters, low roofline, overlapping gables, and deep eaves speak again of the Craftsman style. Materiality, form, and details are akin to the nearby Maxwell’s restaurant.

Though it parallels some of the rustic roots of Gatlinburg’s built environment, the Smoky Mountain Brewery and Restaurant appears more as a nostalgic reference to the antiquated, wooden building forms that typify physical representations of stereotyped mountain construction (figure 74). This form is one of many that bridge the gap between designs informed by locally relevant culture and structures and the streamlined, stylized more marketable, or themed versions of that culture. The Brewery exploits the rustic materials so prevalent in many Gatlinburg buildings; its detailing indicates Stick style references through diagonal braces, varyingly applied siding, use of board and batten, and steeply pitched roof.
The Park Grill and Legends by Max restaurants are more immersed in stylistic details and ornament than either Lineberger’s or the Brewery. The Park Grill plays up and stresses the rustic style and log informed modes of the building (figure 75). Those characteristics, the building’s embellished form, and other rusticated materials provide a strong visual theme to the restaurant. Legends by Max explicitly uses an assortment of features and ornamentation of the more rustic, post-medieval English form. There are heavy, exposed false timbers on all eaves, visible beams in fan light, prolific use of wood and stone, grander scale of features, stone internal chimneys, and a heavily articulated roof form. Despite its lack of true local architectural references, the abundance and exaggeration of period specific details gives this building a stronger presence than many others on the street frontage of Parkway.

Figure 76. Ripley’s Aquarium, 2009. Photo taken by author.
And last but not least, the Ripley’s Aquarium earns its place in the discussion of the architectural landscape of Gatlinburg (figure 76). Situated on the opposite corner of the River Road/Parkway intersection across from Arrowmont’s campus and its Arrowcraft Shop, the site’s size and location alone speaks of importance. The multi-building complex has two structures in close proximity perpendicular to each other that compose the primary facility. Cascading down from the main buildings, the entry ramp, stairs, and pedestrian bridge cross the river and first intersection of the heart of downtown Gatlinburg. Much of the complex’s formal variety and visual interest largely rely on these features and extensive landscaping. Although the architectural goals of Ripley’s center on creating a unique presence solely identifiable with the aquarium, their site design and landscape efforts do not go unnoticed. The Ripley’s Aquarium enhances the natural features of its location; footbridges and stone veneered retaining walls that circumnavigate the river features (some inherent to the site, some man-made) add to the picturesque philosophies guiding the overall design. These principles are reminiscent of the core philosophies of all the historically used styles serving as precedents along the downtown strip.
CHAPTER VI

HUBERT BEBB & AUTHENTICITY: DIRECTIONS FOR NEW RESEARCH

This study of Gatlinburg’s downtown landscape revealed many connections among local historic archetypal forms of the early twentieth century, mid-century building ventures, and current trends primarily geared toward reclaiming a better, more authentic image of Gatlinburg. All are woven together through architectural philosophies and the architects of the periods studied. Throughout the analysis process, Hubert Bebb emerged as the primary creator behind the Tourist Vernacular that developed at mid-century and continued strongly through 1970 and his work remains influential today. By acknowledging previous forms through hybridization and his strong philosophical tenets that hinged on complementing the natural environment and local materials with the built form, he developed a specific visual presence, documented here, that came to dominate much of the portion of Gatlinburg’s downtown landscape studied in this thesis.

Presented in the literature review and used in the analysis, Maxwell’s two-way stretch model strongly informed and guided the design of this visual analysis. As a result, three primary phases of Gatlinburg’s development were reviewed: the inception of Pi Beta Phi’s settlement school and initial tourist development, the booming developmental years following the Great Smoky Mountain National Park’s creation through 1970, and a brief review of current work over the past 15 years seen through the lens of previous
influences, architectural guidelines, and the Gatlinburg Vision Statement and Priority study (see figure 77 for summary with visual cues of these phases in relation to Maxwell’s model).

The vast amount of primary visual data combined with historical sketches and essays available during the formative years of the settlement school and Gatlinburg’s initial evolution into a tourist town provided a strong foundation for my research and the historical context necessary for this mid-twentieth century building analysis. Additionally, the large collection of postcards donated to Gatlinburg’s Anna Porter
Library balanced the visual analysis by adding historic images to the database of current photographs taken by the researcher. More importantly, not only valid for their historic visual insight, these postcards presented the desired, highly marketable images of specific buildings and venues and thus downtown Gatlinburg as a whole.

Key findings illustrated the architectural progression through the archetype-hybrid-prototype model and the duality between modern and historic references present in local buildings as well as the primary architects that molded the built environment. The primary models of architectural form and style that defined the majority of Gatlinburg’s landscape were conceived by two firms/architects: Barber and McMurry and Hubert Bebb, through his firms Bebb and Olsen (and other partner changes) and Community Tectonics. Initially, Barber and McMurry transitioned from the settlement school influences and local vernacular form through Colonial Revival hybrids. Those hybrids then led to Rustic Revival forms and subsequent hybrids due to the influence of the national park, the persistent traditional forms of the area, and national trends. Hubert Bebb, and his various firm associations, resumed where Barber and McMurry left off; he continued traditional local and nationally inspired forms with a few preliminary period-specific buildings entirely in keeping with previous building trends. However, Bebb’s personal style soon evolved into a more modern, abstract approach that formally complemented the local landscape through its philosophical grounding, with tenets similar to those of Frank Lloyd Wright’s. Bebb completed an immense amount of work in Gatlinburg and neighboring areas and this analysis revealed how his broadly accepted,
easily identifiable style came to dominate Gatlinburg’s downtown landscape between 1950-1970.

With Bebb’s work coming to the forefront of this study, it is interesting to note how thoroughly his work penetrated the local built environment. Not only did he define a tourist vernacular, inspired by his prototypical forms, he completed at least 60 homes solely in Gatlinburg, not including those in neighboring cities, remodels, or additions (Community Tectonics Bulletin). A town’s vernacular style is normally the result of historic influences and stylistic trends as interpreted through many architects, local builders, and residents who improve their own homes. For many years, Bebb’s work was so prominent and influential; his style became accepted as the model vernacular form guiding the construction of municipal, commercial, and residential development.

Such a large time frame of study proved to be a formidable task; however, the researcher felt that a core contextual foundation was necessary for completion of this research project. The vast amount of visual evidence over such a long time period also seemed daunting at first; documenting and organizing post cards, historical photos, current photographs and other sources indeed presented challenges. Chronological separation into three developmental periods allowed for ease of organizing these sources, however this delineation resulted in large amounts of data of a singular type for certain periods where other sources’ time frames did not overlap. Preferably, a few of the key sources reviewed, such as the postcards, would have been more helpful had they covered greater periods of time in conjunction with other sources, such as those of the settlement school. And although available postcards numbered in the hundreds, many images of certain
buildings and time frames were missing relevant information, such as dates and architects were not noted. Distance was also a crucial factor; with the area of study 4 1/2 hours away, research was limited to several scheduled visits and supported through emails, personal contacts, and secondary sources. Despite this limitation, however, personal and family knowledge of the area helped overcome this shortcoming.

Ideally, this study was not only to define a local aesthetic, herein realized as the Tourist Vernacular, but fully place Gatlinburg’s mid-century development in an extensive historical context while simultaneously linking it to new development of the past 15 years, all primarily viewed through the lens of the new architectural guidelines (2008) and Gatlinburg Vision Statement (2004), whose goals are heavily centered around enhancing and complementing Gatlinburg’s unique built and natural environments. However, providing such an in depth, architecturally focused historical summary and reviewing, connecting, and drawing conclusions between that early era and the mid-twentieth century development left little time to fully delve into the connections of those eras to current goals of the city and recent physical manifestations of those goals. The architectural guidelines, by virtue of chosen imagery, further lead us back to Bebb’s work and his continued influence. Many current goals seek to complete the suggestions he made nearly 40 years ago, such as burying all power lines to streamline and clean-up the downtown viewshed and the sign ordinance banning neon lights and garish colors. Through such apparent connections and visual references, it is clear that Bebb’s legacy is now embedded in many of these documents currently shaping the local landscape. These
documents were still reviewed and highly influential in the study’s approach but did not get discussed as extensively as originally intended.

Additionally, the notions of authenticity in both architecture and the historic arts and crafts heritage of the area are consistent throughout the goals of all the referenced research studies. Embracing an authentic heritage and architectural style is inherently laden with difficulty. How does one define authenticity? Whose authenticity as the norm? Does the decided on authentic style happen to be a more streamlined, aesthetically pleasing version of previous design decisions? As far as my analysis here in the evolution of Bebb’s specific aesthetic, it is clear that he designed with different intentions, but which of those is more authentic? The forms that most clearly draw inspiration from his original prototype or the commercialized Tourist Vernacular that truly came to dominate the landscape? Which historical influences did he choose to reference? What do those choices say about the past he chose and, in turn, the community’s acceptance of his choices? These boundaries are fluid in many regards, and several buildings reviewed serve as a physical representation of that fluidity, thus providing a transition between the two seemingly separate forms, but making Maxwell’s model all that much more useful as a strategy for understanding architectural style and changes among stylistic variations.

Questions regarding authenticity and the depth Hubert Bebb’s community wide influence through his architecture and activism offer two more valid avenues of research.

This study lays the groundwork for such a discussion; building a study to more fully undertake determining the cross-connections between all three periods would surely yield rich layers of information that have yet to be documented. Yet another future
research direction would be to locate, document, and analyze the homes Bebb constructed throughout his career in Gatlinburg, especially those very near to downtown in combination with the review of his commercial work presented here. Also, studying housing developments, such as the Greystone Heights subdivision built in connection with the hotel might offer more insight into the image desired for Gatlinburg, whether that image extended to personal residences, and if so, whether it was widely embraced and assimilated as a personal statement.

Despite these many other avenues left unexplored, this thesis covered much ground on the evolution of Gatlinburg’s downtown built environment, its identity formation, the shapers of that identity, and some of the historically associated and mental constructs linked to physical form. After close review of a large assortment of buildings spanning approximately 100 years, it was exciting and rewarding to specifically find and trace various stylistic implementations and their evolution over time by visually linking structures that both reference their long standing local heritage and reach to the future. This study not only represents the hope of residents, entrepreneurs, city officials, developers, and architects for a better city and quality of life for Gatlinburg that maintains its historical integrity and ties through the built form, but respect for a locally influential architect, and is also a tangible culmination of my love for my hometown and the surrounding beauty that is the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.
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APPENDIX A

Gatlinburg Vision Statement

*We are a vibrant community that honors our mountain heritage and embraces our responsibility as the gateway to Great Smoky Mountains National Park.*

(The statement above – and those below – were finalized at the 2004 Gatlinburg Vision Conference. It was adopted by the City of Gatlinburg, the Gatlinburg Chamber of Commerce and the Board of the Gatlinburg Gateway Foundation. Below are theme statements that support the Gatlinburg Vision Statement.)

**Aesthetics Vision Statement**

We are a community that is dedicated to living up to the natural beauty of our location by assuring that the built environment compliments the natural environment by:

- Providing signage that is useful but not intrusive.
- Eliminating visual pollution.
- Utilizing materials that are natural and representative of native materials and traditional architecture.
- Constructing buildings that minimize obstruction of mountain views.
- Using lighting that offers safety and security while minimizing light pollution.
- Preserving and creating green spaces both large and small.

**Business Development Vision Statement**

We are a nationally known premier mountain destination and resort and the entrance to Great Smoky Mountains National Park:

- Where increasing market share is driven by continuous improvement to our built environment, attracting visitors who will want to enjoy the authentic products, services, and experiences that reflect our rich heritage and culture.
- Where quality of life for residents draws the top quality worker these businesses require.
- Where business development supports its positive impact on the balance of services, infrastructure and natural environment.

**Environment Vision Statement**

We will continually strive to be a community that cherishes and protects the natural beauty of our environment and works proactively on a local level to:

- Protect native wildlife and their habitat and other natural ecosystems.
- Promote unity between our community and national park to ensure that our environment is part of our planning process.
- Preserve and plan clean green space in the city.
- Develop strategies for political effectiveness regionally and nationally with regard to the improvement and protection of air and water quality and the removal and prevention of the exotic non-native species.
Heritage Vision Statement
We are a Southern Appalachian community that is proud of our unique heritage, respecting and preserving the rich legacy of our ancestors by:

- Celebrating our history; exploring and sharing the rich and deep values of our heritage through art, music, crafts, storytelling and our religious and cultural traditions.
- Creating and sustaining an environment for economic prosperity and cultural enrichment.

Quality of Life Vision Statement
We are a community that values our quality of life and seeks to maintain and improve it. We will:

- Participate and work together in a collaborative spirit to build respectful relationships that lend our energy and talents to support and further initiatives that improve our community.
- Recognize and prioritize the needs of all citizens in our community and form groups to address and fulfill those needs.
- Value quality, lifelong education and support facilities and programs that provide recreational and cultural activities.
- Maintain a wholesome, clean and safe environment in which to work and raise a family.

Traffic & Transportation Vision Statement
We have a safe, efficient, environmentally sensitive traffic and transportation system that fits into the fabric of our community and region, offering multiple options, including transit, walking and bicycling in addition to other options. We will:

- Continue to become a more pedestrian-friendly town.
- Include aesthetics in relation to all transit developments.
- Explore the possibilities of and educate about alternative routes.
- Research the potential of alternative forms of transportation with an emphasis on mass transit.
- Address issues of traffic congestion and seek workable solutions including bus traffic.
- Develop strategies for political effectiveness regionally and nationally with regard to the improvement of transportation issues.
APPENDIX B
Gatlinburg Streetscapes

Looking into Gatlinburg, ca. 1939. Burning Bush on left and Open Hearth on right ‘currently’

Same Streetscape, August 2009. Looking toward downtown from Park entrance.
Parkway, ca. 1939. Riverside Hotel sign on left, Cliff Dwellers rock wall at right.

Similar streetscape. Picture taken from a little further upstreet from Candy Kitchen and former Cliff Dweller’s location.
Parkway, 1952. Looking toward downtown.

Same Streetscape, August 2009.
Parkway, ca. 1939. View toward Pigeon Forge, Village complex on right where cafe’s parking lot visible.

Similar streetscape, Village complex a little farther upstreet, past mock tudor buildings.
Lower Parkway, ca. 1941. Looking toward town, coming from Pigeon Forge.

Same Streetscape, Ruby Tuesday at end of viewshed on right before 321 Intersection.
Parkway at 321 East, ca. 1939. Looking toward Pigeon Forge.

321 Intersection, August 2009. Carousel Mall on right, Ruby Tuesdays visible in yellow building on left.
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Introduction

These design guidelines have been developed by the city of Gatlinburg, in conjunction with the Clemson University Master of Real Estate Development program. They have been created to assist developers, builders, and architects to design buildings that will reinforce Gatlinburg’s mountain village aesthetic. They will also contribute to making the main commercial corridor an excellent pedestrian environment for visitors, residents, and local merchants. While the guidelines are advisory rather than mandatory, following them is strongly encouraged.

Purpose

The guidelines were developed to preserve and enhance the unique architectural character of Gatlinburg’s main commercial corridor. This character is critical for the long-term health of the tourist economy because it creates the sense of place that makes Gatlinburg special. The guidelines encourage respect for history and regional character, while leaving room for creative design and adaptation to changing circumstances.

The design guidelines encourage multiple features that will make walking through the commercial corridor a pleasant and visually interesting experience. For example, eaves and overhangs provide shade from the summer sun. Shake shingles and stacked stone provide the color, texture, and historic reference that are missing when metal siding is used. Buildings with attractive windows and doors engage the street and sidewalk, enticing visitors to stroll, linger, and explore the many businesses in the downtown area.

Unlike many tourist destinations, Gatlinburg’s commercial corridor remains a pedestrian-oriented place, where people park their cars and then access individual businesses on foot. This means that buildings must be designed with attention to the details that are noticed by pedestrians, including building materials, textures, colors, windows and doors, arcades and balconies, courtyards and squares, roof detailing, and the articulation of building facades. Careful treatment of these elements will ensure that visitors have a positive experience and return year after year.

How to Use the Guidelines

The architectural guidelines are organized according to four features:

- Building and Site
- Exterior Walls
- Roofs
- Lighting and Signage

The City has identified each of these architectural features as being essential elements in creating a positive streetscape. Each of these features then has four primary characteristics:

- Materials
- Profiles, Articulation, and Configuration
- Application
- Color

The guidelines specify the preferred design characteristics for each architectural feature, with reinforcement of the mountain village aesthetic as an overarching goal. Photographs and
drawings provide examples of both preferred designs and practices that are discouraged.

Guidelines for site design are also provided, covering the following topics:

- Building Placement
- Tall Buildings
- Sidewalks and Street Trees
- Public Spaces
- Parking Lot Landscaping and Screening

The guidelines should be consulted by builders, developers, and architects at an early stage in the design process, to ensure that any proposed new construction makes a positive contribution to the distinctive character of Gatlinburg. A further clarification is needed, the City of Gatlinburg Planning Department can provide assistance.

The Mountain Village Aesthetic

These guidelines encourage the use of the mountain village aesthetic that is deeply rooted in the culture and history of the southern Appalachians. Gatlinburg's prominence as a tourist destination and cultural center derives from its beautiful mountain setting, regional vernacular architecture, and history as a gateway to the Great Smoky Mountains. An important public purpose is served by encouraging the use of building forms and design elements that reinforce Gatlinburg's special character.

The regional architecture of eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina makes extensive use of natural materials and building forms appropriate to a mountain setting. Early inhabitants constructed log cabins using materials from the abundant forests. These were eventually supplemented by more substantial wood frame, stone, and brick buildings, but all were keyed to the mountain climate and topography. Many different architectural styles have been used, but all have been given a unique regional expression through the use of natural materials such as logs, bark, shingles, fieldstone, and river rock.

Mountain village architecture makes use of traditional building forms that fit harmoniously into the mountain landscape. Buildings are visually complex with pitched roofs, varied rooflines, exposed wooden structural elements, and projections such as porches, porticos, and verandas. The textures and colors of natural materials such as wood or stone predominate.

New and remodeled buildings in Gatlinburg should enhance the City's sense of place by expressing local character and avoiding the standardized architecture of freeway interchanges and suburban strip malls. Visitors come to Gatlinburg to enjoy the mountain village atmosphere and high quality pedestrian environment of the City's commercial corridor. Maintaining that distinct architectural character is important culturally and also for the long-term economic success of the City.
Building and Site

MATERIALS

Building materials should be of high quality and the use of alternative hardcape materials, such as pavers or flagstone, is encouraged.

Large blank expanses of concrete, masonry block, or stucco retaining walls are discouraged.

Site walls should include natural or rustic finishes and integrate the building and parking with the site.

Utility covers should be of natural materials and in keeping with the architectural style of the building.

High quality materials and landscaping create an attractive seating area for pedestrians.

Long glass facades should be avoided.

These bland materials are inconsistent with the mountain village aesthetic of Gatlinburg.
Buildings should be varied and articulated in order to provide visual interest by their orientation, shape, and massing. They should be harmonious with the mountain setting and site as well as the site topography.

The tops of retaining walls should follow and mimic the natural curves of the site. Long, straight walls with no horizontal or vertical articulation are discouraged.
Gatlinburg Commercial Corridor

Building and Site

APPLICATION

Large building masses should be avoided in favor of smaller units in order to create a pedestrian scale.

Maximum building height should be reserved for the central portion of the site allowing the building to cascade down to the public way in order to promote the pedestrian scale as well as a sense of openness.

Enough building setback should be provided to allow space for landscape features, green space, and pedestrian common areas.

Site and building design should screen mechanical equipment as well as loading and trash collection areas from the general public, and placement of utilities underground is recommended.

Landscaped relief between buildings and parking should be naturalistic and reflect the scale of the building and site.

The building cascades down to the front of the site and the building massing is broken up into smaller units.

This building functions well at the pedestrian scale. The facade is divided into smaller units. The arcade provides both visual interest and shelter from the elements.

Large building masses should be avoided in favor of smaller units that cascade toward the street.

Unattractive utility areas like this should be screened so that they cannot be seen from the street.
COLOR

Exterior color composition should be in keeping with the natural environment, consistent with the mountain village aesthetic, and in harmony with the surrounding structures.

Earth tones of greens, blue-grays, rusts, grays, and browns are most appropriate. Bright, fluorescent, or pastel colors should be avoided altogether.

Stone, wood, and slate shingles provide a color scheme that reinforces the mountain village aesthetic.

The bright colors used here are unattractive and should be avoided.

The color and texture of the rubble stone in this building fit in well with the mountain landscape.

This attractive color palette is natural and rustic.
Exterior Walls

MATERIALS

The use of natural materials such as wood and stone are recommended as opposed to exposed standard concrete blocks and vinyl or aluminum siding.

Materials should be used in a manner consistent with their characteristics and visual weight. Stone should be placed at the base or lower levels below wood siding.

This building creatively uses two variations of wood to break up the vertical masses.

This is a good example of combining wood with stone, with the stone at the base level and the wood above.

Painted concrete block and long unbroken walls with no detail are not appropriate for the commercial corridor.

Facades made entirely of glass should be avoided.
Exterior Walls

PROFILE, ARTICULATION, AND CONFIGURATION

Facades should provide visual interest, character, and scale and share these traits with surrounding buildings.

In order to protect the character of the streetscape, large horizontal openings and roll-up doors are to be avoided. Narrow storefronts should have openings that are proportional to their width and height.

Recessed or covered entrances are encouraged.

In this development, the building facades are visually interesting, share similar proportions, and create a positive space that is pleasing for pedestrians.

The store entrance and other openings are proportional to one another, and the covered entrance is aesthetically appealing.

Facades should resemble one another in scale. Window and door openings should be in proportion to each other.
Exterior Walls

APPLICATION

Windows should reflect the architectural style of the building.

Oversized window and door openings should be avoided in favor of smaller detailed openings. Windows with two or more sashes look best in addition to windows that have true divided lites as opposed to one large pane of glass.

Repetitive and large expanses of uninterrupted glass panels should be avoided in addition to burred and reflective glass and roll up doors.

Large horizontal openings that are out of proportion with the building height should be avoided.

Materials appear heavy over a full glass facade and the architectural style is completely unrelated to the mountain village aesthetic.

These windows match the architectural style of the building.

Large repetitive walls of glass should be avoided.
Exterior Walls

COLOR

Exterior color composition should be in keeping with the natural environment, consistent with the mountain village aesthetic, and in harmony with the surrounding structures.

Earth tones of greens, blue-grays, rusts, grays, and browns are most appropriate, and bright, fluorescent, or pastel colors should be avoided altogether.

This building takes advantage of different shades of wood and stone to create a rustic appearance.

Some and minimal use of vibrant colors make this a good example of a corporate restaurant chain.

The color palette here is consistent with the natural environment, varying between different shades of brown, green, and gray.

The color palette here is too bright and contrasts sharply with the natural landscape.
MATERIALS

Suggested materials to use are composite shingles, wood shingles, shakes, metal, and slate.

Dimensional relief is encouraged in the selection of roofing.

Roofing elements such as chimneys, dormers, and ventilation outlets can be accented with natural materials or materials similar to those used on the building’s exterior.

The use of natural materials such as slate or wood shingles creates a rustic appearance.

This is a good example of the use of metal roofing.

Exposed timber framing, accented roof elements, and high quality roofing materials can combine to create an attractive design.

Roofing materials with no dimensional relief should be avoided.
Roofs

PROFILE, ARTICULATION, AND CONFIGURATION

Pitched roofs are preferred.

The use of low pitched roofs should be reserved for porches and similar roof extensions.

Exposed elements such as timber framing and support structures help to create the feel of a mountain village.

Roof lines should cascade down to the street to create a scale that is comfortable for pedestrians. Porches and other roof extensions should not be as steep as the roof over the main building mass.

Awkward roof designs and flat, low-pitched roofs should be avoided.
Roofs

APPLICATION

Sloped roofs should be proportioned to supporting walls below.

Flat roofs should be minimized or concealed.

Long, unbroken roof lines should be avoided.

Roofs should be broken up with dormers, arches, pediments, or other architectural elements. Long unbroken roof lines should be avoided.

Windows and dormers provide a way of breaking up long horizontal roof spans.

Flat, mansard, and bipped roofs should be avoided. Utilities on roofs should be concealed.

This sloped roof is proportioned to the supporting walls below.
Roofs

COLOR

Exterior color composition should be in keeping with the natural environment, consistent with the mountain village aesthetic, and in harmony with surrounding structures.

Earth tones of greens, blue-greys, rusts, grays, and browns are most appropriate, and bright, fluorescent, or pastel colors should be avoided altogether.

Roofs with bright colors are distracting and contrast with the natural colors of the mountain landscape.

The roof material color palette should contain earth tones and use natural materials.

The materials used in the roofing here are multi-colored with different shades of brown and gray. The color and texture are visually appealing and in harmony with the surrounding natural environment.
Galloway Commercial Corridor

Lighting and Signage

MATERIALS

Plastic or internally lit signage is discouraged.

The use of neon should be minimized, or as an accent only.

The use of natural materials is encouraged.

Signs should be carefully integrated into the architecture of buildings using materials that are consistent with the master plan’s aesthetic.

Background signage and cheap framing materials like the aluminum used in this sign are discouraged.

Natural materials have been used effectively in the structure that supports these signs.
Gallivance Commercial Corridor
Lighting and Signage

PROFILES,
ARTICULATION, AND
CONFIGURATION

Sign panels with three dimensional relief are encouraged.

This sign has a clever design with dimensional relief.

This sign uses an attractive color scheme and natural materials.

Effective combination of lighting and signage.

Signage supports, like buildings, should use natural materials, and signs should use simple elements that convey the desired message clearly.
Gathering Commercial Corridor

Lighting and Signage

APPLICATION

Lighting should be adequate for public safety and enhance the building environment while preserving views of the night time skies.

Signage should identify the business clearly with simple messages and a simple layout that is proportional to setting.

Lighting should not be a nuisance to the public way or adjacent properties.

Well designed signages provide a way to present signage and identify a business without interfering with the public way.

This lighting fits in with the building design and materials.

Lighting and signage can be combined to create an attractive ensemble.

This sign identifies a business clearly and projects a positive image.
COLOR

Exterior color composition should be in keeping with the natural environment, consistent with the mountain village aesthetic, and in harmony with the surrounding structures.

Earth tones of greens, blue-grays, rusts, grays, and browns are most appropriate, and bright, fluorescent, or pastel colors should be avoided altogether.

Appropriate colors and a simple design make this a successful sign.

Signs can identify businesses clearly while also improving the aesthetic character of a community.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX D
KEY GATLINBURG BUILDINGS BY BARBER & MCMURRY AND BEBB

Barber & McMurry:
- Addition to the 1927 Industrial HS (1938)
  No longer extant.
- First United Methodist Church (1938)
- National Park Service/Sugarlands Administrative Offices (1940)
- Arts and Crafts Building (c. 1912, 1940 Renovation)
  Hubert Bebb’s firm located here during the 1960s.
- Arrowcraft Shop (1940, addition 1960 by Knoxville firm Cooper and Perry)
- Stuart Dormitory (1941)
- United Methodist Church (1945)
- Jennie Nicol Health Clinic Building (1948)
  Now the Arrowmont business office, was used as health center until 1965.
- Ruth Barrett Smith Staff House (1952)
  West dining wing added in 1989.
- The Red Barn, Stock Barn (1923, renovation 1959)
  Transverse crib stock barn renovated into dormitory space.

Hubert Bebb:
Hotels and Inns:
- Buckhorn Inn and Guest Houses (1937)
- Clingman’s Dome Overlook (1959)
- Gatlinburg Motor Inn
- Mountain View Motor Inn
- Riverside Hotel
- Cooper Court
- Gatlinburg Motor Inn
- Huff Motel Number 2
- Mountain View Hotel
- Rocky Waters Motel
- Skyland Motel
- Candy Kitchen #1 and #2, Davy Dych
- Polly Bergen Shop
- Sky Lift Concession
- The Village
- Sky Room Restaurant
- The Pancake Pantry
- Arrowmont Craft School, Turner Building 1970
- Exhibit Kiosks along Parkway in front of Admin building
- Woodcrafters and Carvers Shop
- Woodwhittlers
- Gatlinburg Civic Auditorium
113 Historic Nature Trail (Artillery Range)

A short walk of walking or biking allowed. Don't expect to find as many flowers as in the early 1900s. A 1/2 mile paved trail through the park provides an opportunity to explore the history of the range and the equipment used. Proceed to the end of the trail where you will find a sign indicating the location of the Artillery Range. Continue east on the paved trail to the end of the range and return along the same trail.

123 Trinity Episcopal Church

The church was organized in 1855 and incorporated in 1860. The present church was completed in 1908. The building is constructed of stone with a brick tower. The interior is decorated with stained glass windows and a large chandelier. The church is open daily from 10 AM to 4 PM and admission is free. Further information about the church is located in the lobby. The church is located on the corner of Main Street and Church Avenue.

133 Methodist Assembly Ground

The Methodist Assembly Ground is a historic site located at the foot of the mountain near the Artillery Range. The site was used as a place for religious gatherings and retreats from 1880 to 1930. The site features a small chapel, a stone wall, and a picnic area. The site is open daily from 9 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.

143 Louis Vothers Home

The Vothers Home, located at the foot of the mountain near the Artillery Range, was built in 1880 by a local businessman. The home features a stone facade and woodpaneled interior. The home is open daily from 10 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.

173 Roaring Fork Motor Nature Trail

The Roaring Fork Motor Nature Trail is a 5-mile loop through the forest area. The trail is open to hikers, cyclists, and equestrians. The trail begins at the visitor center and follows the Roaring Fork River. The trail is open daily from 8 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.

183 Bales Cemetery

The Bales Cemetery is located at the intersection of Old Stage Road and Shawnee Lane. The cemetery contains the remains of several members of the Bales family. The cemetery is open daily from 9 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.

193 Ephraim Bales Home

The Ephraim Bales Home is located at the intersection of Old Stage Road and Shawnee Lane. The home was built in 1880 by a local businessman. The home features a stone facade and wood-paneled interior. The home is open daily from 10 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.

213 Gatlinburg Aerial Tramway

The Gatlinburg Aerial Tramway is a 900-foot-long cable car that spans the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The tramway was built in 1976 and offers views of the surrounding mountains. The tramway is open daily from 8 AM to 5 PM and admission is free. Further information is available at the visitor center.
APPENDIX F

Tourism Policy of the National Park Service of the USA (as summarized in Eagles and McCool, p. 283):

The National Park Service of the USA is one of the few park agencies with an approved tourism policy. This policy provides direction on the types of issues to be addressed by a park agency in tourism. Actions include the following:

1. Dialogue and outreach with other public and private tourism interests.
2. Show agency leadership in sustainable tourism design and operation.
3. Highlight national diversity.
4. Encourage visitation by peoples of all types.
5. Provision of cost-effective and accurate information services.
6. Encourage visitation of low-use parks, and off-season use of high-use parks.
7. Management for international visitation.
8. Identify desired resource conditions and visitor experiences and develop procedures to provide these conditions.
9. Influence the plans of tour operators and gateway communities towards park goals.
10. Mediate the relationships between park concessionaires and other aspects of tourism services.
11. Keep the agency up to date on tourism trends.
12. Look for funding partners to help carry out park programmes.
13. Keep key stakeholders, such as local communities and private tourism businesses, informed about resource conditions, resource management and safety issues.
APPENDIX G
According to Urry’s *Tourist Gaze*:
Characteristics defined as Tourism.

1. Tourism is a leisure activity which presupposes its opposite, namely regulated and organized work. It is one manifestation of how work and leisure are organized as separate and regulated spheres of social practice in ‘modern’ societies. Indeed acting as a tourist is one of the defining characteristics of being ‘modern’ and is bound up with major transformations in paid work. This has come to be organized within particular places and to occur for regularized periods of time.

2. Tourist relationships arise from a movement of people to, and their stay in, various destinations. This necessarily involves some movement through space, that is the journeys, and periods of stay in a new place or places.

3. The journey and stay are to, and in, sites outside the normal places of residence and work. Periods of residence elsewhere are of a short-term and temporary nature. There is a clear intention to return ‘home’ within a relatively short period of time.

4. The places gazed upon are for purposes not directly connected with paid work and they normally offer some distinctive contrasts with work (both paid and unpaid).

5. A substantial portion of the population of modern societies engages in such tourist practices; new socialized forms of provision are developed in order to cope with the mass character of the gaze of tourists (as opposed to the individual character of ‘travel’).

6. Places are chosen to be gazed upon because there is anticipation, especially through daydreaming and fantasy, of intense pleasures, either on a different scale or involving different senses from those customarily encountered. Such anticipation is constructed and sustained through a variety of non-tourist practices, such as film, TV, literature, magazines, records and videos, which construct and reinforce that gaze.
7. The tourist gaze is directed to features of landscape and townscape which separate them off from everyday experience. Such aspects are viewed because they are taken to be in some sense out of the ordinary. The viewing of such tourist sights often involves different forms of social patterning, with a much greater sensitivity to visual elements of landscape or townscape than normally found in everyday life. People linger over such a gaze which is then normally visually objectified or captured through photographs, postcards, films, models, and so on. These enable the gaze to be endlessly reproduced and recaptured.

8. The gaze is constructed through signs, and tourism involves the collection of signs. When tourists see two people kissing in Paris what they capture in the gaze is “timeless romantic Paris’. When a small village in England is seen, what they gaze upon is the ‘real olde England’. As Culler argues: ‘the tourist is interested in everything as a sign of itself…All over the world the unsung armies of semioticians, the tourists, are fanning out in search of the signs of Frenchness, typical Italian behavior, exemplary Oriental scenes, typical American thruways, traditional English pubs’ (1981: 127).

9. An array of tourist professionals develop who attempt to reproduce ever new objects of the tourist gaze. These objects are located in a complex and changing hierarchy. This depends upon the interplay between, on the one hand, competition between interests involved in the provision of such objects and, on the other hand, changing class, gender, generational distinctions of taste within the potential population of visitors.
APPENDIX H

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes

National Park Service U.S. Department of the Interior

http://www.nps.gov/tps/h/IntroGuid.htm

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes provide guidance to landscape owners, managers, landscape architects, preservation planners, architects, contractors, and project reviewers who are planning and implementing project work.

Introduction

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing professional standards and providing advice on the preservation of cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. In partial fulfillment of this responsibility, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation Projects were developed in 1976. They consisted of seven sets of standards for the acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of historic buildings.

Since their publication in 1976, the Secretary’s Standards have been used by State Historic Preservation Officers and the National Park Service to ensure that projects receiving federal money or tax benefits were reviewed in a consistent manner nationwide. The principles embodied in the Standards have also been adopted by hundreds of preservation commissions across the country in local design guidelines.

In 1992, the Standards were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places—buildings, structures, sites, objects, districts, and landscapes. The revised Standards were reduced to four sets by incorporating protection and stabilization into preservation, and by eliminating acclamations, which is no longer considered a treatment. Revised. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, this new, modified version addresses four treatments: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes illustrate how to apply these four treatments to cultural landscapes in a way that meets the Standards.

Of the four, Preservation standards require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, including the landscape’s historic form, features, and details as they have evolved over time. Rehabilitation standards acknowledge the need to alter or add to a cultural landscape to meet continuing or new uses while retaining the landscape’s historic character. Restoration standards allow for the depiction of a landscape at a particular time in US history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods. Reconstruction standards establish a framework for recreating a vanished or non-surviving landscape with new materials, primarily for interpretive purposes.


Defining Landscape Terminology

Character defining feature. A prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a cultural landscape that contributes significantly to its physical character. Land use patterns, vegetation, furnishings, decorative details and materials may be such features.

Component landscape. A discrete portion of the landscape that can be further subdivided into individual features. The landscape unit may contribute to the significance of a National Register property, such as a farmstead in a rural historic district. In some cases, the landscape unit may be individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, such as a rose garden in a large urban park.
Cultural Landscape. A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.

Ethnographic landscape. A landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, sacred religious sites, and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components.

Feature. The smallest element(s) of a landscape that contributes to the significance and that can be the subject of a treatment intervention. Examples include a woodlot, hedge, lawn, specimen plant, alice, house, meadow or open field, fence, wall, arborvitae, pond or pool, bollard, orchard, or agricultural terrace.

Historic character. The sum of all visual aspects, features, materials, and spaces associated with a cultural landscape’s history, i.e., the original configuration together with losses and later changes. These qualities are often referred to as character defining.

Historic designed landscape. A landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, engineer, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a person or a significant event or trend in landscape architecture or illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. Examples include parks, campuses, and estates.

Historic vernacular landscape. A landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped it. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, a family, or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. This can be a farm complex or a district of historic farmsteads along a river valley. Examples include rural historic districts and agricultural landscapes.

Historic site. A landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and presidential homes and properties.

Integrity. The authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evinced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic or prehistoric period. The seven qualities of integrity as defined by the National Register Program are location, setting, feeling, association, design, workmanship, and materials.

Significance. The meaning or value ascribed to a cultural landscape based on the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity.

Treatment. Work carried out to achieve a particular historic preservation goal.

Preservation Planning and the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes

Careful planning prior to treatment can help prevent irrevocable damage to a cultural landscape. Professional techniques for identifying, documenting, and treating cultural landscapes have advanced over the past twenty-five years and are continually being refined. As described in the National Park Service publication, Preservation Brief #36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes, the preservation planning process for cultural landscapes should involve: historical research; inventory and documentation of existing conditions; site analysis and evaluation of integrity and significance; development of a cultural landscape preservation approach and treatment plan; development of a cultural landscape management plan and management philosophy; development of a strategy for ongoing maintenance; and, preparation of a record of treatment and future research recommendations.
In all treatments for cultural landscapes, the following general recommendations and comments apply:

1. Before undertaking project work, research of a cultural landscape is essential. Research findings help to identify a landscape’s historic period(s) of ownership, occupancy and development, and bring greater understanding of the associations that make them significant. Research findings also provide a foundation to make educated decisions for project treatment, and can guide management, maintenance, and interpretation. In addition, research findings may be useful in satisfying compliance reviews (e.g. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended).

2. Although there is no single way to inventory a landscape, the goal of documentation is to provide a record of the landscape as it exists at the present time, thus providing a baseline from which to operate. All component landscapes and features (see definitions below) that contribute to the landscape’s historic character should be recorded. The level of documentation needed depends on the nature and the significance of the resource. For example, plant material documentation may ideally include botanical name or species, common name and size. To ensure full representation of existing herbaceous plants, care should be taken to document the landscape in different seasons. This level of research may most often be the ideal goal for smaller properties, but may prove impractical for large, vernacular landscapes.

3. Assessing a landscape as a continuum through history is critical in assessing cultural and historic value. By analyzing the landscape, change over time - the chronological and physical “layers” of the landscape - can be understood. Based on analysis, individual features may be attributed to a discrete period of introduction, their presence or absence substantiated to a given date and, therefore the landscape’s significance and integrity evaluated. In addition, analysis allows the property to be viewed within the context of other cultural landscapes.

4. In order for the landscape to be considered significant, character-defining features that convey its significance in history must not only be present, but they also must possess historic integrity. Location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association should be considered in determining whether a landscape and its character-defining features possess historic integrity.

5. Preservation planning for cultural landscapes involves a broad array of dynamic variables. Adopting comprehensive treatment and management plans, in concert with a preservation maintenance strategy, acknowledges a cultural landscape’s ever-changing nature and the interrelationship of treatment, management and maintenance.

Some Factors to Consider When Selecting an Appropriate Treatment

The Standards are neither technical nor prescriptive, but are intended to promote responsible preservation practices that help protect our nation’s irreplaceable cultural resources. They cannot be used to make essential decisions about which contributing features of a cultural landscape should be retained and which can be changed. But once a specific treatment is selected, the Standards can provide the necessary philosophical framework for a consistent and holistic approach for a cultural landscape project.

A treatment is a physical intervention carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal – it cannot be considered in a vacuum. There are many practical and philosophical variables that influence the selection of a treatment for a landscape. These include, but are not limited to, the extent of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, historic value, proposed use, long and short term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g. accessibility, fire, security) and anticipated capital improvement, staffing and maintenance costs. The impact of the treatment on any significant archaeological and natural resources should also be considered in this decision making process. Therefore, it is necessary to consider a broad array of dynamic and interrelated variables in selecting a treatment for a cultural landscape preservation project.
For some cultural landscapes, especially those that are best considered ethnographic or heritage landscapes, these Guidelines may not apply. However, if people working with these properties decide that community coherence may be affected by physical place and space— or if there is potential for loss of landscape character whose significance is rooted in the community’s activities and processes (or other aspects of its history)—this guide may be of service.

CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

There is a balance between change and continuity in all-cultural resources. Change is inherent in cultural landscapes; it results from both natural processes and human activities. Sometimes that change is subtle, barely perceptible as with the geomorphological effects on landform. At other times, it is strikingly obvious, as with vegetation, either in the cyclical changes of growth and reproduction or the progressive changes of plant competition and succession. This dynamic quality of all cultural landscapes is balanced by the continuity of distinctive characteristics retained over time. For, in spite of a landscape’s constant change (or perhaps because of it), a property can still exhibit continuity of form, order, use, features, or materials. Preservation and rehabilitation treatments seek to secure and emphasize continuity while acknowledging change.

RELATIVE SIGNIFICANCE IN HISTORY

A cultural landscape may be a significant resource as a rare survivor or the work of an important landscape architect, horticulturist or designer. It may be the site of an important event or activity, reflect cultural traditions, or other patterns of settlement or land use. This significance may be derived from local, regional, or national importance. Cultural landscapes may be listed in the National Register of Historic Places individually or as contributing features in a historic district. In some instances, cultural landscapes may be designated National Historic Landmarks by the Secretary of the Interior for their exceptional significance in American history.

INTEGRITY AND EXISTING PHYSICAL CONDITION

Prior to selecting a treatment, it is important to understand and evaluate the difference between integrity and existing conditions. Integrity is the authenticity of a cultural landscape’s historic identity; it is the physical evidence of its significance. Existing conditions can be defined as the current physical state of the landscape’s form, order, features and materials. For example, the integrity of an abandoned garden may be clear based on its extant form, features, and materials, but existing conditions may be poor, due to neglect or deferred maintenance.

GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT

The surroundings of a cultural landscape, whether an urban neighborhood or rural farming area, may contribute to its significance and its historic character and should be considered prior to treatment. The setting may contain component landscapes or features (see definitions, page 9) which fall within the property’s historic boundaries. It also may be comprised of separate properties beyond the landscape’s boundaries, and perhaps those of the National Register listing. The landscape context can include the overall pattern of the circulation networks, views and vistas into and out of the landscape, land use, natural features, clusters of structures, and division of properties.

USE

Historic, current, and proposed use of the cultural landscape must be considered prior to treatment selection. Historic use is directly linked to its significance, while current and proposed use(s) can affect integrity and existing conditions. Parameters may vary from one landscape to another. For example, in one agricultural landscape, continuation of the historic use can lead to changes in the physical form of a farm to accommodate new crops and equipment. In another agricultural property, new uses may be adapted within the landscape’s existing form. Order and features.
ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
Prehistoric and historic archaeological resources may be found in cultural landscapes above and below the ground (below) and even under water. Examples of prehistoric archaeological resources include prehistoric mounds built by Native-Americans. Examples of historic archaeological resources include remnants of buildings, cliff dwellings, and villages; or features of a sunken garden, mining camp, or battlefield. These resources not only have historical value, but can also reveal significant information about a cultural landscape. The appropriate treatment of a cultural landscape includes the identification and preservation of significant archeological resources. Many landscape preservation projects include a site archeologist.

NATURAL SYSTEMS
Cultural landscapes often derive their character from a human response to natural features and systems. The significance of these natural resources may be based on their cultural associations and from their inherent ecological values. Natural resources form natural systems that are interdependent on one another and which may extend well beyond the boundary of the historic property. For example, these systems can include geology, hydrology, plant and animal habitats, and climate. Some of these natural resources are particularly susceptible to disturbances caused by changes in landscape management. Many natural resources, such as wetlands or rare species, fall under local, state, and federal regulations, which must be considered. Natural resource protection is a specialized field distinct from cultural landscape preservation. A preservation planning team may want to include an expert in this area to address specific issues or resources found within a cultural landscape. Natural systems are an integral part of the cultural landscape and must be considered when selecting an appropriate treatment.

MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE
Management strategies are long-term and comprehensive. They can be one of the means for implementing a landscape preservation plan. Maintenance tasks can be day-to-day, seasonal, or cyclical, as determined by management strategies. Although routine horticultural activities, such as mowing and weeding, or general grounds maintenance, such as re-laying pavement or curbs, may appear routine, such activities can cumulatively alter the character of a landscape. In contrast, well-conceived management and maintenance activities can sustain character and integrity over an extended period. Therefore, both the management and maintenance of cultural landscapes should be considered when selecting a treatment.

INTERPRETATION
Interpretation can help in understanding and "reading" the landscape. The tools and techniques of interpretation can include guided walks, self-guided brochures, computer-aided tours, exhibits, and wayside stations. Interpretive goals should compliment treatment selection, reflecting the landscape’s significance and historic character. A cultural landscape may possess varying levels of integrity or even differing periods of significance, both of which may result in a multi-faceted approach to interpretation. In some cases, interpretation and a sound interpretive strategy can inform decisions about how to treat a landscape.

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
Work that must be done to meet accessibility, health and safety, environmental protection or energy efficiency needs is usually not part of the overall process of protecting cultural landscapes; rather this work is assessed for its potential impact on the cultural landscape.

ACCESSIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS
It is often necessary to make modifications to cultural landscapes so that they will be in compliance with current accessibility code requirements. Three specific Federal laws require accessibility to certain cultural landscapes: the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990. Federal rules, regulations and standards have been devel-
Work must be carefully planned and undertaken so that it does not result in the loss of character-defining features. The goal is to provide the highest level of access with the lowest level of impact on the integrity of the landscape.

HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS
In undertaking work on cultural landscapes, it is necessary to consider the impact that meeting current health and safety codes (for example, public health, life safety, fire safety, electrical, seismic, structural, and building codes) will have on character-defining features. For example, upgrading utility service, storm or sewer drainage systems requires trenching which can disturb soils, plants and archeological resources. Special coordination with the responsible code officials at the state, county, or municipal level may be required. Securing required permits and licenses is best accomplished early in project planning work. It is often necessary to look beyond the "letter" of code requirements to their underlying purpose; most modern codes allow for alternative approaches and reasonable variance to achieve compliance.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS
Many cultural landscapes are affected by requirements that address environmental issues. Legislation at the federal, state and municipal level have established rules and regulations for dealing with a variety of natural resources -- including water, air, soil and wildlife. Work predicated on such legislation must be carefully planned and undertaken so that it does not result in the loss of a landscape's character-defining features. Securing required permits and licenses should be considered early in project work, and special efforts should be made to coordinate with public agencies responsible for overseeing specific environmental concerns.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY
Some features of a cultural landscape, such as buildings, structures, vegetation and furnishings, can play an energy-conserving role. Therefore, prior to undertaking project work to achieve greater energy efficiency, the first step should always be to identify and evaluate existing historic features to assess their inherent energy conserving potential. If it is determined that such work is appropriate, then it needs to be carried out with particular care to insure that the landscape's historic character is retained.
Guidelines to help property owners, developers, and Federal managers apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are available from the National Park Service, State Historic Preservation Offices, or from the Government Printing Office. For more information write: National Park Service, Preservation Assistance Division-424, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127.