1. Name of Property

historic name: Colonial Parkway

other names/site number: N/A

2. Location

street & number: P.O. Box 210 not for publication N/A

city or town: Yorktown vicinity

state Virginia code VA county York & James City code 199 & 095 zip code 23188

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this _x_ nomination _x_ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property _x_ meets _x_ does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant _x_ nationally _x_ statewide ___ locally. ( ___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official _x_ Date _x_

In my opinion, the property ___ meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria. ( ___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting or other official ___ Date ___

State or Federal agency and bureau
4. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby certify that this property is:

____ entered in the National Register

___ See continuation sheet.

____ determined eligible for the National Register

___ See continuation sheet.

____ determined not eligible for the National Register

____ removed from the National Register

other (explain): ____________________________

________________________________________  ______________________________________

Signature of Keeper                              Date of Action

5. Classification

Ownership of Property (Check as many boxes as apply)

___ private

___ public-local

___ public-State

  x  public-Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)

___ building(s)

  x  district

___ site

___ structure

___ object

Number of Resources within Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>building(s) (NPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register __________________

Name of related multiple property listing: N/A
6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions)
Cat: Landscape Sub: Park
Transportation Road-related
Recreation and Culture Outdoor Recreation

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions)
Cat: Landscape Sub: Park
Transportation Road-related
Recreation and Culture Outdoor Recreation

7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions)
Colonial Revival

Materials (Enter categories from instructions)
foundation
roof
walls
other
Pavements: concrete
Walls and bridges: brick, concrete, stone
Swales and channels: concrete
Culverts, other drainage structures: concrete, brick, stone

Narrative Description (Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing)

_x_ A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

_x_ B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
__C__ Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

__D__ Property has yielded, or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

___ a  owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

___ b  removed from its original location.

___ c  a birthplace or a grave.

___ d  a cemetery.

___ e  a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

___ f  a commemorating property.

___ g  less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
conservation
entertainment/recreation
landscape architecture
architecture

Period of Significance 1930-1958

Significant Dates 1931, 1955

Significant Person
(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)  NA

Cultural Affiliation NA

Architect/Builder Charles Peterson, Oliver "O G. Taylor, Stanley Abbott

Narrative Statement of Significance
See continuation sheet

---

9. Major Bibliographical References

See continuation sheet
USDI/NPS NRHP Registration Form
Colonial Parkway
York Co., James City County, City of Williamsburg, Virginia

Previous documentation on file (NPS)

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # VA-48

Primary Location of Additional Data

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

Name of repository: Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property: The Parkway contains approximately 1675 acres of the park’s 10,000 acres.

UTM References (Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>366660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>366500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>366000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>365130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See continuation sheet.
Verbal Boundary Description (See continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification (See continuation sheet.)
11. Form Prepared By

name/title: Shaun Eyring, Historical Landscape Architect, and Phyllis Ellin, Historian
organization: National Park Service
street & number: 200 Chestnut St.
city or town: Philadelphia  State: PA.
date: December 1999
telephone: 215-597-8850
zip code: 19106

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps
A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
A sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs
Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name ______________________________
street & number __________________________ telephone __________________________
city or town __________________________ state ________ zip code ________

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.)
Narrative Description of Historic and Current Conditions

(The following description and evaluation is adapted from the Colonial Parkway Cultural Landscape Report by LANDSCAPES and augmented with additional field survey.)

The Colonial Parkway, part of Colonial National Historical Park located on the Virginia's James-York peninsula, is a National Park Service scenic parkway constructed by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Public Roads between 1931 and 1958. Originally constructed to link the three historic sites of Yorktown, Williamsburg, and Jamestown, the district encompasses 21.44 miles of road from the parking lot at the Yorktown Visitor Center to the parking lot of the Jamestown Visitor Center.

Historical Context

The James-York peninsula is rich in the country's early history. Native American populations dominated human occupation on much of the peninsula from the late Pleistocene until European settlement in the seventeenth century. In 1607, Jamestown became the first permanent English settlement in North America. Growth first occurred along the James River, and later inland and along the York River. Agriculture was the primary land use during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the peninsula was sparsely populated. The James-York peninsula was an important strategic battleground during the American Revolution. Williamsburg, then the colonial capital, was a focus of the war. In 1781, the Battle of Yorktown was fought, and it was here that General Lord Cornwallis surrendered to General George Washington. The peninsula recovered slowly after the war. The reduction in agricultural productivity and a loss of political influence when the Virginia capital moved from Williamsburg to Richmond caused a reduction in the size of the region's large farms and plantations. During the Civil War, the peninsula saw much military activity and again recovery following the war was slow. By the turn of the twentieth century agriculture had declined significantly, and the onset of World War I led to the construction of military installations in the region. Spurred on by the anniversaries of key historic events of 1607 and 1781 and by the restoration of the colonial capital of Williamsburg in the late 1920s, tourism became an increasing industry. Such heightened awareness of the region's historic significance led to the creation of the Colonial National Monument in 1930 (later re-designated Colonial National Historical Park). The primary goal of this new park was to commemorate and preserve the unique historical features of the James/York peninsula including Jamestown, Yorktown, and the Yorktown battlefield. A major feature of the park was to be a new parkway linking Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown.¹

Current Conditions

The Colonial Parkway was designed and constructed as a curvilinear, scenic route with expansive views over both the York and James Rivers. This historic district contains original roads, bridges, culverts, picnic areas, overlooks, and interpretive wayside exhibits associated with the construction period. From the entrance point at the Yorktown Visitor Center Parking lot to the entrance of the Fusiliers Redoubt Overlook, the Parkway moves through forested uplands. A wide swath of lawn on cut slopes characterizes it, with forest defining the top of the roadside slope where it blends with the original grade. Because of the open swath of lawn, open sky can be perceived, affecting the sense of enclosure. From Ballard Creek to the Naval Weapons Station, filtered views to the river on the north side of the Parkway are balanced by a forested edge on the south side. Near the Naval Weapons Station, the Parkway drops on elevation close to the water line. This portion of the Parkway, all the way to Indian Field Creek Bridge, is characterized by its wide-open views of the York River across the level surface of hydraulic fill. Between Indian Field and Felgates Creek, a zone known as Bellfield Straight, has a particularly distinctive spatial quality provided by a combination of alignment, topography, vegetation, and viewshed. It opens onto a long and straight section in contrast to the gently curving corridor previously experienced between here and Yorktown. Situated 25' above the river, regular spaced pine trees provide a shaded, columned loggia through which expansive views of the river are appreciated.

Between Felgates Creek and Williamsburg the spatial character of the corridor is tightly enclosed, with a dense forest on both sides of the road. From Williamsburg to Jones Mill Pond, six underpasses that lend a particular character to this area as one repeatedly moves under the series of brick arches punctuate the continuous forest enclosure. The character of enclosed forest extends all the way from Williamsburg to Halfway Creek Bridge, although there are a few areas that provide lateral views into wetlands and other open zones such as the Great Oaks parking overlook. As the Parkway approaches College Creek from Halfway Creek, the spatial character becomes more open and the corridor affords wide views to the James River and the College Creek tidal marsh. From College Creek to Archers Hope and Mill Creek, the Parkway is set back from the river so that the river is viewed over a larger expanse of open, mowed land, much of which is hydraulic fill. Between Mill Creek and Jamestown Island, vegetative buffers provide dense enclosure and obscure most of the views to the river and marsh. This enclosure breaks momentarily as the Parkway crosses Powhatan Creek. The Jamestown Island Isthmus provides the unique spatial experience of traversing a narrow spit of land with water on both sides. Once the Parkway crosses the Isthmus Bridge it enters the Jamestown Visitor Center parking lot and again becomes enclosed by the surrounding vegetation.

The entire length of the Colonial Parkway possesses extraordinary integrity to the period of its

---

2 Ibid. pp. 339-342
3 Ibid. p. 349
construction. In general, the Parkway provides nearly the same experience for visitors as it did during the historic period. The dominant features of the roadway remaining intact include: original width and alignment of the road, the colonial-style brick work of the bridges and culverts, most of the views and vistas, and the varied experience of a curvilinear road moving from shoreline to shoreline. There are a few exceptions of features that defer from the original Parkway experience including a housing development that is encroaching along the approach to Jamestown from Williamsburg, two post-1958 bridges, several linear stretches of post-1958 concrete swales, some encroaching vegetation, and modern wooden guard rails.

Description of Contributing Resources in the District

In addition to the three traditional categories of contributing resources (structures, sites, and objects), landscape qualities essential to the character of the Colonial Parkway have been divided into four additional categories. The seven categories are as listed below:

- spatial organization
- circulation
- topography
- vegetation
- structures
- sites
- objects

Spatial organization refers to the composition and sequence of outdoor spaces within the district. Circulation refers to the means and patterns of movement through the district. Topography refers to the ways in which the landscape planning responds to the topographic features of the site. Vegetation refers to both the responses to existing vegetation and to the management of vegetation through pruning, removal or addition of trees and shrubs. Structures include all the contributing structures in the district, including the road, bridges, overpasses and underpasses, walls, and culverts. Sites include all contributing sites within the district including parking lots, picnic areas, and overlooks. Objects refers to all the contributing small scale features in the district and may have multiple parts, such as signs, however, within the description is found a total count and general location of the parts.

Spatial organization

The spatial organization of the Parkway was driven by the desire to connect three historic sites through a scenic and beautiful landscape. This was accomplished by moving from a low-lying and open river terrain to a higher, undulating and enclosed forested terrain and back down to a low-lying and open river terrain. The routing of the Parkway only partially created the spatial character, which was further enhanced by
the design of the roadway itself. The road was designed with a series of smaller, individual spatial events which provided an interesting and varied driving sequence. These local spatial characteristics were created in the Parkway design through grading, planting, alignment, and views and vistas.

Today the general organization of the Parkway remains largely intact and moves seamlessly from the low-lying and open river terrain, to the higher, undulating and enclosed forested terrain, and back to the low-lying and open river terrain. Many of the local spatial events, although matured, are also intact, perpetuating that unique and seamlessly planned design sequence. These events include the cleared understory and designed vegetation that frame views to the York and James Rivers, tidal creeks, enclosed forested edges along the higher terrain, the long low sequence of concrete bridges over unbounded tidal marshes near Jamestown, and the parking overlooks. Views and vistas continue to be a strong characteristic of the Parkway. Critical planned views surviving from the period of significance include the following: (see attached sketch map, “Views and Vistas”)

Along the York River:
- V-1: filtered and open views to the York River between Ballard’s Creek and Felgate’s Creek
- V-2: views to Ballard Creek, Bracken’s Pond, Indian Field Creek and Felgate’s Creek

Along the ridge before the Williamsburg Tunnel:
- V-3: filtered views to Ringfield
- V-4: views to King’s Creek
- V-5: views to Jones Mill Pond

Along the ridge after the Williamsburg Tunnel:
- V-6: views to Great Oak
- V-7: views to Halfway Creek

Along the James River:
- V-8: views of the river from College Creek to Mill Creek
- V-9: views of inland marsh at College Creek, Archer’s Hope, and Mill Creek
- V-10: views to Gospel Spreading Farm

Mill Creek to Jamestown:
- V-11: views to Powhatan Creek marsh
- V-12: views from Isthmus bridge to Jamestown Island and the James River

---

4 Landscapes et al., “Colonial Parkway Cultural Landscape Report,” April 25, 1996 (95% draft), p. 239.
In some locations, such as along Bellfield Straight, the views are more random and less regular in their repetition than in general. Because the Parkway borrowed heavily on the adjacent landscape for some of its varied spatial sequence, there has been some change, although not uniformly detrimental, to the Parkway's character. This is especially true in the forested higher terrain where modern development has diminished the vegetative buffer. Other lost views due to encroaching vegetation include areas near Felgates Creek, Brackens Pond, and College Creek. Overall, the Parkway exhibits its historic spatial character including key views and vistas.

Circulation

The Colonial Parkway was designed to link the three historic sites of Yorktown, Williamsburg and Jamestown. The historic circulation character is primarily defined by alignment and surfacing. During the construction period, the alignment of the Parkway was characterized as sinuous, comprised of spiral and single-centered curves with limited tangents, and set in an average 500 foot right-of-way. The design consistently adhered to low curvature and grade standards (maximum 15% and 5% respectively). Horizontal curves smoothly transitioned from one direction to the next and vertical curves moved smoothly from one topographic condition to another. The gently winding road evoked anticipation in the experience of the motorist of moving from one curve to the next. The character design of the curves was consistent from one end of the Parkway to the other, providing an essential unity throughout.

The reinforced concrete pavement of the Parkway, with its finish of exposed local aggregate, was an integral part of the overall character of the roadway. The full length of the Parkway was concrete, except for the terminal ends of the pavement and the terminal parking lots, which were paved in chip sealed asphalt. The Parkway's concrete surface was laid in three lanes, each 10 feet wide, making its total width 30 feet. The light color of the concrete accentuated the roadway's curving alignment, creating a distinctive driving experience. In areas of hydraulic fill, the Parkway's finish of exposed local stone complemented the sandy soil colors, further unifying the Parkway with its surroundings.

Another distinctive characteristic of the generous roadway was the absence of the painted roadway lane striping. A visually present, but recessive joint divided the pavement into three lanes without the obtrusive paint striping. Although the use of striping has been discussed over the decades as a safety issue, "no passing" signage has met this need. The entire Parkway remains unstriped and retains the recessive jointing between lanes, therefore the road blends more effectively into the surrounding landscape and scenery.6

---

6 Landscapes et al., p 274
Circulation characteristics retain a high degree of integrity along the Colonial Parkway. The Parkway's alignment has not changed since construction was completed in 1958. The horizontal and vertical curves remain in their original state with the exception being, some mudjacking that occurred in the 1960s was done to re-establish alignment after roadbed settling. The surface of the road retains its light exposed aggregate concrete finish in three 10 foot lanes, with the exception of the terminal ends of the Parkway that remain single lanes of chip sealed asphalt. Repairs to the pavement have left a patchwork appearance in isolated areas along the entire Parkway length that detracts from the original condition of a unified ribbon of color. Another change to the road surface is the addition of curbs and drainage chutes installed during a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) repair project to facilitate drainage. Overall, the historic character of circulation of the Parkway is preserved.

Topography

Topography is a very important feature in creating the character of the Colonial Parkway as it crosses from a low-lying river terrain to a hilly ridge terrain back to a low-lying river terrain. As the design and construction of the Parkway moved forward, a distinct vocabulary of grading features resulted. The first of these was the broad, relatively flat hydraulic fill conditions where the Parkway crossed creek mouths. These open, level areas created expansive views over the rivers and marshes. Cut and fill slopes also emerged as primary design features of the Parkway. These slopes varied in steepness from 2:1 to 5:1 with 3:1 and 4:1 slopes dominating. These characteristic side slopes helped give the Parkway its three dimensional, volumetric quality. In some areas the road was enclosed by the surrounding landscape; in other areas, sloped embankments falling away from the road on either side gave the feeling of moving through lower terrain. In these ways, the road's cuts and fills helped give the alignment a clear visual definition, which enhanced the experience of driving the Parkway.

Overall changes to the Parkway topography since 1958 have been localized and minor. Although changes in topography have occurred where new overpasses and underpasses and their associated access ramps have occurred, the distinctive volumetric and visual qualities of the roadway provided by the curving horizontal and vertical alignment and the cut and fill side slopes retain a high degree of integrity.

Vegetation

Vegetation is a critical character-defining feature along the Colonial Parkway. Both naturally occurring and designed plantings were used to enhance the driving experience by framing vistas, enclosing spaces, punctuating linear stretches of road, and softening the foreground of sweeping views. Vegetation on the Colonial Parkway may be grouped into three general categories: pre-existing vegetation, designed

---

Ibid. p. 407

Landscapes et al., p. 256
Pre-existing vegetation that existed prior to the Parkway construction was well-documented by park foresters. Three major plant associations were identified which included a mixed pine forest with loblolly pine and scrub pine predominating; a mixed hardwood forest containing sweet gum, red oak, black oak, white oak, and tulip poplar predominating; and a mixed pine and hardwood forest combining species of the two previous groups. Understory in all forest types included American holly, cherry, dogwood, and ironwood. Shrubs and vines in the understory included bayberry, Virginia creeper, and greenbriar. In addition to the forest areas, there were vast stretches of tidal marsh containing bayberry, saltbush, and marsh grasses. Correspondence shows that NPS landscape architects took great pains to preserve the existing vegetation wherever possible. Forests were an important design component of the road, especially along the higher ridges between the rivers. The Parkway also crossed marshes along both the York and James Rivers; the natural marsh communities were an important part of the Parkway scenery.

Designed plantings were planned along the entire length of the Parkway and ranged from highly designed plantings beds to selective thinning or clearing. Supplemental planting of existing vegetation was done to create views, frame spaces, or change the visual and spatial sequence along the road. Along the Yorktown to Williamsburg segment in the 1930s, designed plantings included dense planting beds at the overlooks to shield cars from the view. Another example is low dense masses of shrubs used along the banks of the Parkway to edge and “face down” existing lines of vegetation. Often a large specimen tree would be located along the opposite end of the planted curve to guide the eye. Planting of masses was also done up to the pavement’s edge. In addition to designed planting masses, cutting vegetation to create vistas was a major planting design effort. Vistas were cut to view open areas of swamp, marsh, and river. Sometimes areas of trees were opened up not to expose a dramatic view, but to change the spatial character along the road creating a sequence of alternating light and shade.

Native plants provided the predominant species type and plants were selected for their seasonal interest. Along the Williamsburg to Jamestown segment in the 1950s, many of the same principles were utilized in designed plantings, however, far fewer plants were used and more typically, plants were used to enhance existing lines of vegetation. In contrast to the more enclosed vegetative spaces along the Yorktown to Williamsburg segment, the forest edge from Williamsburg to Jamestown undulated and was much farther away from the pavement. The creation of larger spaces around pavement was part of a distinct planting aesthetic, which held that the Parkway would be more than just a “green tunnel.”

The visual experience along the Parkway in the 1950s was varied by the use of vegetation in the more open areas along the river shores. Plantings clustered around parking overlooks created the feeling of an

9 Ibid., pp. 283-284
10 Landscapes et al., pp. 291-294
oasis in the flat, wide open spaces of the James River. Transforming sandy hydraulic fill areas into a pastoral landscape where specimen trees dapple a sunny lawn created another effect. Plant masses appeared to also be used to frame bridges and soften architecture, helping them to merge into the surrounding landscape.¹¹

Lawn were an important component of the overall design of the Parkway. In the 1930s, turf was used to edge the Parkway pavement in some areas and varied in height throughout the Parkway. The typical arrangement was a short turf trimmed 3” to 4” along the pavement edge with taller grass found behind guardrails and grassy swales, underneath planting beds, and in areas abutting forest. In the 1950s, lawns were used in a more curvilinear fashion in front of vegetated areas, creating an edge that often widened to create small “bays” of lawn. Lawn was maintained by various mowing regimes and was generally kept short at 2” to 3” in height.¹²

Vegetation Summary
There has been substantial change to the vegetation along the Parkway since the construction period. Because vegetation is a biotic feature some change must be accepted. Analyzing this resource type, therefore, requires comparing original design intent with the character of the surviving vegetation.

Pre-Existing Vegetation: Many of the same forest species exist today that were pre-existing, while others have changed through succession, have been displaced by the spread of invasive exotic species, or have been lost due to insect infestations. Forest health in some areas has been negatively affected by the adjacent development, which has fragmented once large contiguous areas of forest. This has also reduced the width of the forest edge in some places along the road. The Parkway wetlands are largely in their historic locations and have been impacted somewhat by environmental changes; Phragmites are beginning to dominate the planted native communities and over time may be a threat to the native wetland species that characterized the Parkway during the historic period. Other native shrub species, such as southern wax myrtle, have been nearly obliterated by invasive shrub species such as Japanese privet.

Designed Plantings: In general, the designers’ intent for the vegetation along the Parkway to mature and change over time. The broad types of designed plantings in place by the 1950s continue to exist today although planting locations may have changed. Designed plantings have not been without their share of environmental threats, however. Invasive shrubs like privet have completely wiped out many of the planted native shrub masses such as southern wax myrtle and Phragmites has overwhelmed the planted native communities around the marshes where bridges span over the outlets. Even with these threats, many examples of the distinct designing aesthetic remains intact throughout the Parkway, such as the tall pines cowering above along Bellfield Straight. Overall, it appears that the designed Parkway vegetation

¹¹ Ibid., p 299
¹² Ibid.. p. 294
can be considered to have relatively high integrity.

Lawn: Lawns continue to be a dominant feature that contributes to the Parkway character. Overall, the variation of turf heights can be viewed and the broad expanses of open turf.

Structures

Structures along the Parkway, as the designers originally predicted, are an important visual element. These can be divided into three broad groups: drainage features, overpasses and bridges (which carry the road over interruptions), and underpasses (which carry other roads over the Parkway, including the tunnel under Williamsburg). Two major types of structures were developed: brick-clad concrete structures and concrete structures. The brick-clad concrete structures were varying in sizes as drainage features, overpasses, and underpasses; the concrete structures consisted of bridges with larger spans located over tidal marshes.

In addition, a 1932 proposed development plan for the Marine Barracks, Navy Mine Depot (now Naval Weapons Station) included barracks buildings, brick masonry and concrete structures, wire fencing, nine gates, a road system, and plantings. It is not known what was actually built and what has been taken down, however, a brick wall and sentry box remain.

Drainage features included pipe culverts designed to carry water under the road. These included concrete pipes with brick-clad headwalls ranging from 18-24 inches in diameter; reinforced concrete arches, also clad with brick, with spans from 4-6 feet; and two larger drainage features of more than 14 feet in diameter — again clad in brick. Drainage features also included grass and concrete swales. These were used to channel water collected off the concrete surface of the road.

Underpasses and overpasses were typically brick-clad concrete structures. Brick headwalls and brick arches featured a Colonial design vocabulary similar to the Williamsburg restoration work. The brick work on the arched structures was complex, using Flemish and English bonds and beveled and half-round bricks. The tunnel under Williamsburg was a further extension of the concrete construction and brick detailing pioneered on the drainage structures and underpasses. The Colonial revival facade, however, hid a major modern engineering feat—the construction of the tunnel’s 30-foot wide concrete arch structure.\(^\text{13}\)

Bridges spanning the tidal marshes were of much less elaborate design intended to blend with the hydraulic fill. Cost, ability to achieve long spans, and the scenery were the primary considerations in developing the low concrete structures. The first to be constructed were over the marshes between Yorktown and Williamsburg and featured sandblasted concrete railings. The modern, streamlined design

\(^{13}\) Landscapes et al., p 207
was carried on in the bridges built later between Williamsburg and Jamestown, with some modifications. The railings became even lower with a single horizontal element between the motorist and the view and the bridge flared out more at the abutments. Overall, the Colonial-style overpasses combined with the modern concrete bridges helped the Parkway link the past with the present.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 323-324}

Nearly all the structures that were present in 1958 are extant today and generally remain in their historic condition. The only structures that may have been lost are a few culverts or culvert headwalls eliminated during the construction of new bridges along the Parkway after 1958. Major changes to structures have been limited to the addition of new bridges, rebuilding of concrete bridges in the 1980s, and the repair of old structures. Since 1958 a total of eight new overpasses and underpasses have been built along the Parkway, all of which were designed to be compatible with the existing structures. Although less detailed, the new structures were clad in a Colonial-style with red brick. The addition of new structures has changed the rhythm of the driving experience along the Parkway. The effect is most noticeable between Kings Creek and Williamsburg. Because, however, the dominant materials of the Parkway were continued, the new construction has blended well with the historic structures. The other major change is the rebuilding of three 1930s concrete bridges to repair structural problems. Although, overall the historic character of the bridges was retained, the design of the concrete railings was changed from a post and beam style to match more closely with the concrete bridges on the Jamestown end of the Parkway. The structures along the Parkway are important elements because functionally, they move water and allow traffic to flow unimpeded and visually, they provide an important stylistic element. Although significant levels of change have occurred to Parkway structures through repair and additions, overall integrity can still be considered high. There have been few structures lost and additions and repairs have been implemented with a high degree of sensitivity and compatibility.

The LCS # in the charts to follow refers to the List of Classified Structures (LCS) which is the primary computerized database containing information about historic and prehistoric structures in which the National Park Service has or plans to acquire any legal interest. Properties included in the LCS are either in or eligible for the National Register or are to be treated as cultural resources by law, policy, or decision reached through the planning process even though they do not meet all National Register requirements.
The Colonial Parkway is a concrete road constructed by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Public Roads between 1931 and 1958. Originally constructed to link the three historic sites of Yorktown, Williamsburg, and Jamestown, the road is 21.44 miles from the parking lot at the Yorktown Visitor Center to the parking lot of the Jamestown Visitor Center. Also included as part of the roadway are a series of small culverts (large culverts are documented individually). These culverts were designed as concrete pipes with brick-faced concrete headwalls. They occur at almost all of the low points where fill occurs along the Parkway route. Headwalls are located on one or both ends of the pipe. These range from 18”-24” in diameter. The headwalls are arched and the brickwork is a simple circular design based on traditional Colonial brickwork. There are 95 culverts crossing under the Parkway and a total of 150 (estimate) brick-faced concrete culverts found along the route.

### Large Culverts

**Ballard Creek Culvert**
- Map #: C-7
- Builder: BPR/NPS
- LCS #: 81955
- Date: 1931

This is an 8-foot concrete arch structure, clad in handmade “Virginia style” brick with granite spillway crest stones. It is located where Ballard Creek drains into the York River.

**Brackens Pond Culvert**
- Map #: C-9
- Builder: BPR/NPS
- LCS #: 81955
- Date: 1931

Designed under the direction of Charles Peterson, this culvert allowed water from Brackens Pond and Roosevelt Creek to flow into the York River. It is a 13-foot concrete arch culvert clad in Flemish bond brick. It appears more like a small bridge, with parapet walls rising about 3 feet above road grades.

**Jones Mill Pond Culvert**
- Map #: C-21
- Builder: BPR/NPS
- LCS #: 81955
- Date: 1931-32

This culvert was built as part of a dam stabilizing the Jones Mill Pond Reservoir and to manage the overflow of water from the pond into Cub Creek below. It is an 18-foot concrete arch culvert with a 59-foot spillway to the creek-side discharge. It is clad with Colonial-style brick and its two brick arches are ornamented with Indiana limestone keystones.

### Overpasses

**Yorktown Creek Overpass**
- Map #: C-3
- Builder: BPR/NPS
- LCS #: 81959
- Date: 1956

This is a single arch reinforced concrete structure. Its brick parapets have a center camber rising three feet.
**Colonial Parkway**  
York and James City Counties, Virginia

### Feature Name  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Route 17 Overpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81958</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a reinforced concrete bridge with 3-foot brick parapet walls and an apex capped pier at all four ends. Two ramps provide access to Route 17, which crosses the York River via the George P. Coleman Memorial Bridge.

### Underpasses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 238 Underpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81957</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This reinforced concrete, single arch bridge was built to carry Route 238 over the Parkway. Modeled after the bridges built in the 1930s, the bridge is clad in brick and its parapet walls have a center camber approximately 3-feet in height. No ramps are associated with this bridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VA Route 143 Underpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-22</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81961</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This single arch, brick-clad reinforced concrete bridge is similar to other underpass structures with 3-foot cambered parapets with an apex-capped pier at each end. The bridge allowed Route 143 to connect northern and eastern portions of Williamsburg without crossing the Parkway at grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Landing Underpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-23</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81947</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This single arch reinforced concrete bridge is 156 feet long. It has brick parapet walls 3 feet high with a center camber, a ribbed vault, a 6-foot granite keystone, limestone skewbacks, and retaining walls. There is no interchange associated with this structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C&amp;O Railroad Underpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-24</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81948</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This complex structure is actually two bridges connected by overhead brickwork. The larger portion of the bridge carries three railroad tracks over the Parkway and the other portion carries Lafayette Street. The bridge has three arches to separate vehicular, bridle, and pedestrian traffic. The large center arch that spans the Parkway is 50 feet, while the two flanking arches span 14 feet. The reinforced concrete structure is clad in Flemish bond brick, with roundels as ornamentation between the arches. The design is credited to both Charles Peterson and Arthur Shurcliff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taswell Hall Underpass</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>81745</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also known as Newport Avenue Bridge, this structure is a brick-clad reinforced concrete arch with brick-faced spandrels, 3-foot high parapet walls, granite keystones, and corner stones at the water table course. It was built to eliminate at grade crossings; today two interchange ramps allow access to and from the Parkway.
**Feature Name** | **Map #** | **Builder** | **LCS #** | **Date**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Williamsburg Tunnel | C-25 | NPS/BPR | 81738 | 1942

This is a cast in place reinforced concrete arch tunnel. It is 1,138 feet long and spans 30 x 18 feet. The tunnel portals are designed in a Colonial style with Flemish and English bond brick, serpentine retaining walls, water courses, arched openings, molded copings, and herring-bone sidewalks.

**Bridges**

Indian Field Creek Bridge | C-14 | NPS/BPR | 82169 | 1932-33, 1980s

This bridge was constructed as a reinforced concrete deck slab on steel I-beams and concrete bents and granite piers. It had a concrete hand railing. In the 1980s it was substantially rebuilt, including the bridge deck, abutment wing walls, and the bridge railing. The railing was reduced in height and made to look more like the railings on the bridges between Williamsburg and Jamestown.

Felgate's Creek Bridge | C-17 | NPS/BPR | 81962 | 1932-33, 1980s

This bridge was constructed similar to Indian Field Creek Bridge. It also was reconstructed in the 1980s and included an extension of the bridge deck, rebuilt abutments, new railings, and the addition of a bike crossing on the river side.

King's Creek Bridge | C-19 | NPS/BPR | 81954 | 1932-33, 1980

This bridge was built as a single arch reinforced concrete bridge with no parapet and a high railing. Major reconstruction work in 1980 included bridge deck replacement and construction of new bridge railings.

Halfway Creek Bridge | C-29 | BPR/NPS | 81743 | 1941-42

This is a reinforced concrete slab bridge and is the longest span on the Parkway. It is 850 feet long, its post and lintel railings are 28 inches high, and a three-foot sidewalk parallels the western edge. In 1988, repairs included reinforcing the abutment walls, modifying the railing to accept a new timber guard rail, and cleaning and sealing.

College Creek Bridge | C-31 | NPS | 81742 | 1955-56

This is an 87-foot long, cast-in-place linear span bridge with low post and lintel guard rails. The bridge was repaired in 1988 and included cleaning, sealing, inspecting, and modifications for a new timber guardrail.

Mill Creek Bridge | C-36 | NPS | 81741 | 1955-56

This 137-foot long, steel I-beam bridge is a reinforced concrete structure on timber piles with deep foundation pilings and rip-rap shore protection around its abutments. Because of the instability of hydraulic fill, deep foundation pilings were required. In 1988, repair work took place and included modifications to its parapet wall to accommodate a new timber guard rail.

Powhatan Creek Bridge | C-39 | NPS | 81740 | 1955-56

This bridge is 725 feet long. It is a cast-in-place post and beam linear span bridge with low post and lintel guard rails. 1988 repairs included cleaning, inspection, and modifications to accommodate a timber guard rail.
### Colonial Parkway
York and James City Counties, Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isthmus Bridge</td>
<td>C-42</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a simple reinforced concrete deck structure built on steel I-beam with a reinforced concrete substructure on timber pilings. The bridge's location made it vulnerable to erosion by wind, waves, and other actions has necessitated continued maintenance of the bridge abutments. The most recent repair included rebuilding and enlarging the rip-rap surrounding the abutments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass and Concrete Swales</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930s, 1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass swales predominate along most of the Parkway to collect water shed off the uncurbed roadway. Concrete swales are used on steep down grades where fast moving water would cause deep erosion in an unpaved channel. The grass swales originated with the 1930s Parkway construction and were extended into the 1950s construction. During the 1950s, the concrete and stone-lined drainage swales were introduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Barracks Wall &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentry Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A brick wall and sentry box are all that remain of a larger landscape development plan for a then, Marine barracks at the current Naval Weapons Station. No longer in use, the entrance gate is now a high wrought iron fence with no opening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contributing Features-Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpasses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pier Overpass</td>
<td>NC-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>81960</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bridge was constructed to allow an access road to the Navy Pier to pass under the Parkway. It was modeled after the Navy Mine Depot Overpass and is notable for its 3-foot brick parapet walls with apex piers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 641 Overpass</td>
<td>NC-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>81967</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bridge is a reinforced concrete bridge with brick-cladding, 3-foot high parapet walls with a center camber and apex-capped piers at each end. The bridge allows the Parkway to pass over Route 641 without interruption and interchange ramps provide access to Cheatham Annex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpasses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Underpass</td>
<td>NC-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is one of two sets of double bridges on the Parkway. These bridges were built to carry I-64 over the Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Route 199 Underpass</td>
<td>NC-8</td>
<td>VaDOH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bridge was originally constructed as a single-bridge grade crossing but was later redesigned as a two-bridge interchange to accommodate increased traffic. The two bridges are reinforced concrete arches with brick veneer. A full cloverleaf of ramps allows access to the Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Colonial Parkway
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Drive Underpass</td>
<td>NC-6</td>
<td>FHwA</td>
<td>81964</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bridge is a typical reinforced concrete-filled spandrel arch, clad in brick, with a granite keystone. The parapets have capped ends. Two ramps are provided to allow access to and from the Parkway. The bridge is modeled after “Miller’s Crossing” bridge at Route 199 south of Williamsburg. It was constructed to allow a separate grade change at Route 163.

**Bridges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Lane Bridge</td>
<td>NC-5</td>
<td>81695</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a reinforced concrete-column structure with brick parapets that have a 3-foot high center camber. The structure was built to eliminate the at-grade crossing at Hubbard Lane.

**Structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Entrance Station</td>
<td>NC-9</td>
<td>1957, 1974-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This small wooden structure was built as a shelter for the Jamestown Island fee collector. Later it was expanded to its current size.

Sites

Various stopping points (parking overviews) along the Parkway as well as parking lots and picnic areas are another aspect of the Colonial Parkway experience. Each was designed implementing standard NPS design procedures. The curvilinear forms of the parking overviews were based on standard NPS overlook design utilized in other parks. A planted divider usually separated the parking area from the main road. By the 1950s, it appears that substantially more work was spent on designing the overviews, likely due to more interest in developing interpretive stories to accompany the views. In the 1930s, they were chosen by Charles Peterson, primarily with a scenic view in mind. In the 1950s, sites for the overviews were chosen jointly by park historians and landscape architects. A picnic area at Ringfield was also constructed in the 1950s as part of the interpretive and recreational plans for the park. Located just east of Indian Field Creek, it was typical of most NPS picnic areas with two winding loop roads leading to individualized picnic sites.

The parking lots at the Yorktown Visitor Center and the Jamestown Visitor Center provide terminus points for the Parkway; they were constructed in the 1950s as part of the “Mission 66” program. Throughout much of the 1930s, the Yorktown end was simply a large open field and a parking area at Fusiliers Redoubt while the Jamestown end simply dead-ended into Williamsburg. The completion of the Parkway changed the formal terminus on the Yorktown end. The Yorktown visitor center parking lot was designed with the curvilinear forms found in forms at the picnic areas. The planting plan was carefully designed with shade and understory planting. The Jamestown parking lot was much bigger and took on a more informal character. Designed to be altered as changes were made to the Visitor Center...
area, it had predominantly straight rows for efficient use of space.\(^{15}\)

The overlooks and the parking lots retain a high degree of integrity to the historic period. The Ringfield Picnic Area is no longer in use along the Parkway; it is overgrown and not maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlooks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusiliers Redoubt Overlook</td>
<td>C-6</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This former Parkway terminus is located on a short spur off the Parkway. The parking area provides a view of the York River and Coleman Bridge from the crest of the York River bluffs. Reconstructed Revolutionary War earthworks are located at one end of the spur, within walking distance of the parking. It contains three interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Mine Depot Overlook</td>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a standard, bow-shaped overlook with a view of the Naval Weapons Station piers and there is one interpretive sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York River Parking Overlook</td>
<td>C-11</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook has a good view of the Naval Weapons Station piers. It also has one interpretive sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan Village Overlook</td>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is located adjacent (across the road) to the Indian Field Creek Overlook. It has two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Field Creek Overlook</td>
<td>C-13</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is located adjacent (across the road) to the Powhatan Village Overlook. It has two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellfield/Cheatham Overlook</td>
<td>C-15</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is located in shady grove east of Felgates Creek. There are two interpretive signs; one that describes the Bellfield Plantation and one that describes the Navy operations at Cheatham Annex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringfield Parking Overlook</td>
<td>C-16</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is located on the York River at the mouth of Felgate’s Creek. It has two parking bays, an island planted in lawn, and a deteriorated asphalt walking path extending from the parking area. This overlook has changed from its 1950s appearance with the addition of the walking path, the redesign of the parking pull-off into parking bays, and the loss of plantings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Landscapes et al., p. 282
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones Mill Pond Overlook</td>
<td>C-20</td>
<td>NPS/BPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1932-33, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook was designed to fit into a small open area adjacent to the pond. It is therefore smaller and somewhat more angular than the rest of the overlooks on the Yorktown end of the Parkway. It has two interpretive signs, is a popular stopping point, and showing signs of wear from pedestrian traffic. An informal trail leading from the parking area around the east edge of the pond is causing some erosion into the pond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Oaks Parking Overlook</td>
<td>C-27</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the first parking overlook on the Jamestown side of the Parkway. It provides a view to a very large and old oak tree. A standard, bow shaped parking area contains two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Dam/Great Neck Overlook</td>
<td>C-28</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook located just south of the Great Oaks overlook, is also a standard bow-shaped design. It contains two interpretive signs that describe the historic dam on the creek and the history of the area known as the Great Neck. The overlook has views to the currently closed to the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway Creek Overlook</td>
<td>C-30</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is a tadpole-shaped loop located in a shady forested area just south of Halfway Creek Bridge. Parking is provided in three bays at the wide end of the loop. The overlook is well-screened from the Parkway and is further separated by being elevated above the Parkway level, on top of the hill through which the Parkway cuts. This makes this overlook more secluded than others along the Parkway. It contains two interpretive signs, one at the entrance and one at the parking bays. A brick arch culvert headwall is located just down the slope from the parking bay and appears to carry storm water from the surfaced parking lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Creek Overlook</td>
<td>C-32</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook is on the marsh (inland) side of the Parkway just south of the mouth of College Creek. It is bow-shaped with two parking bays and two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River Overlook</td>
<td>C-33</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This overlook has a good view of the James River, is bow-shaped, and has two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archers Hope Parking Overlook</td>
<td>C-34</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This elongated overlook is located on a small rise along the James River shoreline. Specimen trees shade the long island separating the parking area from the Parkway. The rest of the area is predominantly open turf. Although the shoreline is eroding, pedestrian impacts appear to be minimal. Two interpretive signs, one describing Archer’s Hope and one the life of Solomon Michaux, are located here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Island Overlook</td>
<td>C-35</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This irregularly-shaped overlook has two long arms leading to a two-bayed parking area near the river’s edge. It provides a view to the back of Jamestown Island. It is situated in a grove of trees and contains two interpretive signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feature Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Overlook</td>
<td>C-37</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck of Land Overlook</td>
<td>C-38</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan Creek Overlook</td>
<td>C-40</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmus Overlook</td>
<td>C-41</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a standard, bow-shaped parking area with a wooded character and one interpretive sign.

This overlook is a semi-circular drive with parking to the side. An island is planted in pine and deciduous trees. There is one interpretive sign, a brick culvert and views to the James River and to Jamestown Island.

This large parking area is located before the entry gate to Jamestown Island. A large, two-bayed parking area is located off two curving access arms. The parking lot is located very close to the edge of the Back River. The shoreline is showing signs of erosion, possibly because of pedestrian traffic and wave action.

This is a standard, bow-shaped overlook located within the fee area of Jamestown Island. It has a good view of the James River. There is one interpretive sign.

### Parking Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Lot</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorktown Parking Lot</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Parking Lot</td>
<td>C-43</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This parking lot is large, almost circular lot with four double bays of 90-degree parking spaces. The turf parking lot islands are large and wide with numerous large canopy trees that provide shade for the cars. Sidewalks from the lot directly access the Visitor Center and Park Headquarters. The lot is paved in asphalt with beige aggregate chip seal that is comparable in color to the exposed aggregate in the Parkway concrete.

This lot is bigger than the Yorktown lot. It is large and a rectangular shape. It contains four double bays of 90-degree parking. The islands are generous and support a large number of canopy trees. Picnic tables and trash receptacles are also available for visitors’ use. Visitors access the Jamestown tour roads at the northwest corner of the parking lot.

### Picnic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picnic Area</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ringfield Picnic Area</td>
<td>C-18</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ringfield Picnic area is a larger area with vehicular access to two loops of picnic sites.

### Non-contributing Features-Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Neck Picnic Area</td>
<td>NC-7</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This picnic area is a large loop of picnic sites located south of Williamsburg and is accessed off the northwest ramp of the Virginia Route 199 exchange. The area is closed to the public.
Objects, or small scale features, were parts of the original design of the Parkway. These evolved during the entire historic period and have continued to evolve to the present. Objects of the historic period include guard rails, interpretive signs, tree wells, and other signs.

Guard rails were part of the early surfacing contracts for the Parkway and were implemented along the entire length from York to Williamsburg. The guardrails were peeled locust and cedar wood 8 inches wide and supported by 20-inch high posts. They were similar to those used in the western parks. Guardrails were also installed in 1957 along the Williamsburg to Jamestown segment. Instead of using the peeled locust and cedar rails, a timber-beam guard rail was designed and used along the James River portion of the Parkway. It was almost two feet tall and was set back from the roadway by about five feet (325-CLR). It appears that over time these guardrails deteriorated and were removed. By the late 1970s, they seem to have vanished from the Parkway completely. In the 1980s, the FHWA installed new steel-backed timber guard rails along most segments of the Parkway where the slope exceeded 3:1 and along the approaches to the bridges.

Interpretive signs did not appear along the Parkway until the 1950s when they were placed at each parking overlook. These signs were designed to be read from cars; the park historian in conjunction with other interpretive staff developed the interpretive texts. There are approximately 32 signs. Other signs that could be found along the Parkway during the historic period include small locational and regulatory signs.

Tree wells were used during the 1930s period of construction and were built of brick to match the other Parkway structures. Tree wells were used to retain and protect trees where extensive grading occurred. It does not appear that tree wells were used during the 1950s period of construction.

Since the construction period, there have been changes in the form, number, and appearance of the Parkway’s small-scale features. Although there is some visual similarity between the current guardrails and those on the Parkway during the 1950s, their construction is different, utilizing steel-backed timbers. The current locations of the guardrails were determined by the Federal Highway Administration staff and Colonial National Historical Park staff and were based on safety concerns. Interpretive signs from the 1950s are essentially in the historic condition and locations. The only recent addition is a new sign at Archer’s Hope. There are many more signs on the Parkway than were present during the historic period, including locational, directional, and regulatory signs. Brick entry signs were constructed as part of the bicentennial celebration and are located near the Williamsburg Traffic Circle, Jamestown, and Fusiliers Redoubt. These were later faced with a standard brown and white NPS sign. Tree wells from the 1930s currently exist along the Parkway between Yorktown Parking Lot and Williamsburg.
Colonial Parkway
York and James City Counties, Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>LCS#</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributing Features-Objects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signs</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These signs are gray-blue and consist of cast aluminum panel mounted in a large rectangular wooden frame that stands between two wood posts. The posts are topped with pointed finials and an ornamental cast iron bracket supports the lower edge of the sign frame. Designed by Robert Steenhagen and Stanley Abbott, the signs contain a title and several lines of raised text. They also contain a raised circular logo of a town crier, a ship, or a cannon. The town crier is depicted on the leg between Yorktown and Williamsburg or around Williamsburg, and the ship is depicted along the leg from Williamsburg to Jamestown. The title is black, the text is white, and the logo is a combination of white, black, and gray. There are 32 signs along the Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree wells</td>
<td>BPR/NPS</td>
<td>81971</td>
<td>1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These were constructed with the purpose of protecting existing trees along the Parkway where grades would be changed. This detail was not used during the 1950s period of construction. Brick tree wells can be found along the Parkway between Yorktown and Williamsburg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-contributing Features-Objects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road signs</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980-90s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road signs include standard regulatory signs, directional signs, and kilometer markers. The regulatory signs are predominantly stop signs, yellow warning signs, do not pass signs, pass with care signs, no parking signs, speed limit signs, and others. Regulatory signs are generally located in the immediate road margin along the Parkway and interchange ramps. Directional signs are generally the traditional brown-and-white NPS signs and are found in a variety of sizes. They point the way to the various NPS sites and units accessed by the Parkway, they name natural features such as creeks along the Parkway, and they indicate names of cross streets or destinations at Parkway interchanges. Green Colonial Williamsburg signs are also located on the Parkway, near the Williamsburg traffic circle. Like the regulatory signs, directional signs are generally located in the immediate road margin. Kilometer markers are grey and white posts located at intervals along the roadside on the north or west side of the Parkway. Although most are found within a few feet of the roadside edge, a few are located somewhat further back in the woods and are not immediately apparent to motorists. The numbering begins at the Yorktown end of the Parkway with the K1 marker located just west of the U.S. Route 17 bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrails</td>
<td>FHwA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard rails currently along the Parkway were designed by the FHwA and are similar to the 1950s guard rails. There appears to be some level of correspondence between the location of the current guard rail and where guard rail existed historically. However, it should be noted that safety issues, not historic location, were a consideration when the current steel-backed guard rail was installed. Although they are somewhat compatible in appearance they are not contributing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three large brick bases, faced with brown and white NPS sign boards, are located near the various starting points of the Colonial Parkway and announce the motorist's arrival on the roadway. One is located at the entry of Virginia Route 31 at the Jamestown end, another is located at the traffic circle near the Williamsburg Visitor Center, and the third, at the Yorktown end, is located on the roadside slope near the Fusiliers Redoubt area.
Overall Evaluation of Integrity: Colonial Parkway

The above discussion of character-defining features demonstrates that the condition and integrity of the Colonial Parkway is quite high. With the exception of some of the small-scale features such as guard rails and some plant materials, virtually no major element of the Parkway's original design has been lost. Most of the changes to the Parkway have been changes of addition, such as the growth of new vegetation, the increase in suburban and urban development, and the augmentation of existing structures with new, but visually compatible structures. In the following paragraphs, each of the seven aspects of integrity identified by the National Register is considered separately for the Parkway, and then an overall assessment of integrity is determined.

Location
Colonial Parkway's integrity of location is high. It exists in the location where it has always existed and has had very few changes in alignment with virtually no rerouting.

Design
Colonial Parkway's integrity of design is also high. Designed features, including characteristic curving alignment and grading, unique bridges, overpasses, and underpasses, and orchestrated views and vistas, remain intact, in a condition similar to that of when the Parkway was completed. Although, there are a number of significant intended vistas that have become enclosed due to the growth of vegetation particularly at the Jamestown end, many of these small views and wide vistas can easily be re-established by selective clearing or vegetative management along more sensitive areas, such as shorelines.

Setting
The integrity of setting for the Parkway is moderate. On the one hand, the broad physiographic patterns of topography, watershed, and views and vistas remain intact around the Parkway. However, other changes to the Parkway's physical context have occurred, including the loss of forest and agricultural land that once abutted much of the Parkway. In many cases these rural land uses have been replaced by urban and suburban uses.

Materials
Integrity of materials for the Parkway is high. Most of the Parkway's original materials such as brick, wood, exposed aggregate and poured concrete are still present in the field today. Many of the Parkway's original plantings still survive, and replacements have largely followed the original plant palette. Repair and replacement projects along the Parkway have proceeded with a replace-in-kind strategy.

Workmanship
Integrity of workmanship for the Parkway is also high. The Parkway's original construction used high quality materials and a large work force to produce a roadway defined by its precisely calculated and
constructed alignments, meticulously designed and built structures, and carefully planted roadside plantings. Work which was done after the original construction periods followed these standards, so that in many cases additions to the Parkway are, to the untrained eye, indistinguishable from the original structures.

Feeling
Colonial Parkway’s integrity of feeling is high. Because of a lack of change in alignment, driving speed, surfacing, and moderate changes to the spatial character of the corridor, the experience of driving the road today remains very similar to that of 1958.

Association
Although association is an aspect of integrity more important for properties associated with a historic figure or event, it appears that Colonial Parkway’s integrity of association is also high. The development of the parkway systems in the National Parks was a clear attempt to address the new way society functioned during the first half of this century. As a direct result of political and social changes, the middle class had expanded, automobiles were affordable, and people were able to and willing to drive to parks to learn about the natural and cultural history of this country. Driving the Parkway by car is still the preferred way to visit the park and, besides by bicycle, is the only way to enjoy the signs and views at a leisurely pace. The Parkway still retains its characteristic designed features and its associations with this early period of roadway engineering and aesthetics and thus, the Colonial Parkway is still enjoyed by all who use it today in much the same way as when it was planned and constructed.

Overall Integrity
Because it retains integrity for six of seven aspects, and because so many of its character-defining features are still extant, the overall integrity of Colonial Parkway can be judged to be high. Not only is Colonial Parkway a special place and a carefully designed landscape, but it is substantially intact and fully able to convey its historic significance as an outstanding example of American Parkway design.16

16 Landscapes et al., pp. 431-432
Statement of Significance

Introduction

The Colonial Parkway, designed and constructed in two stages between 1930 and 1958, is a part of Colonial National Historical Park. It connects the two main sections of the Park, the early seventeenth century site of the Jamestown settlement and the Yorktown battlefield where an American victory secured American independence. The restored and reconstructed colonial capital city of Williamsburg is accessible near the midpoint of the Parkway. The Parkway is, however, significant in its own right. It meets Criterion A in the area of Conservation in relation to the history and development of the National Park Service (NPS) and in its conservation ethic as it was applied to historic resources. The Parkway’s design and construction marks a significant stage in NPS’ notable legacy of designed roads and parkways that were planned and built primarily in the 1920s and 1930s for conservation and interpretive purposes in National Parks. It is a critical unifying component and part of the original concept for one of the first “National Historical Parks,” recognizing historic rather than natural resources. The Parkway also meets Criterion A in the area of Recreation as an unusually intact example of a recreational parkway and built in the 1920s and 1930s on the country’s East Coast in response to a new and growing public interest in motoring for recreation.

The Parkway meets Criterion C in the area of Landscape Architecture as an unusually intact example of 1930s parkway design, incorporating design and construction elements of both East Coast suburban parkways and the NPS-built wilderness roads in Western national parks. It also meets Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an innovative and somewhat unusual application of the Colonial Revival style of architecture, with the design of its drainage structures and bridges that were influenced by the concurrent Williamsburg reconstruction.

Although the Williamsburg to Jamestown segment of the Parkway was not constructed until 1956-58, the Colonial Parkway does not need to meet Criterion Consideration G because the entire Parkway was designed during the 1930s planning and design phase and is thus, a resource that is significant for its plan or design which is over fifty years old even though completion of the design overlaps the fifty year period.

History

The fact that the Virginia peninsula between the York and James Rivers contains within its fairly small confines the sites of three remarkable events or periods in early American history had not gone unnoticed by historians and local inhabitants. The earliest of the three was the settlement of Jamestown and the establishment as the first capital of Virginia following the English landing in 1607. Secondly, the city of
Williamsburg flowered in the second half of the eighteenth century as the second colonial capital of Virginia. Thirdly, the battle at Yorktown in 1781 ended with Lord Cornwallis’ surrender to George Washington, presaging the end of the war with England and legitimizing the new United States of America. Thus the two sites marking the beginning and the symbolic ending of the British colonial experience in Eastern North America are fortuitously located within 25 miles of each other. The concept of a road connecting these sites via Williamsburg had been suggested as early as 1909 at a meeting of the Williamsburg City Council. The suggestion built upon a growing awareness of the area’s historic resources, sparked in part by the 1881 centennial of the battle at Yorktown. Since the events at the three sites were separated in time and had no functional or historical link, there had never been a single road connecting them despite their proximity. The peninsula in the early twentieth century was primarily an agricultural landscape where local farmers grew hay, corn, potatoes, and apples and was dappled with forest as well as marshes, reflecting the tidewater setting.17

Today’s Colonial National Historical Park began its life as an idea that would build upon the private restoration work in the city of Williamsburg sponsored by John D. Rockefeller. In 1928, his staff contacted the new Director of the National Park Service, Horace Albright, about a project to develop the historic and tourism potential of the entire peninsula by linking Yorktown and Jamestown with Williamsburg. This idea eventually resulted in Congressional passage of a bill, signed into law in July 1930, that created the Colonial National Monument in time for the sesquicentennial of the Yorktown victory the following year.18 Notably, the Colonial Parkway was an integral part of the Monument from its inception. The boundary proposed in 1931 included 2,500 acres around Yorktown, the Jamestown Island, and a 500-foot right-of-way connecting them. The intent behind this physical link was made clear in the Park Service’s “Outline of Development” for the new Monument, which was put forth in 1933. It presented the Parkway as an explicit part of the interpretive mission of the park that would establish and maintain an appropriate historical “mood” for visitors traveling between the three sites.19

The Parkway’s construction took place in three major phases: the leg from Yorktown to Williamsburg was built from 1931-1937; the tunnel beneath Williamsburg from 1940-1942; and the leg from Williamsburg to Jamestown from 1953-1957. The design and alignment of the entire Parkway, once established in the 1930s, were followed consistently throughout its construction, even though the final completion was much delayed. The Yorktown leg was chosen as the first stage in part because land was more easily acquired from private landowner, Jim Dozier and the Secretary of Interior was able to acquire land from the Navy through the Secretary of Defense. Moreover, the route’s alignment near

---

17 Landscapes et al., pp. 170-1.
18 Landscapes, p. 67.
Williamsburg and from Williamsburg to Jamestown raised difficulties with local communities and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, which were not resolved until 1939.\(^{20}\)

The Williamsburg area presented a difficult problem: where to place a modern roadway that would provide access to the city without disturbing the Restoration and its aims. The route preferred by Charles Peterson, the Park Service landscape architect who was designing the Parkway, produced objections from the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation which were voiced by their landscape architect Arthur Shurcliff. The Foundation disliked the proposal for the Parkway to approach the east side of Williamsburg, as well as the alignment along the James River and the approach to Jamestown. The impasse was not solved until 1936, when a tunnel under the city was proposed. This solution hid the road from the Restoration area, and debauched the roadway in a convenient direction toward the James River. Construction on the tunnel began in 1940 and was essentially completed in 1942, but work was halted for the remainder of World War II, and the tunnel was not actually opened to traffic until 1949.\(^{21}\)

During and for some time after the War, little was done to complete the Parkway until the advent of "Mission '66," in 1955, an ambitious ten-year nationwide campaign to improve National Park Service staffing and funding for increased visitation in the parks. Colonial NHP was the first park to receive Mission '66 funding, since it already had plans in hand and work initiated to complete the Parkway to Jamestown for the 350th anniversary of Jamestown's founding in 1607.\(^{22}\) With $4.5 million of Mission '66 funding, the Jamestown end was completed barely in time for the celebration on April 1, 1957; with a new Yorktown terminus, the entire Parkway was completed and open from end to end on April 27. The location of the Yorktown terminus had been affected by the construction of the massive George C. Coleman Memorial Bridge across the York River in 1952.

A number of major figures in the history and development of the National Park Service and road design participated at one time or another in the planning and design for the Colonial Parkway. Oliver "O.G." Taylor, who had been Park Engineer at Yosemite and had worked with Chief Engineer Frank Kittredge, began work at Yorktown in 1930 to purchase land and plan for the Sesquicentennial. Charles Peterson, who had begun work in the Park Service's Western Office of Design and Construction in San Francisco under Chief Landscape Architect Thomas Vint, arrived later that year and undertook the primary work of surveying and planning the Parkway itself. Peterson was instrumental in establishing the main design features of the Parkway, as will be discussed in greater detail below. Edward Zimmer became the first resident landscape architect assigned to the park in 1931. Subsequently, other landscape architects came from projects throughout the country. In later years, Stanley Abbott, who had worked on the Blue Ridge Parkway's construction in the 1930s and had become the Service's parkway "expert," became

\(^{20}\) Landscapes et al., pp. 1, 180-90, 217.
\(^{21}\) Ibid., pp. 190-4, 202, 207-9.
\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 212.
Superintendent at Colonial in 1953 and supervised the Parkway’s completion. H.J. Spelman and W.H. Smith of the Bureau of Public Roads (later the Federal Highway Administration) also participated in the design and construction of the Parkway through its 1958 completion.23

The Parkway has been maintained in a remarkably intact form since its completion, and its overall integrity is very high. Changes and additions have been minor in the overall context of the Parkway’s setting, and do not detract from its character. In the 1950s the Parkway acquired a uniform set of interpretive markers in a distinctive style. During the same period, some design details of the Parkway came into conflict with FHWA regulations and the National Park Service was able to argue successfully to exempt the Parkway from many of those requirements on the basis of the need to retain the integrity of the Parkway’s original design details. To this day the Parkway has no lane striping or street lights.24 The most noticeable changes have been the construction of five additional overpasses and underpasses to accommodate the growing volume of traffic and roads in the area in the 1960s and 1970s. To channel heavy traffic away from the Parkway, three of these underpasses eliminated at-grade crossings of the Parkway. The overpasses themselves were carefully designed to be compatible with the original design and appearance of Parkway structures. Some additional small guardrails were added in selected places near bridges and slopes. A picnic area at Great Neck and interpretive area at Bellfield were also added although, while accessible from the Parkway, they are not visible to drivers.25

Since the 1970s, the Parkway has been increasingly maintained as a scenic corridor, and the NPS has sought scenic easements and buffer zones to retain original vistas despite increasing development in the area. In 1980, two bridges on the Yorktown end (Indian Field Creek and Kings Creek) were structurally rehabilitated, acquiring new concrete decks and modified post-and-lintel guide rails. The Felgates Creek Bridge was entirely replaced; the new bridge has a slightly lower railing than the original. At the same time, 1½ miles of new curbing and drainage channels were added over the length of the Parkway to improve drainage, which had been affected by increased development in the area. In 1984, the FHWA prepared a comprehensive report on the Parkway recommending a 10-year, $10 million program that has included roadway repairs and bridge rehabilitation.26

Landscape Architecture: Colonial Parkway and the “Parkway Movement” in America

The factors named above that define the integrity of a “parkway” are based on characteristics of roads built for scenic transportation during a period from approximately 1921 to 1936, known as the “golden age of American highways.” This is when most parkways were built and reached the height of their

23 Ibid., pp. 174, 181-2, 210-2.
24 HAER, pp. 108-117.
25 Landscapes et al., p. 217.
26 Ibid., p. 226.
The parkway idea developed from the landscape ideas of the nineteenth-century urban parks movement that sought to bring the restful and recreational benefits of parks to the growing urban populations in the United States. The earliest parkways were, in fact, roads through parks; notably Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux's Central Park in Manhattan and Prospect Park in Brooklyn. Designers then extended the roads to link parks within cities, as in the Buffalo park and parkway system in 1870. The links provided drivers with an uninterrupted "parklike" experience; the "psychological carryover of the restful influence of one large park area to its echo in another, with little or no interruption on the way." In Boston in the 1870s, wide streets with sidewalks in the Back Bay followed the curving natural terrain. The idealization of the driver's experience while traveling these roads was a critical aim for parkway designers: it was to be pleasant, leisurely and scenic, incorporating aspects of both the natural and designed landscape.28

Parkways gradually grew from the purely recreational to a scenic and enjoyable form of transportation in the early twentieth century as automobiles came into use. They began to link unrelated scenic areas or any destinations. From the original "emerald necklaces" in cities, urban parkways grew to form a critical element of regional arterial road systems. The Bronx River Parkway, built in 1923, can be considered the first "modern" parkway. The first limited-access parkway, it provided enjoyable transportation in a setting tree-lined and landscaped, with unobtrusive structures in native building materials set along gentle curves. Its concrete bridges were faced with local stone to blend into the natural scene and avoid any suggestion of artificiality. It was followed by similar parkways in both Westchester County and Long Island in New York, built in the mid- to late 1920s, which provided easy and pleasant access between New York City and its growing suburban areas. This type of parkway actually guided development, encouraging growth along the artery provided by the road.29

In a similar form, but with a very different objective was the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, later expanded to become the National Park Service's George Washington Memorial Parkway. It was authorized in 1928 to be constructed by the federal Bureau of Public Roads, and to run from Washington, D.C. to George Washington's Mount Vernon. This primary destination reflected its stated commemorative purpose in honor of Washington, leading the driver (here more likely a tourist than a commuter) to Mount Vernon as the climax of the trip. For this purpose, a "dignified setting" was desired, highlighting existing historic sites along the way. This parkway made use of the same design principles as those built for more prosaic transportation further north. It made use of native stone facing on its bridges and planned views and turnouts to "place the visitor in the right frame of mind" to contemplate Washington's importance by means of the restful beauty and dignity of the setting.30

27 HAER, p. 38.
28 Landscapes, pp. 1-5; HAER, p. 91.
29 Landscapes, pp. 11-15; HAER, p. 38.
30 Landscapes, pp. 21-22.
In the 1930s, more parkways in the Northeast were constructed to link urban areas within local regions. They built upon the traditional Olmsted style of landscape planning, using modern engineering practices for their construction. What they continued to have in common were design elements based upon natural scenic features. Curving alignments, limited access, and park-like plantings also characterized these parkways, although their emphasis had shifted decisively to providing efficient transportation. The Merritt Parkway in Connecticut, whose construction began in 1935, was the premier example of this type, joined by urban parkways in New York City (the Henry Hudson Parkway and Riverside Drive) which linked up with the Westchester County parkways in a continuously flowing transportation system.

Although nature-based design elements dominated this tradition, municipal areas linked by these roads had "continued to employ historical references in their architectural design and detailing." The Merritt Parkway had branched out by employing contemporary architectural styles in its concrete bridges but otherwise adhered to the basic design elements of "classical" parkway construction. This period essentially ended with World War II. Although some roads identified as "parkways" were built after the war, these were designed more decidedly for quick transportation than a scenic or restful driving experience. Highway design standards changed to reflect greater automobile speeds. The Garden State Parkway in New Jersey, one of the last designed in the 1950s, was designed for driving speeds of 70 miles per hour, although trucks were banned from the "parklike" setting. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway, a collaboration of the National Park Service and the Bureau of Public Roads intended merely to provide an attractive entrance to the nation's capital, had a similar character. Completed in 1954 as a modern highway outside the context of a National Park, it was something of an anomaly among NPS-built roads. Most of the earlier parkways lost many of their original design characteristics in conversions to modern speed-focused driving and modern highway standards. These changes typically included: wider travel lanes, causing the loss of landscaped medians and shoulders and the loss or alteration of original bridges; straightening of curves for faster speeds; elimination of trees and rock outcroppings to reduce roadway hazards; the replacement of original lighting fixtures and signs with standard designs; and the enlargement and realignment of access and egress ramps.

Meanwhile, during this same period of urban east coast parkway construction, the National Park Service had begun building roads that fell solidly within this design tradition, but which also had unique characteristics of their own. The NPS entry into this area was made in an entirely different part of the country, in the wilderness parks of the West, and initially for very different reasons, which will be
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discussed in greater detail below. The Park Service built Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park in the mid-1920s as the first of a series of renowned roads through national parks. Going-to-the-Sun Road pioneered the application of evolving roadway design principles to a wilderness area. Its design emphasized minimal intrusion on the landscape and used explicitly "rustic" forms and local materials in its structures. It was the first road where "landscape engineers" designed and implemented the construction. This and similar roads in Sequoia, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain, and Zion National Parks were part of a grand scheme in which the park roads would be connected by means of a "Park-to-Park Highway" as a magnet for motorists. As early as 1920, a scenic drive was dedicated that made use of 6,000 miles of designated State and county roads in the western United States to connect the parks.36

The expertise the NPS developed in the construction of these roads was soon turned to its holdings in the eastern half of the country. The Park Service began construction on four major parkways in the east during the 1930s: the Colonial Parkway, Skyline Drive, the Blue Ridge Parkway, and the Natchez Trace. All were characterized by slower design speeds and use of natural elements in their design, as were other eastern parkways, and the Park Service put a greater emphasis on views and scenic qualities. Most of these parkways, unlike the roads built in the West that lay wholly within national parks, were intended to link various parks or park elements in the same way in which the Western Park-to-Park Highway was envisioned. Colonial Parkway linked Yorktown, Williamsburg, and Jamestown. Although Skyline Drive lay within Shenandoah National Park, it connected to the Blue Ridge Parkway, which in turn linked Shenandoah National Park with Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Natchez Trace, whose alignment sought to follow a historic route from Nashville to Natchez, also passed near several battlefield parks. Many of these connections were components of an Eastern Park-to-Park Highway that was never fully realized.36

Although all of the Eastern NPS parkways were initiated in the 1930s, the complete construction of all but Skyline Drive was prolonged for a decade or more. Some construction technology and architectural detailing evolved over the periods of construction, but the original intent and overall designs had been established at the outset for all of the projects. For this reason, the National Park Service became a haven for landscape engineers and designers who wished to continue working on classic parkways, rather than joining the rest of their field in more contemporary highway and landscape design. Stanley Abbott was an excellent example of one man whose career focused on classic parkways. After working for Gilmore Clarke at New York’s Westchester County Park Commission, Abbott began work in 1935 on the Blue Ridge Parkway. He worked next on the Mississippi River Parkway (later abandoned), and having established these credentials, came to Colonial National Historical Park as Superintendent in 1953.37

35 Carr. p. 87.
36 Landscapes. pp. 29, 50.
37 Carr. p. 307; Landscapes et al. p. 212.
Each of these roads had distinctly different origins and intent, although they shared many design and form elements. Colonial Parkway, authorized in 1930, was the first and was the only one whose reason for construction was to link historic resources; this objective was reflected in many of its design characteristics, as will be detailed below. Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park, initiated only a few years later, was, in its rustic aesthetic, the most similar to the western wilderness park roads, just as Shenandoah itself was envisioned as a "western" type of park based on natural resources but located in the east. A large part of the impetus for the Drive was its accessibility by a large population via automobile; its 105 miles were designed to provide a daylong excursion drive for visitors.\textsuperscript{38} The Blue Ridge Parkway was part of the ideal of an eastern park-to-park highway. Begun in 1935, it was far grander in scale, reaching a total length of 469 miles. This was recreational planning at a national level, an aim that was largely abandoned following World War II. The Natchez Trace, authorized in 1938, was the only attempt to reconstruct a historic route, one that originated as an Indian trace, then became an early national road. Its intent was to provide transportation and recreation while simultaneously commemorating the history of the region. Both the Blue Ridge and the Natchez Trace also used native stone facing on bridges, continuing the traditional rustic style.\textsuperscript{39}

Colonial Parkway's design and construction reflected the technology and design principles of the great northeastern parkways as well as the specific administrative, organizational, and landscaping approaches that had been developed in the western national parks. The designers of Colonial Parkway in the early 1930s wished to create a safe and durable "modern" road while achieving other conservation and interpretive goals for the new park. They sought to create a pleasant scenic drive that would incorporate elements of both the cultural history and natural landscape of the area. Many of the actual design decisions that were to realize these goals were not made fully in advance, but took shape in the field as work progressed. The result was a parkway that had much in common with its precursors in the New York area and Mount Vernon, but whose national park origins led to the emphasis of some site-specific characteristics.

A major element of the drive's spatial character is the alternation of open and enclosed sections which provided areas of light and shade and long and short vistas, linked by gentle vertical and horizontal curves. Its curves and gradients were slightly flatter than Westchester County's parkways, and its unusually wide 500-foot right-of-way and three-lane design were more spacious. These features, along with the virtual elimination of major intersections, emphasized the leisurely nature of the intended drive for park visitors.\textsuperscript{40} The plantings along the Parkway enhanced its scenic qualities while highlighting and imitating the nature growth of native vegetation such as dogwood and redbud trees; the characteristic cut-and-fill slopes also contributed to the visual qualities. Charles Peterson's original intention had been
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to allow forest trees to grow right to the edge of the roadway and form an overhead canopy, more like
the “wilder” national park roads, but in fact the Parkway was built and maintained in a more domesticated
urban fashion, with margins of grass in most areas. Overlook parking areas allowed motorists to pause
and contemplate the vistas along the York and James Rivers. The unusual Colonial Revival bridge
structures, which will be discussed in the next section, provided an additional dimension to the Parkway’s
color.

The technology used to create the roadway was innovative in some minor aspects, but generally made use
of contemporary techniques with which the designers were familiar. The designers used aerial
photographs to plan the Parkway’s alignment and made use of mechanical equipment where possible in
the construction of the road. Hydraulic fill, which at Colonial Parkway was used to cross the wide
mouths of streams along the rivers’ edges, had been employed on the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway
a few years earlier. In a few areas along the Colonial Parkway, the use of hydraulic fill actually altered
the natural shoreline, forming dams across natural drainage channels. This changed tidal relationships
between the various creeks and the York River, requiring riprap to combat the resultant erosion and
creating a small section of armored shoreline. At smaller creek channels, the use of culverts retained the
natural water flow.

The paving surface chosen for the Parkway was the area of its greatest technical innovation. Wishing for
a durable modern infrastructure, Charles Peterson had initially assumed that the Parkway would have a
concrete roadway. However, the new park superintendent, William Robinson, requested that the
designers consider a more “historic” surface that would make use of marl, the fossilized shell common in
the area, in keeping with the road’s role as a connector of historic sites. Peterson was aware that the
concurrent private restoration of Williamsburg was making experimental use of concrete with a brushed
surface that exposed its aggregate. The engineers with the Bureau of Public Roads, which was the
agency actually constructing the Parkway, weighed the issues of durability versus a more natural
appearance, and suggested either a concrete surface or a bituminous one that would incorporate marl.
Peterson was concerned that the color of the pavement not be too white and wished to avoid a stark
appearance. In the end, a technique was developed that approximated a historic surface by using
concrete with the traditional marl as aggregate. The marl was exposed by using first wire brushes, then
brooms on the wet concrete. After attempting this step by machine, the designers and engineers found
that the proper effect could only be achieved satisfactorily with hand sweeping. The last step in the
surface preparation was the use of an acid solution to remove the last of the cement and fully expose the
marl on the surface.
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The Colonial Parkway was the first effort by the National Park Service to apply its road-building experience from western wilderness parks to an eastern location and in a comparatively more developed area. In doing so, NPS made use of the techniques and aesthetics of parkways designed for recreational transportation in the Northeast. Its emphasis on scenic views and careful attention to detail in landscaping and construction made it a preeminent example of American parkway design of the 1930s. Skyline Drive, the Blue Ridge Parkway, and the Natchez Trace soon followed, and shared many of Colonial's design characteristics. Of these NPS eastern parkways, and of Eastern parkways in general, Colonial is among those few, along with the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways, that retain a very high degree of integrity to the present day. These roads have always been treated by NPS as significant settings to be preserved within the parks. In addition, at Colonial, the Parkway's short length has limited its use to tourists in the immediate area and some local residents, so that it has it has never become part of a larger regional transportation system. Ironically, the failure to complete an eastern Park-to-Park Highway may have been one of the greatest means of preservation of this parkway.

Conservation: NPS roads as conservation tools

The decision to build a parkway as part of Colonial National Monument was possible only after the National Park Service had established in the West the precedent of road-building as a conscious element of a strong conservation ethic. This concept took roads and parkways beyond scenic and restful transportation to serve a larger purpose. Going-to-the-Sun Road in Glacier National Park and its successors in Sequoia, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain, and Zion National Parks established the idea that roads in wilderness parks were subordinate to greater conservation goals, which governed their design. Road-building was to foster conservation in two ways: first, to provide access to parks for the public and thus create a constituency for their preservation; and second, to establish construction practices that respected and even enhanced the park resources. This conservation-minded viewpoint was embodied in the administrative and staffing arrangements that NPS developed for building its roads and parkways.

In these rugged and largely undeveloped areas, the government hoped to attract the burgeoning population of motorists to the parks by providing access into and through them by road. Nevertheless, the administrators of the Park Service were keenly aware that such roads must have an understated presence in the landscape lest they destroy the unspoiled atmosphere in which they were set. Stephen Mather, the first Director of the Park Service, stated in 1922 that "our purpose is to construct only such roads as contribute solely toward accessibility of the major scenic areas by motor without disturbing the solitude and quiet of other sections." To achieve this, the park roads followed the dicta of Mark
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Daniels, the first landscape architect working in the parks in 1914 and 1915, who stipulated the need for comprehensive planning for the development of roads and trails with a "consistent architectural expression."

The naturalistic or rustic style that developed from this philosophy made extensive use of native materials (especially wood and rough-hewn stone) for constructed elements. This was influenced by the already existing idea of using native materials in park settings, such as the Adirondacks, and also by a strong architectural interest, tied to the Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century, in the use of uniquely American forms and materials. Such elements as peeled log guard rails, timber tree enclosures, and log curbs had become such a standard part of NPS park road design that they even appeared on the first segment of the Colonial Parkway between Yorktown and Williamsburg. The western park roads, completed between 1926 and 1933, that employed these principles included the Generals Highway in Sequoia National Park, the Zion-Mt. Carmel Highway in Zion National Park, Wawona Road in Yosemite, and Trail Ridge Road in Rocky Mountain National Park.

These enormous construction projects in inaccessible wilderness areas could not have been accomplished with the limited staff available to the National Park Service at the beginning of the 20th century. The agency soon realized this as road building began in the 1920s to provide automobile access to some western parks, including Mount Rainier and Zion. NPS had already begun to work with the road engineers at the federal Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) in these efforts. A partnership began to evolve, formalized in a "memorandum of agreement" in 1926 between the two agencies, in which BPR staff conducted surveys, made contract specifications, and supervised construction, while NPS staff reviewed (and could alter) location surveys and contract specifications to meet their standards for landscape preservation. This important and specialized work, and the ballooning number of projects on which it was needed, required the Park Service to develop new professional capacities, namely the evolution of a new class of "landscape engineers" to carry on the work that a few individuals (George Goodwin, the Park Service's chief engineer, landscape architect Daniel Hull, and his assistant Thomas Vint) had begun on Going-to-the-Sun Road.

The arrangement with BPR and the developing cadre of landscape engineers and road design specialists in the Park Service were first employed on a significant scale in the eastern United States at Colonial National Monument and on Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park. Oliver "O.G." Taylor was brought out from Yosemite, originally to work at George Washington's birthplace, Wakefield, but was shortly transferred to Colonial to survey the Parkway route; he had previously worked with BPR engineer...
Frank Kittredge. Landscape architect Charles Peterson, who had worked for by-then Chief Landscape Architect Thomas Vint in the Western Office of Design and Construction, was also sent to Yorktown, and became responsible for most of the surveying and planning for the Parkway; he also worked on Skyline Drive as well.51 The Bureau of Public Roads, in accordance with the agreement between the two agencies, developed plans and specifications for the Parkway, which were subject to the approval of NPS landscape architects and the park superintendent. BPR then bid and supervised the construction. BPR’s Senior Highway Engineer H.J. Spelman and Project Engineer William H. Smith did this work at Colonial, and in fact remained involved with the Parkway construction all the way through its completion. They covered technical issues such as grading, drainage, and structural engineering, while Peterson and his staff supervised details of alignments, fine grading, planting design, and the architectural design of structures.52

For Skyline Drive and again a few years later at the Blue Ridge Parkway, NPS’ experience in designing roads that would harmonize with “natural” areas was easily transferred to these eastern settings. Skyline Drive was built on the mountains’ ridges in part to avoid intrusive and expensive cuts and fills and to provide spectacular scenic views. The stone used for aggregate in the Drive’s paving was the same that had been blasted out to carve the right-of-way, forming path whose color perfectly matched its setting. Planting was limited to restoring natural-looking vegetation to disturbed areas. The design for the Blue Ridge Parkway also followed the rustic approach, with its bridges and culverts faced with native stone. Its tight curves and steep grades, needed in the mountainous setting of the Blue Ridge, were quite close to those previously used for both Skyline Drive and Going-to-the-Sun Road. It too emphasized conservation of natural features, notably through its land-leasing program to conserve traditional uses and appearance beyond its already broad right-of-way.53

The application of these road design skills by NPS and BPR to the creation of Colonial Parkway was possible only as the result of a major change in the responsibilities of the National Park Service in the early 1930s that was closely tied to the historic preservation movement. John D. Rockefeller’s initiative to preserve and restore the colonial capital of Williamsburg in 1926 enhanced an interest in the artifacts of the nation’s early history that had been growing since the Centennial celebration fifty years earlier. The scale and professionalism of the effort at Williamsburg brought to the historic preservation field new and higher standards of accuracy, research and public education. Before this time, preservation efforts had largely been limited to the homes of great men, mostly the founders of the Republic, and to the commemorative care of battlefield sites.
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With the numbers of automobile tourists growing rapidly, especially on the populous East Coast, Horace Albright, who became Director of the National Park Service in 1928, was eager to include historic sites in the National Park system. Since the battlefields and other war-related sites were then administered by the War Department and there was little support at first for their transfer to the Department of the Interior, Albright embarked on a campaign to create new historical parks in the East. The first of these, on a small scale, was George Washington’s birthplace, made a National Monument in 1930. In July of the same year, authorization of the more ambitious Colonial National Monument culminated a two-year effort by Albright. Then, in 1933, Albright’s efforts to bring other historic sites to his agency succeeded through the signing by President Roosevelt of two Executive Orders that transferred dozens of historic sites, battlefields, and national monuments from other agencies to the Park Service. In one stroke, NPS acquired an enormously varied new focus on the history of social, political, economic, and military subjects.

Colonial, as a newly created site, presented different issues than the management of existing sites transferred under the Executive Order. More than a single site or building, it was to become a true “historical park” (the designation was updated in 1936), which Albright intended to develop as a tourist destination in the area. It became the prototype of a new class of national parks, which he hoped would nurture an active eastern constituency for the National Park Service. The methods of caring for and presenting to the public a historical park and its culturally derived resources differed considerably from those of wilderness areas. This new approach was reflected physically in Peterson’s use of local material culture for his architectural vocabulary: he designed Colonial Parkway’s bridges and drainage structures to be clad in Colonial Revival brick, rather than NPS’s standard rough-hewn logs or rusticated stone meant to harmonize with a purely “natural” landscape. The task of interpreting the significance of a historical park to the public became mediation between the visitor and the past, rather than between the visitor and a contemporary wilderness.

In fact, the conception and design of the Colonial Parkway marked a new idea, quite different from that of a road inserted into a wilderness for a purely scenic experience, of a road connecting separate historic resources and playing a historical interpretive role in the process. No parkway has been built since with quite the same purpose. (The term “interpretive” is used here in the broadest possible sense of mediation between the park resources and the public, and is not meant to refer to specific interpretive techniques used now or in the past by professionals in the field.) From the first, the Parkway had an explicit educational and interpretive purpose, and this intent affected all elements of its design. Indeed, quite unlike the contemporary parkways being built in the Northeast, which sought to provide universally
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attrACTIVE transportation, the Colonial Parkway was meant to attract park visitors specifically, and to exclude other people and activities in order to conserve the intended "mood." Michigan Congressman Louis Cramton, chairman of the Sub-Committee of the House Appropriations Committee, who visited the area with Horace Albright in 1920, wrote afterwards, I would like the visitor to Jamestown to be able to drive on to Williamsburg and to Yorktown, without the impression of the early days being driven from his mind by a succession of hot-dog stands and tire signs, etc., along the highways and hence would like a new highway as a part of the new park, on a strip sufficiently wide to protect it by trees shutting out all conflicting modern development, this highway not to be a glaring modern pavement but as much as feasible giving the impression of an old-time road.58

Creating a setting sympathetic to the historical period of Colonial National Monument thus effectively served a much more specific purpose than the scenic transportation provided by earlier parkways in the Northeast. The original Outline of Development for the new Monument stated in 1933 that the Parkway's "function as a unifying factor transcends mere considerations of transportation. Its location and design should contribute, as far as practicable, to the general commemorative purposes of the Monument."59 When possible alignments for the Parkway were first discussed, Superintendent Robinson and Arthur Shurcliff, landscape architect with the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, were at first inclined to make use of historic roads. This thought was soon abandoned when it became apparent that existing roads did not correlate to those in the 18th century. Instead, the designers chose an entirely new route. Charles Peterson made no attempt to re-create an 18th-century roadway but rather designed a 20th-century parkway in harmony with the actual historic resources.60 Like the roads through the western wilderness parks, the new parkway was a conscious attempt to "manipulate" visitors' experience and appreciation of park resources. But here, rather than presenting drivers with a series of spectacular views of the park itself, the orchestration of the experience was one step removed. Colonial Parkway created a harmonious transition between resources rather than a passage through them.

Charles Peterson desired that the route would emphasize the scenic qualities characteristic of the region that would link the driver's passage to the setting in which the historical events had occurred. In fact, he envisioned that most visitors would travel the Parkway "chronologically" from 17th-century Jamestown to mid-18th-century Williamsburg to late 18th-century Yorktown (despite the fact that the Yorktown segment was completed long before the Jamestown segment). Peterson's subtle way of conveying this atmosphere of a historic setting was to design brick-faced bridges and culverts in a style reminiscent of the 18th century. Like the road itself, these structures were not literal re-creations in the manner of Williamsburg. The Roman semicircular arches he chose were not a specifically local form, since bridge
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construction on that large scale was not needed in the Tidewater area in the 18th century. Roman arches had been used elsewhere during that period, and in England were built of brick, but in Virginia would more likely have been of stone construction. Peterson’s bridges were in fact modern concrete structures, but he borrowed from period architectural elements to clad them in brick. It was carefully done, with the same detail and technology used in the Williamsburg restoration. The brick was handmade, formed in special shapes where necessary, laid in Flemish or English bond, then scrubbed with an acid solution after construction. This careful effort to design new structures (both the road and the bridges) that were not reconstructions, and yet which suited a historic setting, was an early example of what would now be called contextual design, an approach that has become a fundamental tenet of modern historic preservation practice.

The importance of interpreting the past to visitors to Colonial was emphasized by the placement of a series of historic interpretive markers, carefully designed by Superintendent Stanley Abbott and Robert Steenhagen in the 1950s when the Parkway was completed. The markers use three circular designs, one each for the Williamsburg area, the Yorktown leg and the Jamestown leg, and are distinguished by very brief narratives of historical or natural features. This approach was wholly consistent with the philosophy already established for western park roads and described by Arno B. Cammerer that held that, “besides being attractive to look upon, they [should] appear to belong to and be a part of their settings.” The innovation here was that the “setting” was another period in time rather than a contemporary natural environment, and the Parkway partially created that setting — whereas constructions like Going-to-the-Sun Road sought to enter an existing setting with the smallest possible disruption. This is a crucial distinction, because the creation of an historical or quasi-historical setting implies an interpretive role, one that is subtly distinct from the respectful ambience of simple commemoration.

The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, which preceded Colonial Parkway’s initiation, was meant to be no more than an appropriately dignified and respectful setting through which to approach Washington’s home. The eastern NPS parkways initiated after the Colonial Parkway each had somewhat different intents, none of which shared Colonial’s explicitly interpretive purpose. The Blue Ridge Parkway also expanded the NPS parkway or road concept, but did so by emphasizing vernacular landscape and culture, rather than history. It resembled the Northeastern urban parkways in form and design, but was placed in a rural setting, and was intended to be a destination in its own right while connecting two great parks, the Great Smoky Mountains NP and Shenandoah NP. This placement was most closely related to the ideal of the park-to-park highway system. The Blue Ridge Parkway’s planners also had a larger purpose, encompassing the preservation of local culture, for this road. Stanley Abbott, who worked on the Blue Ridge for many years, wrote of efforts to include the local vernacular from the relatively recently-vanished past in parkway structures: “the design of new parkway structures echoes the simple, distinctive
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lines of the old buildings, employing native materials; and there has been restored a series of old buildings inherited with the right of way...the grist and sawmill and the wheelwright and blacksmith shop.” While the original idea behind the Natchez Trace was to reconstruct the path of an historic transportation route, the new road itself provided primarily recreation and transportation while commemorating the existence of the old Trace. Significantly, the Natchez Trace builders used native stone (a “natural” material) as facing on its bridges, rather than anything equivalent to the explicitly historic architectural brick at Colonial.63

Thus the Colonial Parkway, as a part of Colonial National Monument, realized a significant new expansion in the National Park system. The design and concept of Colonial Parkway itself, however, applied the existing NPS principles of road design as a conservation tool in a wholly new way, as a historical interpretive tool. This application has not been repeated by the Park Service (or others) in quite the same way.

Recreation

In the 1920s and 1930s, a major impetus for the construction of parkways and roads of all kinds, as has been touched on above, was the growing phenomenon of motoring for pleasure. Automobile ownership had grown from a mere 500,000 registrations in 1910 to more than eight million in 1920, and by the 1930s cars were a common middle-class possession. The new pastime of “auto-touring” took hold, with national parks as popular destinations. Auto clubs formed, and became a powerful constituency pushing for the construction of roads and campgrounds both in and between park areas. The early managers in the National Park Service were well aware of this when they began to plan Going-to-the-Sun Road. Indeed, they hoped that the road would bring a significant number of new visitors who would thereby become a strong constituency for the Park Service’s preservation mission. While they acknowledged that such road construction in parks would have to be limited, it was also considered very necessary.64

Similarly, the hope to increase tourism in the area was a major motivation for the designation of Colonial National Monument as well as for other recreational parkways. This showed very clearly in the plans for Skyline Drive, whose facilities included gas stations, lunchrooms, camp stores, picnic grounds, and rest rooms, all within easy reach of the road. In the 1930s, attracting visitors was an important issue in Virginia, which had become the second most popular tourist destination on the East Coast after Florida. The idea of capitalizing on the remarkable concentration of historic resources between the James and York Rivers by creating a “historical park” was critical, not only for the National Park Service -- Director Albright knew that he needed to develop a constituency for the Park Service’s mission among the many
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inhabitants of the East Coast -- but also for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the Virginia Conservation and Development Commission.\(^6\)

While the physically separated resources at Yorktown and Jamestown dictated some transportation link between them for the new park unit, the concept of Colonial National Monument carried this impetus well beyond a perfunctory road to make traveling on the Parkway a significant and contributing part of the park experience for visitors. The Blue Ridge Parkway took this concept another step, whereby the road itself was the major destination, although it led to and connected independent park units, thereby making them more accessible as well.\(^6\)

Architecture: The Colonial Parkway and the Colonial Revival

The Colonial Revival style in architecture, which had begun shortly after the nation’s Centennial in 1876, capitalized on a growing public and architectural desire to celebrate American architectural heritage as a form of patriotic expression and cultural unity. The restoration of Colonial Williamsburg was its pinnacle, and this effort had considerable influence on the design of the adjacent Colonial Parkway.

The earliest Colonial Revival structures were often deliberate copies of great houses from the eighteenth century. The desire both to preserve the original houses, and to build anew in their style was at first based mainly on the “patriotic sentiment” associated with the political and military heroes who were the original residents of these houses. In the late 19th century, in fact, the architectural style itself was not widely admired on its own merits. This changed gradually, however, as influential architects adapted colonial elements. Charles McKim designed a colonial interior in 1872, and Richard Morris Hunt’s own house at Newport, Rhode Island, is considered the first major effort to revive the colonial style.\(^6\)

With the turn of the 20th century, the influence of this style on a wider range of structures both grand and humble grew considerably. In addition to frequent replications and adaptations of such famous buildings as Independence Hall and Mount Vernon, the Colonial Revival was a frequent choice for civic buildings such as town halls, as it was thought to express a distinctly American style.\(^6\) As a contemporary architectural style, however, it was eclectic rather than scholarly, culling elements from sources that ranged considerably in time. Even McKim, Mead & White’s prestigious designs made little distinction between various 18th century styles, or even between the 18th and 17th centuries. The work at
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Williamsburg was a much more focused attempt to apply architectural scholarship to a specific reconstruction effort, and it came to “epitomize” the Colonial revival. After the 1920s, one saw fewer buildings specifically in the full-blown colonial style, but many of its elements such as red brick, Palladian windows, side lights at doorways, paneled or louvered wood shutters, and multi-light sash (real or simulated) dispersed into the American vernacular to become almost-invisible cliches of residential, commercial and institutional architecture.

The conscientious “colonial” style so clearly expressed at Williamsburg in the reconstructed Governor’s Palace, the reconstructed Virginia Capitol, and the restored Bruton Parish Church, among other buildings, was Charles Peterson’s inspiration in designing the architectural elements on the Colonial Parkway. In addition to the facings on the bridges and culverts mentioned above, using handmade bricks laid in Flemish or English bond, vitrified clay was used at the visible ends of concrete pipes in culverts for a more “historic” appearance. The semicircular arch form of the bridges, as mentioned earlier, was true to the 18th century, if not to any specific examples from the Parkway area. Despite concerns in Washington about the higher cost, Peterson’s historically detailed designs for these “Unit 1” structures (the Yorktown segment, designed in the 1930s) not only prevailed, but became the standard for design throughout the Parkway. This is true despite the fact that the brick-faced bridges built on the Jamestown segment in the 1950s were somewhat less detailed, and did reduce costs by leaving the concrete structure exposed on the top of underpasses, unseen by Parkway drivers who viewed colonial brick veneer from below. Highway underpasses built in the 1960s were even less detailed, but did hold to the same general design mold.

The Colonial Revival structures dominate the Parkway’s design, visually overshadowing the simple concrete slab bridges built over tidal marshes. Peterson had originally wanted these to be of brick as well, but the cost became prohibitive. As designed, the slab bridges built in both the 1930s and 1950s had unobtrusive concrete railings that did not attempt a historicized appearance. Small elements such as guardrails generally were constructed of wood for an unobtrusive “natural” appearance. These minor elements allow the Colonial structures to leave the primary visual impression on the viewer. This emphatic architectural choice makes Colonial Parkway the only one of the National Park Service roads or parkways with a “style” based on material culture of a specific historical period, rather than on unobtrusive adaptations of natural materials found locally.

The work he did to design the Colonial Parkway in general and its Colonial Revival structures in particular had a profound effect on Charles Peterson’s career. After his early landscape architecture background and work in NPS’s San Francisco office, he had expected to spend his working life in the
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great natural parks of the West. Transferred abruptly to the east to work on Skyline Drive, and then to George Washington's birthplace at Wakefield, Virginia, he was soon assigned to the work at the Colonial Parkway and took up residence in Williamsburg. He closely observed the ongoing work on the Restoration and became acquainted with his professional peers working for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, particularly the architects Perry, Shaw and Hepburn and their staff. He not only designed the bridges, but also researched historic buildings at the park and played a key role in the restoration of the Moore House.

Following this assignment, Peterson supervised park development in the East, at which time he worked on reconstructions and historic structures at Morristown National Historical Park in New Jersey. More significantly, he founded the Historic American Buildings Survey in 1936, which today is the nation's premier collection of high-quality documentation of an enormous range of American architecture; many of the later-demolished buildings thus recorded are preserved only through this documentation. Today it has grown to be the largest archive of its type in the world.

Other assignments continued his focus on historic architecture: at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, where he fought to save some of the many 19th-century structures demolished for the new park, he also formed the William Clark Society to raise awareness of the city's history and to save an important local historic site. After World War II, he worked in Philadelphia at the new Independence National Historical Park, where he went to inventory historic structures and plan for the park's development. As the park's Resident Architect from 1950-1954, he originated its Architectural Study collection. Until his retirement from NPS in 1962, he then served as supervising Architect of Historic Structures for the NPS Eastern Office of Design and Construction, overseeing projects in most of the eastern half of the country. He continued to work independently in architectural restoration and historic preservation, and is a founding member of numerous societies in the field, including the Association for Preservation Technology and U.S. ICOMOS, with numerous honors attesting to his contributions. Today, he is acknowledged as one of the leading figures not only in the history of the National Park Service but in historic preservation in America.  

Conclusion

The Colonial Parkway was an outstanding example of parkway design at the time it was built, the height of the American parkway "movement." It has retained its integrity to a remarkable degree, and is very close, especially considering its continuous use, to its original appearance. The Parkway is a notable part of the strong tradition of NPS park road design as landscape conservation, but is more remarkable for the
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way it applied this tradition to a historical park, as a direct result of the expansion of the National Park System to include historic sites as part of its mission in 1933. Colonial Parkway is exceptional for having as its primary objective the creation of a setting compatible with a historic period. It reflects the recreational climate of the 1920s and 1930s when it was conceived with an unabashed auto-transportation focus, and its architectural elements are an unusual, if not unique, application of the Colonial Revival style at the peak of its expression.
Bibliography


Historic American Engineering Record, “Colonial National Historical Park Roads and Bridges,” HAER No. VA-48


Landscapes et al., “Colonial Parkway Cultural Landscape Report,” April 25, 1996 (95% draft)


UTMs (cont’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>364820</td>
<td>4122310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>364000</td>
<td>4123440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>363480</td>
<td>4123710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>363000</td>
<td>4124470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>362430</td>
<td>4125000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>362000</td>
<td>4125580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>360000</td>
<td>4126000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>359130</td>
<td>4126310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>358550</td>
<td>4125860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>357000</td>
<td>4126360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>356000</td>
<td>4127000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>354160</td>
<td>4127390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>353480</td>
<td>4127120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>353000</td>
<td>4127150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>352560</td>
<td>4126780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>351660</td>
<td>4126920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>350790</td>
<td>4126680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>350000</td>
<td>4126890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349390</td>
<td>4126760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349000</td>
<td>4125600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349060</td>
<td>4124730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>348840</td>
<td>4124300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349180</td>
<td>4123590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349430</td>
<td>4122000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349770</td>
<td>4121000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>349000</td>
<td>4120140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>346000</td>
<td>4119680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>344650</td>
<td>4120150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>344000</td>
<td>4120200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>343000</td>
<td>4120500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>341680</td>
<td>4121190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>341680</td>
<td>4119780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>342410</td>
<td>4119540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boundary Description

The historic district encompasses all of the Parkway corridor within the right-of-way. Beginning at the Yorktown Visitor Center parking lot (C-20), the Parkway extends for approximately 22 miles to the Jamestown Parking Lot (C-21). This typically is 300 feet on either side from the center of the road. District incorporates all contributing shorelines, hydraulic fill, overlooks, parking areas, and picnic areas. From Yorktown, the boundary encompasses the Yorktown Visitor Center parking lot and includes a linear corridor to Ballard Creek. From Ballard Creek to Ringfield, the boundary expands to the north to include the York River shoreline, all parking overlooks, and Ringfield Picnic area. From Ringfield to King’s Mill, the boundary maintains a narrow, regular corridor along the right-of-way of 300-feet on either side of the road from the center line or following the park boundary. From King’s Mill to Mill Creek, the boundary expands to the south to include the irregular shoreline of the James River. From Mill Creek to Jamestown, the boundary maintains a regular, linear corridor along the Parkway right-of-
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