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Abstract.

The goal of this thesis has been to enhance the documentation process for historic houses and gardens. The Macht House is a historic designed house and garden in the modernist style, designed by James C. Rose. The house is being documented for the on-going James C. Rose Documentation Project. This thesis has attempted to show a new way to document and record the spatial relationship between the indoors and the outdoors through the use of scale models and digital photographs of these models. The Historic American Building Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and the recent Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) programs evaluate and record "historically significant" designed landscapes or gardens. An evaluation procedure is initiated through one of these programs by obtaining information about a site's characteristic features and by determining its design style. Once evaluated, places are documented by plan, section, elevation, and isometric drawings; photography; and a descriptive narrative containing historical background information are also included. To date, few modernist buildings and gardens have been documented.

This project asserts that current documentation procedures have not adequately considered one of the major conceptual themes of modernism: the fusion of architectural and landscape space (indoor and outdoor). This project proposes to amend the existing HABS/HAER/HALS documentation standards through the following methodology. First, by studying and evaluating the existing HABS/HAER procedures, I identified what needed to be added for a comprehensive documentation of modernist sites. Second, look at three case studies that were outstanding examples of spatial fusion between building and garden. Third, I identified defining characteristics of modernism, particularly with regards to the "fusion" concept. Fourth, I applied this knowledge to propose an amendment to the existing documentation standards. Finally, I documented a historic site using these enhanced standards, providing before and after drawings, photographs, and models. The site chosen for this project is a house and garden in Baltimore, Maryland, designed by pioneering modernist landscape architect, James C. Rose.
**Introduction.**

The main goal of this master’s project is to enhance the current Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) process for documenting and recording historic designed gardens on the Modernist period. The amended process will be applied to a James Rose garden in Baltimore, Maryland. The documentation of the garden will identify and fill in the gaps in current documentation guidelines and aid in the development of the standards for the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) program, hopefully so that modernist houses and gardens can be better evaluated and recorded as they increasingly become of interest.

The first objective of the project is to study and evaluate the existing HABS/HAER documentation standards, since the guidelines for the HALS program are still in draft form. A historic designed landscape is considered significant only if it meets the criteria described by the National Register of Historic Places. Once nominated to the National Register, the site (which includes both the surrounding landscape and the house) undergoes a thorough documentation process. The existing process was originally devised to address buildings and engineered structures, which typically change less over time. The recent introduction of the HALS program was intended to address landscapes more specially. Most designed historic landscapes recorded under the auspices of the National Park Service (NPS) are documented as being “historically significant” sites of more than fifty years old. The NPS usually recommends that the original design be maintained to uphold the integrity of the landscape. But, the NPS does not mention how to evaluate a designed Modernist garden, a style that occurred from the 1930s to 1960s. There are only a handful of Modernist gardens in the country that have been allowed to be documented and photographed, thereby limiting public awareness of the Modernist garden. This raises the question of how to preserve and document a garden in which a space was created that was functional, adapted for modern use, and designed to encompass environmental change. It is through the work of the James Rose Center in Ridgewood, New Jersey (founded in 1991), that Rose’s unique vision has gained recognition from the landscape architecture profession. One of the objectives of the center has been to preserve Rose’s gardens by recording and documenting them.

One of James Rose’s one of the pioneers of the Modernist landscape architectural movement design intentions was that house and garden, with their interior and exterior spaces, should be merged together to create a functional and meaningful experience. Rose interpreted the garden not as an object, but as an ‘outdoor sculpture…designed to surround us in a pleasant sense of space relations’. Others architects such as Mies van der Rohe, Richard Neutra, and Philip Johnson explored this idea to a lesser extent. The exception to this is the Miller garden, (see Hilderbrand, et al.), designed by Dan Kiley and Eero Saarinen, where the designers successfully integrated architecture and garden. The result is seen as a masterpiece of landscape modernism.

The next objective in the project is to explore and discuss three known masterpieces of modernism that embody experimentation in the fusion of architectural and surrounding landscape space. The last case study is Kiley/Saarinen/Roche’s work on the Miller garden and can be
considered a deliberate and fully successful fusion between house and garden. All case studies will be analyzed and discussed to identify important characteristics of a modernist house with surrounding landscape or garden. Rose, in particular, spent his lifetime exploring and experimenting with the relationship between shelter and the landscape. It is this that makes Rose’s finished works unique, and this is the main reason why the Baltimore garden was chosen.

The National Park Service has guidelines for determining the historical significance of properties that are less than fifty years old. A property may be eligible for the National Register if it is of “exceptional significance”. The Baltimore site should be seen as “exceptionally significant” because it fits into the NPS definition, which is “a landscape that has significance as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out by a master gardener, landscape architect, ……… using a recognized style or tradition ………, or reaction to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, event, etc. in landscape gardening or landscape architecture; or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture”. The Baltimore garden might be seen as exceptionally important because the architecture and garden could fall under ‘scholarly evaluation’ given within the guidelines.

Insights from the case studies lead to the project’s next objective, namely, the study and identification of characteristics of modernism. The nomination procedure from the NPS guidelines requires that certain characteristics of any design genre be identified so that the historical significance of the garden can be determined. The project will use current thinking on aspects of modernism from two landscape architectural theoreticians, Marc Treib and Dean Cardasis, as well as original texts by James Rose. Insights from the project may reveal some defining Modernist characteristics from Rose’s design work. For example, how did Rose create space using the earth and retaining walls? The project will discuss some misconceptions about Rose’s work. In his article for example, Treib mentions that Modernists did not use an axis in the same way as the Beaux-arts designers. The project will point out that Rose (and others) did use a multitude of axis as revealed from the project itself.

This thesis suggests existing shortcomings in the methods for documenting and recording Modernist houses and gardens. Firstly, there is little mention of the designer’s intent for the garden designs. Secondly, there is little analysis on how to describe “space”, in the Modernist sense, in the narrative aspect of the documentation procedure. Finally, there is no discussion on how to document how interior space fused with the exterior space of the garden, which is an important characteristic of a Modernist house and garden. Other issues that highlighted the problems in historic garden and landscape preservation and documentation were discussed as the Wave Hill and NPS conference in 1999. It was suggested that there is a pressing need for a preservation and strategy plan to maintain such gardens. This illustrates the importance of improvement to documentation standards. In fact, three symposia on Modernist historic preservation issues are planned this year.

The articulation of spatial volume was critical to Rose’s design intentions. He achieved this successfully by using models at first, and then applying his design ideas in the existing landscape.
during the construction phase of the project. Rose also used models which would help the client understand what his design intentions were and how he was shaping the space in the client’s garden. One of the best ways to understand, study and record space is by the construction of a model of both house and garden. This thesis/project intends to follow in the footsteps of Rose and to make a case for models quoting from written works of Rose, Cardasis and Marguerite Koepke.

The project does not dismiss drawings, but points out their limitations to understanding spatial definition. Indeed, the project goes further than the suggestions derived from the HABS/HAER guidelines, which suggests the use of plan, section and axonometric drawings, by modeling the Baltimore site and using digital photography of the model to reveal spatial relations that no longer exist. The project will use mass/void drawings to illustrate the forms of space and their relationships to each other.

The final objective of the project is to apply these amendments to the site located in Baltimore there will be a “before” and “after” study using black and white photography, drawings and models. The purpose will be to discover how the spaces within the house and garden have changed over the years. It is hoped that the clients will respond to a verbal questionnaire that will help to add to the historical background information of the project. However, the major component of the project using the above methodology will reveal what Rose’s design intent was, how he fused indoor and outdoor space and what his responses were to the existing topography that created spaces for contemporary living.

---

Endnotes.
3 Homepage of the James Rose Center at http://www.jamesrosecenter.org
5 Hilderbrand, Gary R., “Icon of Modernism” . (Fall 2000). Published by Spacemaker Press. p. 1- 64
12 Phone and email conversations with Patricia O'Donnell in January and February 2002
14 Rose, James, C. “Landscape Models”. Pencil Points (April 1938), p.438
Chapter 1: Three Case Studies

There are certain characteristics that define Modernism, such as the spatial fusion between the house and the garden. This chapter will discuss and describe these ‘masterpieces of modernism’ and touch on three different types of fusion.

1. The Lovell House – the fusion of house and nature
2. The Glass House – the fusion of house and pastoral landscape
3. The Miller House – the fusion of house and the modern landscape for living.

1. The Lovell House - Neutra.

Richard Neutra was a prolific modernist architect, who was known for using the latest industrial technology as a construction material for designing residential houses in California. One of Neutra’s first recognized houses was the Lovell House (also known as the ‘Health House’ because the client was a naturopath) in 1928.¹ This particular Neutra project is included in the paper, because few modernist houses have been documented by the Historic American Building Survey. A ten page descriptive narrative with plan and section drawings can be downloaded from the Prints and Photographs Division, off the Library of Congress website.² It is a prime example of where the technology of residential architecture created a modern environment for living.

The site is situated on a cul-de-sac in the Hollywood Hills of Los Angeles. The property is adjacent to the southern boundary of the beautiful, natural, city-owned Griffith Park, with views of the city to the north. The original lot was almost wedge shaped and measures approximately one acre in size. There is a considerable drop in elevation of 100 feet from the north-east to the south-east corners of the existing topography. Neutra spent most of 1928 designing and planning the house.

Since, he had little confidence in hiring a contractor, whom he believed would be sufficiently competent to complete the difficult task ahead, Neutra decided to become the general contractor himself. This house brought Neutra into the limelight of the architectural world, because it was the first completely built steel-framed residence in America. This beach house is supported by five reinforced concrete frames, with airy double height living rooms and built-in furniture. The house
was constructed of a light steel framework, filled with standard window components. All parts of the structure were shop fabricated and transported to the steep hillside site where the structural skeleton was erected in just forty hours. The frame became the essence of the building, filled and covered with light concrete, steel and glass. Here Neutra’s concept promoted easy, flowing spaces for the contemporary family, combined with industrial materials of elegantly balanced glass and steel.

Neutra also designed the garden. He created a series of curvilinear terraces that followed the contours of the steep slopes using low concrete retaining walls. Neutra’s garden terraces sharply contrasted with the orthogonal lines of the exterior architecture. Despite Neutra’s knowledge of botany and landscape design skills, there is no mention in Hines book\(^3\) that Neutra ever attempted to fuse the spaces of garden and house together. As can be seen from the isometric drawing, there is little connection of circulation between the house and garden entrances. Neutra, unlike his mentor Frank Lloyd Wright did not conform to the philosophy that architecture should blend with the landscape, but should be a shelter embracing the natural surroundings. Nevertheless, Neutra succeeded in combining the utilitarian activities with the elegant beauty of the house.

*Aerial isometric view from the south-west of the Lovell House*
2. **The Glass House - Johnson**

Philip Johnson has never made an effort to conceal his debt to Mies van der Rohe; he used Mies’s concepts to construct his ‘Glass House’ in New Canaan, Connecticut. Although Johnson’s early work was Mies-inspired, he was recognized later in his career as having his own fresh and inventive style. The Glass House, now 50 years old, is the building which architects and non-architects alike readily associate with Johnson. It is an extraordinary building, that expresses Johnson’s thinking and experiential architectural work. Johnson wanted to create a “picture window” within the confines of his ‘Glass House’, so that he could enjoy his manicured, pastoral landscape.

The ‘Glass House’ measures 56 feet long; furniture groupings define the use areas. The house was originally constructed with eight steel columns, but changed structurally from four columns to six columns over the years. Johnson was preoccupied with early Mies “less is more” concept and subsequently pushed building technology to its limits. There are no partitions, only a round brick cylinder, containing a bathroom, rising to the ceiling. The manicured landscape is visible from the interior; it functions not just as an enclosure but acts as an illusion. The glass sides of the house are reflective, refractive and transparent depending on the light, but they are never shaded by the structure. The ‘Glass House’ is ordered about a brick cylinder which pierces the roof slab in such a way as to emphasize the flat roof plane. The surface of the podium is treated as an earthwork, its woven brick herringbone fusing with the brick cylinder of the bathroom/chimney core.4

The views outward from the house are open to the world, but outside, there is no world at all - just an elegantly arranged landscape that is as much a part of the house as the furniture. Johnson created the landscape by cutting back many trees that surrounded the property to allow ambient light to enter the building. ‘New England is a jungle, it has to be beaten back….Americans don’t understand woodlands. They let second growth come up….There’s no such thing as dappled shade in American forests. I worked very hard to get dappled shade”5. Despite Johnson’s rigorous pruning efforts the relationship of indoor to outdoor space is only abstractly fused. Since the ‘Glass House’ was completed it has grown into a compound of five buildings; if the house itself is a relic from an earlier era, the overall grouping reflects all of the phases of Johnson’s career. 6

![Site plan of Glass House, in which Johnson could enjoy his picturesque views of the Connecticut valley](image)

Although, Johnson’s Glass House was Miesian-inspired by way of the Farnsworth House, there are distinct differences between the two. The Farnsworth house is a floating glass rectangle raised
Kiley's first plan, early August 1955. The garden spaces of the upper plateau changed little after this first complete sketch.

Initially, Saarinen proposed a twenty-five foot podium marked by a uniform grid as the ground plane. This Modernist conception created a separation between the built world and the natural world. Kiley did not accept the separation of man and nature, but saw man as a part of nature. He reduced the twenty-five patio area to ten feet, measuring just two and a half feet beyond the roof overhang and defined the podium as more of a continuation of the floor inside. Around the podium, Kiley planted ground cover and deciduous trees, which would eventually encompass the house. The plants would provide a supple spatial field, characterized by shade and shadow, mass and

on eight steel columns, six that support the house and two that support the loggia. The window arrangement is fixed and the loggia is established outside the glass structure. In the ‘Glass House’ the column system is partially concealed by the glass establishing an airtight enclosure. Johnson’s loggia concept is now the manicured landscape directly outside. In summary, what Johnson did was is to refine the original concept of Mies van der Rohe’s Farnsworth project. While Mies regarded nature as an ambient mirage of light and color, Johnson saw nature as nothing other than a picture to be seen through glass walls.7

3. The Miller House – Kiley and Saarinen

The Miller House was designed by the architect Eero Saarinen between 1953 and 1957 in Columbus, Indiana. In 1955 landscape architect Dan Kiley began work on the garden on Saarinen’s invitation. The house is dominated by the living room; its other spaces pinwheel outward from the center. This plan gave Kiley the opportunity to explore Neoplatonic geometric forms. The garden’s design derives from the architectural order of the house, repeating the spatial theme of radiation outward from the living room to the nearby river and road. The architect allowed Kiley the freedom to integrate the house with the surrounding garden using a shared geometric spatial order so that there was a fusion of space. The only significant difference between the two spaces lies in the materials, living vegetation as opposed to inert construction materials. The Miller Garden was a turning point for Kiley because the design concept was derived from Modernist architecture, unlike his previous works which were based on form as pure art. The use of the grid, asymmetry, and horizontality represented this radical change. Kiley used the classic structure in a unique way to extend Modernism’s free plan into the landscape,8 Kiley’s design approach is not found in the later designs of James Rose, who preferred open, free-flowing and experimental design forms.
void, and alternation of enclosure and view. In this way the fusion of interior and exterior space was created not just by the floor surface of the house, but by the close presence of ground cover, trees and their canopies.  

The Miller House is supported by sixteen white cruciform columns arranged to form a nine-square grid. These structural columns support the steel frame, forming the distinction between column, wall, and horizontal roof, a characteristic that Saarinen learned from his mentor, Mies van der Rohe. The free interior plan was organized on a grid module and allowed the rooms to accommodate the different needs of the Miller family. In spatial terms, each of the four rooms pinwheels around the center of the house and provided Kiley with an opportunity to fuse the architecture of the house to the garden. Kiley’s design divided the site into three parts: garden, meadow and wood. These zones created a composition that is analogous to classical design, unlike the spaces immediately surrounding the house that are based on the Modernist concept of functionalism. Functionalism provided Kiley with the opportunity to begin with a classical style and then transform it by using asymmetrically placed walls and spaces, all controlled by the square. “The house was designed in functional blocks, such as the kitchen, the dining room, the master bedroom, and the living room. So I took this same geometry and made rooms outside using trees in groves and allees”. The five design characteristics with which Kiley integrated indoor and outdoor space were neoclassicism, the grid, asymmetry, horizontality, and space.

Endnotes.

3 Ibid.
9 Hilderbrand, Gary R., “Icon of Modernism” (Fall 2000). Published by Spacemaker Press. p. 1- 64
Chapter 2: The defining characteristics of modernism and spatial fusion

Marc Treib, in his article ‘Axioms of a Modern Landscape Architecture’, outlines six characteristics that define modern landscape architecture. European architectural thought of the early 1930s brought to America the idea of the free plan and the integration of indoor and outdoor space. James Rose, Dan Kiley and Garrett Eckbo who created open and continuous spaces which suited the needs of their prospective clients, then applied these modern ideas to the landscape and garden. From 1938 to 1941 they published a series of articles that outlined their design concepts for urban, rural and primeval landscapes. These landscape designers were the leaders of the Modernist landscape architecture movement. This chapter will discuss and analyze Treib’s theories on the characteristics of Modernism. Rose’s Ridgewood project will be used as a prime example of the integration of indoor and outdoor space.

1. A rejection of historical styles. These Modernists believed that a style derived from history would be irrelevant to a world that was undergoing rapid technological, social, and cultural changes. They argued vehemently that ornamental design had no place in such a world. Eckbo advocated a rational and scientific approach to determine a design based on site conditions and the surrounding built context. Rose expressed his view on the irrelevance of historical design style applied to the contemporary world. ‘We can appreciate Gothic cathedrals and Renaissance places, but we can no longer produce them because we have been cut off from their source of inspiration. History has no value for us unless we learn this first. The only direct stimulus we can get from the past is an understanding of how social and psychological influences led a particular civilization to arrive at its peculiar expressions. We should do the same for our own civilization and seek to express it.’ In other words, Rose and other Modernist landscape architects believed that design should only be appropriate to the current social, economic and cultural situation.

However, Treib was not entirely accurate in asserting that all modernists rejected the history of landscape design. For example, Kiley in the latter half of his professional career designed the Miller garden based in Columbus, Indiana, using a honey locust allee on the western edge of the Miller home. An allee is a Renaissance period design idea, and Kiley found inspiration from Pirro Ligario’s design at Ville D’Este in Tivoli, Italy. Kiley made the allee modern by changing its function. He created a lateral view across the allee rather than the traditional view down its linear path, thereby giving shade and definition along the western side of the house. Rose took his inspiration from the Japanese art of garden-making, in which “the spiritual nature of the garden was reinforced for Rose by his practice of Zen Buddhism and his frequent visits to Japan”.

2. A concern for space rather than pattern

Landscape Modernists, according to theorists like Dean Cardasis, Treib and others, believe that space and the volumes contained therein would take precedence over pattern or any preconceived design style. Modernism is often misunderstood as being preoccupied with form and materials. This is not the case. Rose, Kiley, Eckbo and others were concerned with sculpting the earth to create outdoor rooms or spaces. A mass and void relationship would successfully interlock these spaces together and serve the needs of the client. As Eckbo wrote in a Pencil Points article, ‘people live in volumes, not planes’. This statement underscores one of the founding rules of modern landscape architecture. One quotation from Rose identifies the difference between the separation of space in the older formal movement and the division of
volume in the open and free form movement. ‘The fundamental fallacy of the old school (Beaux-Arts) is an archaic conception of space which originates from the segregation of ground area instead of division of volume. That is why the members can justify themselves with the same words, and yet have an entirely different meaning. That is why we can arrive at an entirely different expression without a change in materials. And that is why we can produce Twentieth Century design while they continue in archaeological distortion’. In another Pencil Points article Rose explains the difference between indoor and outdoor space: ‘In buildings, we define space mainly with structural material to provide for the function of living which requires shelter. This structural outer shell articulates the form of interior volumes, which are broken into smaller volumes or partial volumes for use and circulation requirements and the best possible relation of void to solid, by which is created a knowledge and feeling of space. In pure landscape, we drop the structural shell and the volume is defined by earth, paving, water, and ground cover; foliage, walls, structures, and other vertical elements on the sides; and sky, branching, and roofing above.’

3. A rational and scientific consideration of site conditions

Rose in Pencil Points, again points out that the two dimensional plan from the Beaux-Arts movement took no consideration of the surrounding site conditions, arguing that this design philosophy was irrelevant to modern contemporary living. ‘Wherever man goes, we find a reorganization of nature. This fact is the sole justification for the profession of landscape design, and our job is to provide a more skillful arrangement for greater utility and for the expression of contemporary living. Unfortunately, the profession (meaning the Beaux-Arts) has produced a lot of aesthetic ornament which has nothing to do with the problem.’ Rose, along with other Modernist colleagues, Dan Kiley and Garrett Eckbo took a rational and scientific view that a ‘landscape cannot exist as an isolated phenomenon, but must become an integral part of a complex environmental control. It is quite possible, with contemporary knowledge and techniques, to produce environments of sufficient plasticity as to make them constantly renewable, reflecting the organic social development.’ In particular, Eckbo’s design approach to a large-scale landscape site and the surrounding context led to the idea of site planning. Rose’s approach was different and usually on the smaller garden scale. Nevertheless Rose took into account that, ‘economy and expediency in producing useful landscapes revolve on three major factors in planning: maintenance, plant control, and grading.’ Rose believed that science could help reduce maintenance costs and continues, ‘when science becomes an integral part of landscape development, the very techniques of control produce a definition of form and a juxtaposition of living and non-living materials which limit and reduce the maintenance.’

Finally, Modernists aptly designed outdoor spaces with contemporary modern living in mind. Eckbo wrote in 1937, ‘People, not plants, are the important things in the garden. Every garden is a stage, every occupant a player’. Rose saw the garden as a place where people could experience both its functional and spiritual aspects.

4. An infinite number of axes.

There are numerous Modernist examples, where spaces were organized from a multitude of axes picked up from other site conditions such as the architecture of surrounding house or the natural contours from the site. While Treib pointed out, those modernist gardens would be free formed and multi-faceted, he inaccurately stated that modernist landscape designers did not use an axis. Rose and other modernists decided that their designs would not be constrained by elements of symmetry, focal points, or formality. Rose noted these elements did not necessarily have to be rejected, but must not be used as a starting point to a design. In his article, Articulate Form in
Landscape Design, Rose states that ‘symmetry might result from a thoroughly contemporary approach, as it does in the form of a motion picture auditorium…. Something which could be labeled an axis might even develop. But when we begin with any preconceived notion of form – symmetry, straight lines, or an axis – we eliminate the possibility of developing a form which will articulate and express the activity to occur.’ This revolutionary idea meant that the spatial quality of the garden would not become chaotic or disorganized. Rose’s writings clearly explain how a single axis could no longer suffice in an industrial world. ‘If you wish to consider any line of sight an axis, then you have an infinite number of axes in a garden or anywhere else, and so it should be. By selecting one or two axes in a garden and developing a picture from a given station point, we are losing an infinity of opportunities.’ Again, referring to the Miller garden, Kiley transformed the conventional use of the axis that ran laterally across both sides of the house rather than vertically. Gary Hilderbrand defines the axis as ‘a centerline of reference - usually, but not always, of a symmetrical kind.’ He states that Kiley’s allee was not dependent on objects or architecture and could not be axial because it did not align or originate with the house, since Kiley had re-invented and transformed the traditional axis. His modern idea was to create lateral views from the house to the garden (which he called the ‘meadow’) rather than the traditional view down a linear path.

5. Plants are used for their individual qualities, not for decoration.
Plants are rationally and scientifically used for their structural and textural qualities and placed in the garden under the proper climatic and environmental conditions. The modernist architects Henry Russell-Hitchcock and Philip Johnson argued that standardization of building materials would provide consistent and regularly shaped, contemporary modern houses. They concluded that the consistent order of standardization would replace the consistent symmetrical organization of space in traditional design. This architectural thinking about standardization presented Modernist landscape architects with an opportunity in planting design to use the same consistency to highlight a plant’s particular structural and textural qualities. The early Modernist landscape architect writers reacted strongly against two particular aspects of traditional planting design and use. One was that a plant would be selected for its horticultural use and interest rather than chosen for some formal aesthetic. The other was to avoid planting decorative gardens and that plants should be used as an edge to create spatial volume. Rose disliked the Beaux-Arts philosophy for applying, what he called ‘exterior decoration’ to the landscape, which he felt was irrelevant to modern contemporary living. Rose’s idea of beauty and its meaning to a landscape design was ‘the organic relationship between materials and the division of space in volume to express and satisfy the use for which it is intended.’ Rose states that, ‘to use plants intelligently, a landscaper must first know his territory: soil, climate and indigenous growth. Then he must understand plant forms: not as he would like to have them, but as they grow…’ In his article, Plant Forms and Space, Rose categorizes plants for their space-creating qualities, such as columnar, horizontal, pendulous, spreading, rounded and irregular shapes or forms. Rose, like his colleagues, believed that plants should also be selected for scientific reasons. ‘Certain activities as well as certain plants need the protection of a particular kind of wall or windbreak: others need exposure. Newly developed ground surfacings have infinite possibilities of form and an important relation to plant control as well as use. When any of these requirements is scientifically provided for, it automatically suggests a form, probably unprecedented, which puts maintenance on an intelligent, clear-cut basis.’
Despite this rational thinking in modernist planting design, the effect was not all that dissimilar to formal plantings. For example, Le Notre’s highly ordered and structural planting schemes in France could easily be interpreted as modern when compared to Kiley’s later garden design works. Treib suggests that Kiley used grid ‘bosquets’ to reinforce the connection between formal design and the centrifugal spatial order (the pin wheel) of the modern architectural era. Treib concluded that the difference between the two planting designs has remained ambiguous. Hilderbrand however argues that Kiley re-invented the traditional use of the hedge. The Miller garden shows that Kiley’s staggered hedges are more complex. They are thicker and denser which means that their edges are more flexible to alignments and adjustments for design purposes. In short, Kiley’s hedges are inventive, flexible and alterable without following any conventional design rules and not merely decorative.

In all of Rose’s planting schemes, texture took precedent over color. However, Treib’s article seems to support the notion that uniform color and texture is found in Beaux-Arts schemes. Treib sees the only significant difference between Modernist and Beaux-Arts planting designs lies in the fact that the plants from the Beaux-Arts movement are physically manipulated by man. Rose also used plants to create spatial volume and states, ‘Space is the constant in all three dimensional design, but a realization of space is not possible until it is defined by materials. In both architecture and landscape, material plus space create a volume through which human beings circulate and carry on the functions of living’. Eckbo took the view that color should add to the spatial quality of the garden design and never become so dominant that the spatial quality was lost in a modern garden. ‘We advocate the use of color, but we advocate its use in a disciplined and controlled fashion which will strengthen, rather than disrupt, the spatial concept of garden or park’. The purpose of color, therefore, was to strengthen the structural and spatial qualities of the modern garden.

6. The fusion of house and garden.

Finally, there should be a fusion between the interior space of the house and the exterior space of the garden; Rose is probably the best source to explore this concept. Rose saw the fusion of these two entities as one, unified space, which he defined as a garden. From his book, Creative Gardens, Rose thought ‘it helpful to think of a garden as sculpture. Not sculpture in the ordinary sense of an object to be viewed. But sculpture that is large enough and perforated enough to walk through. And open enough to present no barrier to movement, and broken enough to guide the experience which is essentially a communion with the sky. This is a garden’. Modernist architects from Europe such as Richard Neutra realized that Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s project in Barcelona started to develop the concept of complete integration of interior and exterior spaces. Neutra used this idea to great effect in his architectural design projects in southern California. Neutra’s Kaufmann house is an example of how the line between the inside and the outside could become fused. Although, Neutra saw his building as a ‘machine for living’, he nevertheless considered the house as a sanctuary which would embrace the surroundings. However, modernist architects, like Neutra, Mies van der Rohe and Johnson never fully engaged the landscape by their design interventions. Their houses were to fit into the landscape rather than to fuse with the outdoors. The design priority was for these houses to be simple and elegant, allowing plenty of light and openness to enjoy the landscape from the inside. So, the idea of integration between the house and garden was only partly realized by these modernist architects. Rose realized this early in his career and stated, ‘With a few notable exceptions, architects have made no attempt to express any human experience outside the walls of the building’. He goes on, ‘No matter how
closely they may resemble a “machine for living”, they are still an objet d’art, and as such, may provide a momentary thrill and.....have little relation to the rest of the world in which living also occurs.\textsuperscript{24} It was Rose, Kiley and Eckbo, who drew upon the spatial structure of the building and connected both the interior spaces of the house with the exterior spaces of the garden.

Eckbo focused his garden design efforts on the space of the lot as a whole, realizing that subdividing the lot would only serve to reduce the spatial dimensions of the site, thereby reducing spatial quality. Kiley’s Miller Garden project of 1955 is recognized (as stated in numerous articles\textsuperscript{25}) as a serious attempt to bring together the spatial qualities of house and garden. He collaborated on this project with the visionary, Eero Saarinen, one of the very few Modernist architects who believed that the house should be fully integrated with the garden. This project came late in Kiley’s career and marked a significant turning point for him. Kiley abandoned the free-form compositions that he had been designing for the previous nineteen years for a design scheme that interplayed with the grid, asymmetry and horizontality. Kiley’s overall design divided the site into three parts: garden, meadow and wood. Within the garden Kiley created a series of outdoor rooms that extended from Saarinen’s pin-wheel floor plan to the perimeter of the site. Hilderbrand describes the Miller garden thus: “spaces open, unfold, and overlap as they do within the house, breaking free of their orthogonal straightjacket to become dynamic and surprising. Allees become screens and filters; grids of trees enclose dramatic pools of light at their centers.”\textsuperscript{26}

The final example of Modernism is the James Rose residence based in Ridgewood, New Jersey, which is now the James Rose Center for Landscape Architecture Research and Design. The house at Ridgewood is a composite of three buildings, which consists of a main house, guest house and studio. It is the clearest existing modernist example of spatial fusion between house and garden, which Rose later described as ‘neither landscape nor architecture, but both, neither indoors nor outdoors, but both.’\textsuperscript{27} It was built so that the interior spaces could ‘slide easily from individual to group function.’\textsuperscript{28} House and garden spaces would not only intertwine with one another, but Rose also wanted the entire site integrated so that both house and garden would seem to be renewed over the years. The Ridgewood project was conceived to accommodate changes in the modern landscape. Again in Creative Gardens, Rose states, ‘I decided to go at the construction as you might a painting or a piece of sculpture. I set up the basic armature of walls, and roofs, and open spaces to establish their relationships, but left it free in detail to allow for improvisation. In that way it would never be “finished” but constantly evolving from one stage to the next - a metamorphosis such as we find, commonly, in nature.’\textsuperscript{29} To support this argument Cardasis pointed out at the “Preserving the Recent Past” symposium that Rose ‘acknowledges the inevitability of change in time while creating continuous interlocking spatial experience.’\textsuperscript{30} Certainly, Ridgewood during the course of Rose’s lifetime has changed dramatically over a period of four decades. Finally, Rose believed that he succeeded in achieving fusion at Ridgewood and comments, ‘I think the experiment illustrates both the spatial and esthetic increment of fusion. The walls become garden walls instead of barriers. The landscape is of the house instead attached to it, and the space is one.’\textsuperscript{31}
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Chapter 3: A critical analysis on the nomination, evaluation and
documentation procedures of the HABS/HAER and recently developed HALS
programs.

Landscape sites, whether large or small scale, are always judged for their “historical significance”
by an evaluation procedure to nominate them for the ‘National Register of Historic Places’. Once
officially nominated, the property (which can include both the building and the surrounding
landscape) may undergo a documentation process as part of the nomination, or subsequently
through Historic American Building Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record
(HAER) or Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS). This chapter will provide a brief overview
of how the National Park Service (NPS) nominates, evaluates and documents historic designed
landscapes. There will also be a short discussion on the current state of the new HALS program.
These procedures will then be assessed to discover if and how the guidelines can be improved to
document modernist houses and gardens. Finally, the chapter will determine whether or not the
relationship between interior and landscape space is explored in the guidelines.

The evaluation procedure for nominating a historic designed landscape or garden.

In National Register Bulletin 18 a designed landscape is defined as follows:

“...a landscape that has significance as a design or work of art; was consciously designed
and laid out by a master gardener, landscape architect,........., using a recognized style or
tradition........., or reaction to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with
a significant person, trend, event, etc. in landscape gardening or landscape architecture; or
a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture.”

The technical information bulletin assumes that the researcher, whether a landscape architect,
architect, horticulturalist, or historian, will identify certain characteristics to determine a particular
design genre of a historic designed landscape and its historical significance. The guidelines
suggest that researching features such as physical sites, structures, objects and buildings help
determine the design intent of the historic landscape. However, the guidelines neglect to mention
other features such as interior architectural spaces and exterior landscape spaces. The
relationship between these two spaces is a key element in a modernist house and garden, a
characteristic that has been missed from this dated bulletin.

In order to assure a historical perspective and avoid rash judgments, based on recent trends, the
National Register of Historic Places Act (1966) does not define or describe ‘exceptional’. One of
the problems with evaluating modernist houses and gardens is that they barely fall under the “50-
year rule”. However, there is an evaluation procedure for the recognition of historic places and
gardens under 50 years old, provided the property is defined as “exceptionally significant” at the
national, State or local level. However, as the guidelines put it in National Register Bulletin for
Evaluating and Nominating Properties that have achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years,
“Exceptional by its own definition cannot be fully cataloged or anticipated.” The bulletin goes on
explaining that “the passage of time allows our perceptions to be influenced by education, the
judgment of previous decades, and the dispassion of distance”.

Technical bulletin #18 suggests that historic designed landscapes are judged for significance by
investigating the history, design intent, social significance, and other qualities of the site. An
investigation should achieve the following:

a. Obtain information documenting its history and collect any available plans and
   photographs.

b. Identify the landscape type (e.g. modernist garden)
c. Look into the characteristic features of a good representation of the landscape type (e.g. modernist garden)

d. Using the National Register Criteria, evaluate the significance of the site.

e. List features that will help to evaluate the integrity of the design.

‘Integrity of the design’ requires assessment of how features such as the facades of buildings or the upkeep of the garden have withstood the test of time. If the original design has changed, the evaluation process will assess by how much it has been compromised. The evaluation process is thorough when assessing a historic building on a property. When considering the landscape the evaluation treatment is similar to a landscape site assessment, and includes analysis and survey mapping, as used in the practice of landscape architecture. The bulletin suggests that key garden structures and objects should be identified, and pedestrian circulation, soils, and planting analysis investigated. However, the guidelines in the HABS nomination procedure, unlike landscape architectural practice, do not mention spatial assessment of the property. This does not mean spatial assessment need be excluded when historic property is undergoing the nomination process.

The HABS documentation procedure

The HABS documentation procedure is divided into three parts. There are guidelines on how to write a historical report; how to record structures and sites with measured drawings; and how to record black and white photographs³.

There are three types of formats for historical reports.

a. Narrative – contains chapters and sections, emphasizing significant aspects of the building and garden.

b. Outline – discusses aspects of the garden and building.

c. Short – uses a minimal amount of information.

The narrative and outline format are suitable for describing buildings, their structures and surrounding gardens. The narrative format goes into greater detail than an outline format. Both are divided into five main informational sections: Identification, Historical, Architectural, Sources and Project.

The identification portion states the name of the building, its present owner, present use, location, and significance. The historical section documents the physical history of the building: the date construction started; the names of the architect, original and subsequent owners, and the contractor; and whether any original plans exist. The guidelines suggest that the historical context of the building should be attached to the identification section. The historical portion might be expanded to examine the building’s relationship to the surrounding area in terms of its historical ‘events’ within a neighborhood. There is, however, no suggestion within the guidelines that characteristic features, such as spatial quality and the relationship between indoor and outdoor space, are of historical significance; only physical attributes are mentioned. The architectural section discusses what facts are missing from the measured drawings and describes the condition and architectural character of the building. Again, physical dimensions are given of the foundation, floors, walls, doors, windows, etc. Included in this section are detailed descriptions of the interior and exterior of the building. The historic landscape design is covered under this section, but only to the extent of describing the layout, character and what plantings are present. What is missing in the documentation procedure is a description of the spatial analysis between house and garden.

For example, a description of how the deck of the house, in terms of pedestrian circulation, fuses with the garden. Since this key characteristic is missing, there are no subsequent guidelines on the subject. Neither is there anything in the guidelines to say that this feature should not be
included in the documentation process. The next section ‘sources of information’ will aid any researcher by referring to all relevant sources. These sources would be original architectural drawings, including any alterations, early photographic views, interviews with the original owners, a bibliography and any likely sources not yet investigated. The final part of the documentation process is ‘project information’, and describes who was involved with the project. The guidelines suggest it would be more appropriate to document landscapes and gardens in narrative format. The outline and narrative formats could be combined, with a description in one form and the history in the other. The guidelines suggest that the narrative format should be “of fluid nature”. It is difficult to determine what this last suggestion means, but here is an opportunity where a researcher could fully discuss the combined design intent of the house and garden.

The HABS documentation procedure for recording buildings using measured drawings is thorough. There are guidelines on how to sketch, measure, and record building plans, elevations, sections and details. Within this particular bulletin, there is a chapter on landscape documentation in which HABS has come up with some guidelines. They suggest that there should be a site plan that locates the building, identifies circulation routes, walls and fences, major trees, shrub plantings and water courses. Directions are given that point out that both house and garden should be thoroughly documented but treated as separate entities. Therefore, directions for documenting a modernist house and garden, in which interior and exterior spaces are fused would fail to document such a property accurately. Further confusion is added as the guidelines go on to point out that a site plan should complement the architectural component of the building. The guidelines point out that previous site surveys and photographs should provide valuable insights as to what changes, if any, have been made to the original design, but they do not explain how and why these insights should be documented. The landscape is always changing and evolving and the guidelines provide no recommendations as to what preservation treatment should be applied to the landscape or garden. If a comparison study is done between the original and existing design, it may be possible to assess what preservation treatment could be applied. The guidelines encourage the researcher to describe what physical features are present with the purpose of understanding the designer’s intent. However, modernist houses and gardens are based on the premise of the spatial relationship between the two entities, hence it is this characteristic feature that needs to be documented and included in the guidelines.

Finally, documentary photographs aid the preparation of measured drawings and historical reports. Indeed, photographic records in the HABS/HAER collections have been of the highest standard. The collections only accept large format original black and white negatives with a minimum dimension of 4” by 5”. These standards are directed towards professional photographers and are not intended for beginners. Large format photographs are required so that the many users of the HABS/HAER photographic collections may examine minute areas of the images to determine the design, construction and craftsmanship of architectural elements such as gargoyles and be able to read manufacturing plates. Small and medium format negatives do not have the same resolution and clarity to maintain the required level of detail. Black and white photographs are used because they have an archival life expectancy of 500 years, are easy to store, and are cost effective; color prints have a relatively short life expectancy and are expensive to store and handle. There is ample technical information on what equipment, film and paper the researcher should use and how to process films and prints. There is some information on which views of architectural structures and sites should be taken. For example, the guidelines suggest that there should be perspective views of the front, rear and side of the house. There should also be a general view of the house from a distance that shows the environmental or landscape setting.
However, there is no information on how to photograph a landscape or garden and the document simply states that this section needs to be expanded.

In summary, there are some additions to the nomination, evaluation and documentation guidelines that are required to determine how, why and what makes historic designed landscapes and gardens significant. The additions are as follows:-

a. A spatial assessment of both modernist house and garden, especially the relationship between interior and exterior spaces and the fusion between them, should be undertaken.

b. When determining a historic designed landscape spatial features as well as those of a physical nature should be included.

c. The fusion between house and garden should be recorded on measured drawings.

d. Guidelines on how to photograph the garden accurately and what the photographer should look for in the garden should be included.

e. The landscape is always changing and evolving, but the guidelines should have recommendations as to what preservation treatment should be applied.

The new HALS program has begun to deal with issues such as the preservation treatment of a historic designed landscape or garden. However, HALS has no guidelines in place for documenting a modernist house and garden, in which both spaces are fused.

The Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) program

HALS is a permanent federal program charged with recording historic landscapes in the United States and its territories. HALS is intended, like its sister programs, the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) to produce written and graphic records of interest to educators, land managers and preservation planners. In the past the Federal Government’s commitment was to architecture and engineering technology (HABS was founded in 1933 and the newer HAER was founded in 1969), in which more than 33,000 structures and sites have been recorded in the US. Since the 1930s the NPS has recognized the historical significance of the landscape characteristics of a national park. It is only since 1998 that the NPS has developed a program entitled ‘A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports’ that has established policies, guidelines and standards for preserving and managing cultural landscapes. The Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) serves two important functions. Firstly, the CLR documents cultural landscapes. Secondly, it is the primary tool for long-term management of those landscapes. A CLR guides management and treatment decisions about a landscape’s physical conditions, natural biological systems and cultural use, and when the use contributes to historical significance. In addition, the ‘National Register of Historic Places Criteria’ provides the basis for evaluating the significance of a property, which must be at least fifty years old, and have remained fairly unaltered and meet one or more of the four National Register criteria for significance. These are as follows:-

a. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of American history, or

b. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past, or

c. Embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that which represents the work of a master, or that which possesses high artistic value, or that which represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
The criteria have been developed for a variety of landscape types, such as cemeteries, rural historic districts, and battlefields, issued in the form of technical bulletins. They have also published ‘The Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties’, a guide to the physical treatment of a significant property. This particular bulletin recommends four different treatments: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction. Collectively these documents have helped to develop the framework for the NPS cultural landscapes program. It was the NPS cultural landscapes program that has led to the development of the HALS program in 2000. Today the NPS oversees the daily operation of HALS and formulates policies, sets standards, and drafts procedural guidelines in consultation with the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). The ASLA provides professional guidance and technical advice through their Historic Preservation Professional Interest group subcommittee on HALS. The Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress, based in Washington, DC, preserves the documentation and makes it available to the general public.
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Chapter 4: Amendments to the HABS/HAER evaluation and documentation procedures, present status of HALS and a case for models.

An abundance of National Park Service “technical bulletin” information, which gives guidelines for the nomination, evaluation and documentation of significantly historic designed landscapes and gardens. As from the previous chapter The HABS/HAER documentation procedure is the following:-

a. Historical report, which can be a narrative, an outline or a short report.

b. Measured drawings and sections.

c. Black and white photography.

Even though the guidelines suggest that there are certain qualities to look for in a particular landscape design\(^1\). They are not specific regarding how the landscape space and its underlying concepts, such as the fusion between house and garden should be considered or recorded. It is therefore appropriate to amend the guidelines specifically to evaluate and document a modernist house and garden located in Baltimore, Maryland designed by James Rose. The recently developed HALS program is designed specifically to document historic landscapes or gardens only, but it is not clear how the program will document modernist houses and gardens. These projects typically fuse architectural and garden space in one spatial entity. This gap in the guidelines for documentation purposes has been brought up as a historical preservation issue by landscape architects and academics such as Dean Cardasis and Elizabeth Meyer. Their arguments and suggestions will be discussed first, followed by a brief description of the HALS program. Finally a case will be made for the introduction of scale models and photographs of these models as an addition to the documentation process.

Historic preservation issues.

Modernist landscape architects, such as Garrett Eckbo, Dan Kiley and James Rose designed and built many gardens that were intended to be flexible in order to adapt and respond to changes in the twentieth century environment and their clients’ needs. These designers recognized that if the interplay between architectural and landscape space is unified, then changes in time had to be acknowledged between the two entities\(^2\). Cardasis in his paper at the Wave Hill – National Park Service (NPS) conference points out that this creates a new problem in current historic preservation practice, “one in which the traditional effort to preserve the material qualities of objects and surfaces is insufficient to preserve the meaning of a legacy the essence of which is space and change”\(^3\). Dean Cardasis, who is the director for the James Rose Center located in Ridgewood, New Jersey, is upholding Rose’s legacy, namely Rose’s experimental works of fusing indoor and outdoor space. He has achieved this by following a flexible plan, part of which is to explore the history of Ridgewood. This has helped to understand Rose’s designed works and the idea of fusion within the property itself. Indeed, Cardasis suggests that historic preservationists would do well to look at Rose’s views on preservation for insight and guidance. For example, Rose suggests that preservationists should preserve present characteristic features on the site and not from another era. “We talked a great deal about what could be done to preserve the original character ... And then we discovered something important. The old place had vitality because it had been produced from the necessities for vital living ……all that had changed, as living things do, and now we have a new problem. And so without subterfuge, we met the new conditions just as I feel sure the earlier pioneers must have done. We allowed it to grow out of the present necessities for vital living.” \(^4\)
Elizabeth Meyer raises the problem of spatial re-conception in a modernist garden. She uses the Miller garden designed by Kiley, as a prime example. She points out that Kiley arranged trees and plants in a number of ways to create a variety of spatial volumes. “For Kiley the form of the plant, its branching structure, and its leaf shape and arrangement are a means of articulating a spatial structure.” She asks if different plants be used to preserve and maintain such modernist gardens as the Miller garden. She is quick to point out that any changes to the plant species must not alter the spatial quality of the garden. However, if they are similar in shape and form, then she suggests that it is reasonable to do so. Meyer quotes from a Calvin Tomkins interview with Kiley, in which Kiley came up with an alternative list of plant materials, “so that he could adjust the costs of his landscape designs without altering the designs themselves”. At the end of her paper, Meyer suggests that alterations to original designs are “acts of design, not preservation treatments, and so these projects should be worked on – and over – by the best of our generation of designers”. Meyer’s suggestions, however, must be considered within the needs of the HALS program. The HALS standards for documentation are generalizations that needs to account for certain common aspects of modernist houses and gardens. Meyer correctly assumes that every modernist house and garden have their own unique qualities. The HALS program therefore should not only use HABS/HAER guidelines for a descriptive narration of the site with accompanying historical background information, but include a preservation and future strategy plan as in the case for the James Rose Center in Ridgewood.

**History of the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS)**

HALS is a permanent federal program charged with recording historic landscapes in the United States and its territories. It is intended, like its sister programs, the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and the Historic Engineering Record (HAER) to produce written and graphic records of interest to educators, land managers and preservation planners. In the past, the federal government’s commitment was to architecture and engineering technology (HABS was founded in 1933 and the newer HAER was founded in 1969), in which more than 33,000 structures and sites have been recorded in the US. Since the 1930’s, the NPS has begun to recognize the historical significance of the landscape characteristics of a national park. However, it is only since 1998 that the NPS published “A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports” that has established polices, guidelines and standards for preserving and managing cultural landscapes. In addition, the “National Register of Historic Places Criteria” provided the basis for evaluating the significance of a property. The criteria have been applied to a variety of landscape types, such as cemeteries, rural historic districts, and battlefields. Also, “The Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties”, which guides the physical treatment of a significant property, was published in 1995. Collectively, these documents helped develop the framework for the NPS cultural landscapes program. It was this program that led to the development of the HALS program in 2000. The NPS oversees the daily operation of HALS and formulates policies, set standards, and drafts procedural guidelines in consultation with the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). The ASLA provides professional guidance and technical advice through their Historic Preservation Professional Interest group subcommittee on HALS. The Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress, based in Washington, DC, preserves the documentation for posterity and makes it available to the general public.

Patricia M. O’Donnell, FASLA, and principal of LANDSCAPES, a landscape architecture, planning and historic preservation firm in Charlotte, VT, has been actively involved in historic preservation for years and is a key member in the HALS program. She revealed to me that a group of 22 people representing the NPS and ALSA met during the summer 2001. The discussion focused
on the documentation process and techniques of the HALS program. It was decided to address three levels of procedural management. Level one would determine what baseline would be used in the documentation process. Level two would look into the guidelines for natural systems such as tree preservation and plant and animal ecology. Finally, level three would address the procedures for the tools and techniques used for landscape preservation and restoration. A written draft on these three levels has been compiled and will be documented in the near future.

The latest current status of the HALS program is that it has gained some funding from the federal government progressed through pilot projects and developed preliminary standards. HALS has thus developed from a name only to a program that can now offer summer internships. There will be three symposia with invited participants in New Orleans, Philadelphia and San Jose during 2002 to discuss the HALS Landscape Documentation guidelines. These sessions will test the standards and explore documentation issues for historic landscapes as a set of resources with both similarities and differences from buildings, bridges, etc. The New Orleans workshop will be at Longue Vue House and gardens on March 21 – 22, 2002.

A case for models

A Modernist landscape architect such as Rose, (as Cardasis suggests) spent much of his professional career exploring the idea of fusion between indoor and outdoor space. How does one accurately record and document a Modernist designer concept on the powerful relationship between indoor and outdoor space? Perhaps the best answer would be to do as Rose would do through the construction of scale models. He advocated that models revealed the true nature of a designed space. ‘By working in plan and section only, the landscapist cannot approach the real problem, which is to integrate materials with design in a three-dimensional relation’. Unlike models, the spatial quality of a design is more difficult to interpret and understand through section, axonometric and perspective drawings. This viewpoint is shared in Marguerite Koepke’s book, “it is very difficult even for the most experienced designer to visualize a final design solution when the third vertical dimension is missing. The best two dimensional drawing is generally a poor representation of a three dimensional design. Sketches, elevations and plans rarely convey the design in a complete and understandable way”. Cardasis, who is a landscape architectural instructor, cautions that drawing skills are important among students and professionals alike, but “it does not make a good; landscape space”. Cardasis, Koepke and Rose caution that models should be used for the purpose to study the spatial quality of a house and garden.

The Baltimore project will therefore be documented by using both drawings and models. The HABS/HAER guidelines suggest that paraline or axonometric drawings “impart a feeling for the mass and volume of the building without the distortion of essentially un-measurable perspective renderings”. Even though only the house is considered in the guidelines, the author intends to use axonometric drawings that will provide a volumetric study of the fusion between architectural and landscape space. Similar to the HABS/HAER guidelines a site plan drawing will be used to locate the house with its floor plan and garden features such as trees, shrubs, paths, benches and outdoor spaces.

The amendments to this documentation process will be the inclusion of solid/void drawings and models. The purpose of a solid/void drawing is to illustrate the relationship of spaces to one another and as a visual aid to study Rose’s fusion concept on the Baltimore project. While these
drawings have their limitations in fully recording the spatial qualities of Rose’s Baltimore garden, they nevertheless have the major advantage of being easy to record and store for documentation purposes. On the other hand, the purpose of models is that these spaces are represented three-dimensionally, in which their shape, form and proportion can be easily studied and understood. Additionally, models help to replicate and resolve complicated mass/void and sequential relationships between multiple spaces. Therefore a model in the case of the Baltimore project is the ideal component to express the fusion concept and will serve as a communication tool to help explain Rose’s design intentions. The question is how to record and document these spaces accurately from a model. Photography will provide the solution, but there are difficulties of perception of space, such as depth of field. However, this problem could be alleviated, as suggested by the HABS/HAER guidelines for photographing outdoor facades of buildings using a scale device. Why not then use an architectural scale ruler placed by the side of the model to eliminate distortions in measurement, when photographing the model? Another alternative would be to use a scale figure in the model to provide a proper sense of scale and proportion. Photography further adds the advantage of obtaining an eye level view that will help to interpret the spaces and their relationship with one another in greater detail. A comparison study will apply models and drawings from Rose’s original design to the design of today, to discover whether the fusion between house and garden has remained intact or become lost over the years. A descriptive narration will be used to compare the differences between the fusion of indoor and outdoor spaces and other Modernist characteristics between the Baltimore garden of the past and present.

In summary, there are many unresolved issues in the field of historic landscape and garden preservation. The most difficult one is how to preserve modernist houses and gardens that constantly evolve with the changing social, cultural and environmental climate. Perhaps, one amendment to the existing guidelines would be to include models, by photographing them when the physical design has been amended or no longer exists and volumetric drawings to reveal and understand the shared spatial qualities of both house and garden.
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Chapter 5: Documentation of the Macht residence in 1955 and in April 2002 (using the HABS/HAER format).

Location
2301 Cross Country Boulevard, Baltimore.

Present Owner
Mr. and Mrs. Philip Macht.

Present Occupant
Mr. and Mrs. Philip Macht

Present Use
Residence

Significance
The Macht house is a prime example of how fusion takes place between the interior spaces of the architecture and the exterior spaces of the landscape in the work of James Rose. The spaces and edges are used to create a unique design, where the distinction between the garden and the house is blurred. This is a characteristic typical of Rose and a definitive characteristic of Modernist design. Transparency, openness and adaptability of the house with nature and an atrium within the center are some of the characteristics of spatiality and fusion that characterize this Modernist masterpiece. To date, a number of Rose gardens have been documented, but this is the only site recorded that has 25% slopes on the landscape, which Rose used to great effect. There are no original plan drawings of the landscape design, which is typical of Rose’s hand’s-on design approach. There is only an incomplete, original axonometric trace drawing of the house. (Figure 1) the complete drawing can be found in Rose’s book “Creative Gardens”.

Figure 1: Axonometric Drawing of Rose. The original was found on a piece of tracing paper at the Ridgewood Center, New Jersey. The numbers refer to photographs from 1956 given in Rose’s book, ‘Creative Gardens’.
PART 1. HISTORICAL INFORMATION.

Physical history

1. Date of erection of house and garden: 1955-56. (Figs. 2 & 3)
2. Architect and landscape architect: James C. Rose. Rose was the chief designer of both house and garden and was responsible for all major decision decisions and operations. Associate architect: Donald Radcliffe. Radcliffe’s role was to produce a floor plan of the house to satisfy the building codes and permits. Consulting Architect and Interior Designer: Henry Hebbeln. Once, the majority of the project was complete, Hebbeln, on Rose’s recommendation, was in charge of the interior of the house and any technical difficulties that arose.

Client and engineer: Philip Macht. Macht wished to have vehicular access from Cross Country Boulevard, rather than from the alley located west of the house. This was made possible, since Macht was a civil engineer and his professional knowledge proved invaluable in the construction of the wood retaining walls for the driveway with parking area and other cut and fill operations. Macht was able to supply Rose with all building material and construction equipment.

Landscape contractor: Pat Donofrio. Donofrio was the landscaper contractor, who carried out Rose’s design instructions.
3. The house is set just forty feet away from a busy main street that leads to downtown Baltimore, a fifteen minute drive away.
4. The office of Albert Poumer did the original topographic survey 3rd January 1954. The office of Donald Radcliffe did the original plan drawing of the house.
5. The lot size of the property is 1.25 acres in size. The property line measures 250 feet from the east, 220 feet from the south, 290 feet from the west and 220 feet from the north. There is a grade change of 46 feet from the road to the top of the hillside, with some slopes measuring more 25% in places.
6. An addition was added to the west side of the house in 1960 to accommodate a growing family.

Figure 2: Present day view towards northwest corner of house and garden

Figure 3: 1955 view looking towards the northwest corner of the house and garden.
PART 2

Architectural information and overall description of the house.

Rose divided the house into three parts. (Fig. 4) Part one was the master’s bedroom with study, a palatial living room and dining room. Part two was originally to accommodate three children’s bedrooms with easy access to the garden. The expansive playroom would be directly linked to the private play-yard and bedrooms. Today, the children’s bedrooms have been converted to guest rooms. Part three was the servant’s quarters, kitchen and utility room, with easy access to the delivery entrance from the alley above. The servant’s room was occasionally used as a spare guest room. All three parts of the house are interrelated and linked by the main passageway running in an east to west direction (Fig.5) and the children’s passageway running in a north to south direction. There are five main doorways to the house, which includes a broad fourteen-foot wide front entrance. The overall dimensions of the house are approximately 80 feet by 67 feet and accounts for 5,360 square feet in footprint size, including the atrium. The atrium is located in the center of the house with three sides of the space lined with shoji screens. All ‘interior’ spaces and the atrium, within the framework of the house, are visually and physically connected to the designed garden. (Fig.6)

Figure 4: The diagram shows how Rose divided the house into three parts as seen by the blue zones indicated. The red lines indicate the main and children’s passageway, linking the interior spaces together. The black arrows indicate the many entrances of the house, allowing for easy access on all sides. All interior spaces and passageways surround the atrium, unifying the overall organization of the house.

Figure 5: The main passageway runs in an east to west orientation. The large windows and the atrium provide a sense of connectivity to the outside world. This picture was taken in 1956, in terms of space and fusion; there has been no significant change.

Figure 6: Although, more furnishings have been added to the house, the interior spaces of the rooms have not been seriously affected. The picture to the right is from today, while the picture to the left is from 1956.
PART 3

A. Written narrative of the 1954 - 1955 house exterior and garden.¹

Beginning at the front entrance of the house, four trees were placed at the corner of the wood wall and in front of the steps. (Fig. 7) They serve as a gateway and an edge to define the transition space between the motor court and the house. From the front entrance looking northwards, there was a series of nine-inch high risers made from railroad ties, making a dramatic stairway along the house’s northwest corner. (Figs. 8 & 9) Adjacent to the stairway were four rectilinear planting beds containing dogwoods. The edge of this wood wall was at right angles to the edge of the wood retaining wall from the parking area. Two upright Cryptomeria trees and a row of low growing rhododendrons terminated the stairway. The path headed towards the chimney and led down into the one of the few spaces, that has remained unchanged over the decades. What has changed significantly is that there was originally considerably less vegetation. At the time, the clearly defined edges revealed the spatial quality, openness and volume of Rose’s garden spaces.

¹Every attempt has been made to document this garden of the past as accurately as possible. However, gaps of information cannot account for all aspects of the house and garden.
Moving east, up a small set of steps one enters into a more dramatic space. At this point, there was an abrupt eleven-foot high wood retaining wall (Fig.10) that was used to accommodate the location of the pool. The wood retaining wall reveals the extent of the cut and fill operations. This was due to the fact that the clients insisted that the house should remain one story high and have a large floor plan. Nevertheless, Ezra Stroller’s photography reveals the magnificent architecture of Rose’s eleven-foot high windows on the northern façade and how close the house was to the landscape surroundings. It is a prime example of how Rose was able to successfully fuse the house with all its modern requirements into the garden. Also, notice the placement of the two Cryptomeria trees near the house complementing the stone chimney. The clients’ daughter pointed out that one of the reasons for the tall wood wall was to allow for another later addition to the house. The clients firmly believe that Rose would not have left such a tall wall, but would have provided more terraces. However, the edge and spatial volume contained within are abundantly clear. The surrounding lower, sunken walls define the remaining edges of the space. The ground surface of the space was made from wood chips as recalled by Mrs. Macht.

Figure 10: Rose successfully managed to fit the house into the steep landscape without losing an existing tree, as can be seen by the eleven-foot high wood wall. The photograph shows how Rose masterfully fused both modernist house and garden.

Figure 11: The pool was shaped to fit between the existing trees and follow the contours of the landscape. A plant moat surrounds the pool to prevent the children from accidentally falling into it.
It is difficult to determine what was constructed north of the swimming pool due to lack of data and photographic evidence. However, it has been confirmed that the bottom of the pool sits above grade giving an appearance that the pool ‘floats’. There was a moat, which surrounded the pool, to prevent the Macht children from accidentally falling in. (Fig. 11) The moat was planted with rhododendrons with a five-foot wide entrance on the eastern tip of the pool edge.

To the east of the pool, there were two terraces with a lower one following the edges of the pool, while the upper one was geomorphic in form and five sided. The significant difference in these spaces compared to the present day garden was the use of the ground material and the lack of plant material. The lower terrace having a blacktop surface and the upper one having a white washed gravel surface with a natural rock protruding from the southwest corner of the bed.

Rose was a great believer in re-cycling construction materials which the client, Mr. Macht encouraged, since he was in the construction business and wanted to keep costs to a minimum. On either side of the broad stairway, there are at least five terraces that range in size and shape, with their wood wall edges maintaining a geomorphic form. Again, these terraces were used to great effect by Rose, so that the functional and recreational aspects of the garden could be fully enjoyed. (Fig.12) One photograph from Ezra Stoller entitled ‘Terraces’ indicates how Rose used earth, plants and structure to shape space into geomorphic terraces. The photograph indicates numerous characteristics of Rose’s Modernist design approach. The rectilinear pattern of the blacktop and concrete slabs was directly linked to the architecture of the house, while some of the terrace edges followed the existing contours of the landscape. There were numerous obtuse angles emanating from the wood retaining walls. The combination of the pool and the jet spray shows how Rose used water for recreation and visual effect, accommodating aspects of modern living. (Fig.13) The oak and beech trees seem to have been limbed from the bottom up, so that there are views from the outer regions of the garden to the house. Evergreens and the large natural rocks are placed in the corners to highlight the terraced planting beds. Finally, the ascending wide path with its broad trends leads the eye to beyond the property line of the garden towards the nearby alley.

Figure 12: Geomorphic terraces and the stairway have connected all the different functional uses of the garden. The swimming pool is to the left of the photograph, while to the right is the service area. The stairway leads to a playing field, which is enclosed by an earth mound.

Figure 13: View from the stairway looking towards the dining room of the house.
Figure 14: Interior view looking from the dining area out towards the swimming pool. This interior space of the house is integral to the garden outdoors. Notice how the rectilinear pattern of the tiles matches the same pattern of the concrete slabs outdoors.

Figure 15: Interior view from the playroom, in which the children’s passageway is directly, connects to the room to the outdoor play space.

The shape of the terrace space at the north side of the house has not significantly changed over the decades. However, there have been some subtle differences between the space of the past and the space of today. For instance, there was a planting bed adjacent to the bay windows. (Fig.14) There was also another planting bed containing holly and a couple of evergreen trees that aligned with the wood wall. And, finally one could then walk from this upper terrace directly down to the lower terrace using a staircase that turned abruptly in the opposite direction during the walk. These differences have not changed the overall quality of fusion between house and garden.

The walk from the service area to the playground was layered in pea gravel with a raised planting area on the walk’s left hand side. The walk leads towards the playground space, which was
located at the south side of the house. Again, the wood walls follow the existing contours that help to frame the playground space.

The simply designed sand box has some Photinia trees and dogwood shrubs dotted around it without impinging upon the space. The children’s passageway and the door provide strong connections to the play space and their corresponding bedrooms. (Figs. 15, 16 & 17) Finally, at the west side of the house, the children can easily gain access to a small private, intimate garden space. Here the blacktop path contrasts with the white washed gravel. The architecture of the house and the evergreen holly hedge frame the space and screen off the parking area.

Figure 16: The outdoor play space is divided into three levels and is directly linked to the children’s passageway and bedrooms. The small trees are planted on the periphery of the play space to avoid impinging on the space.

Figure 17: This photograph shows two of the children’s bedrooms. To the left of the photograph, a hedge screens off the parking lot with enclosed provided for by the architecture of the house and the trees.
Atrium
This outdoor space is central to the fusion theme for both the house and garden. The atrium separates the three main divisions of the house, namely the adult bedrooms, living and dining rooms; the servant’s quarters and kitchen; and the children’s bedrooms and playroom. These interior rooms surround the atrium. Only the south side of the atrium is enclosed with a solid wall, while the other three sides are glass walls. (Figs. 18 & 19) The atrium is visually part of the kitchen and the living room and maybe partially or completely shut off from the sliding shoji screens.

Figure 18: View from main passageway towards the atrium.

Figure 19: View from dining room towards the atrium and the entrance hall. Again, the photograph shows the relationship between indoor and outdoor spaces.
B. Written narrative of today’s house exterior and garden.²

As one approaches from downtown Baltimore, one immediately faces a six-foot high stonewall. This substantial retaining wall allows the driveway to negotiate the initial steep slopes of the heavily wooded landscape. (Fig.20) On ascending a number of terraced wood retaining walls run along, on the right hand side, and underneath the sinuous driveway.

Figure 20: Looking from Cross Country Boulevard, the serpentine driveway reveals the extent of the sharp slopes of the garden. The six-foot high stonewall holds back the steepest slopes, which measure a one foot drop for every four feet traveled.

Figure 21: Continuing up the driveway to the parking area where timber beams support the wood wall.

These large and complexly arranged retaining walls, range in height from five to eleven feet, and help to maintain the driveway’s one in ten slope. A sharp left off the driveway, reveals a sizeable geomorphic parking space that can accommodate six cars. (Fig.21) Just before the left turn, another retaining wall can be seen, which has timber posts and beams that act as supports to hold the wall up. Facing the west side of the house, a three-foot high terrace with an evergreen holly hedge planted at the edge defines the motor court and screens off the house. There is a wooden lattice fence in front of the main entrance that provides a small landing space to the house. (Fig.22) This fence is one of the many changes to the original Rose design and provides a visual screen from the parking area. Donofrio’s landscape company removed the dogwoods and constructed the fence shortly after Rose left the project. During James Rose’s time there was a small hedge of trees that used to separate the parking area from the front entrance of the house.

Figure 22: The front entrance to the house has changed little over the years. However, the wooden fence to the left of the picture now encloses the landing and separates this space from the motor court, in which there once was a hedge of small trees.

² This description will amend the present day documentation procedure by highlighting modernist characteristics of each terrace and space in the garden.
A flight of shallow, one-foot wide steps leads to the front entrance of the house. From the front entrance, the main passageway will lead one directly to the palatial living room and atrium. The other passageway leads to the spare guest and small office rooms. These interior spaces have not changed since the original construction of the house. (Fig.23)

Left of the front entrance, there is a path with two flights of descending stairs flanked by two rhododendron beds. The beds are geomorphic in form and include another change to the original design. From the driveway they can hardly be seen due to the dense surrounding vegetation. The path leads down to the lower terraced semi-open space at the northwest corner of the house. At this point, both the northern and western façades of the house and the stone chimney act as edges helping to frame the space at the lower end of the garden. That this space belonged to the Rose original design is indicated by the 1984 topographic survey and the nearly rotten, railroad timber edge. The space has been filled with rhododendron shrubs and other plants. What can still be determined is that Rose used the slope of the existing landscape to construct the terrace edge. One particular Modernist characteristic of Rose was that he never had any preconceived pattern in mind, but rather would shape space based on an intuitive feel for the landscape. This space is such an example.

There is a small set of broad ascending steps that leads to a convoluted path, which skirts around the two terraced planting beds and eventually winds up behind the swimming pool. To the right of this path, the two (three-and-a-half foot) terraced planting beds have replaced the original single wood retaining wall. (Fig. 24) These beds contain numerous rhododendrons and a couple of cherry trees on the top terrace. These terraces were put in because the original wall had become unstable due to rotting wood. Nevertheless, there was a wonderfully defined open space in the original design, which has been subdivided by these three newer terraces, so that the original space is now lost. The lowest terrace is the path one walks on. (Fig.25) In fact, the area now seems to be forgotten and neglected, with a wild butterfly bush growing in the corner, next to the chain link fence. The path continues around the swimming pool and merges into two different sets of steps. The first and lower set is made from railroad ties layered with gray pea gravel, while the second and upper set is made from wood decking. Some of the wood decking steps have been cut into bizarre shapes. The path eventually leads to a metal sculpture. Just before this art piece, there is another raised planting bed to the left of the path, which Rose
did not design. There is no spatial purpose of this bed, other than to enjoy the ground coverage of the newly planted rhododendrons.

Figure 26: The photograph above shows the sculpture in the foreground as an added feature to the garden, but does nothing to the garden's overall spatial organization. The photograph to the right shows the tight placement of the jacuzzi next to the sculpture. Just in front of the sculpture the jacuzzi is set in a small, lower wood deck. Access to the jacuzzi is not easy, as the ground plane has been awkwardly subdivided. The placement of the sculpture seems to serve as a foreground to the surrounding vegetation, but adds nothing to the spatial quality of the garden, nor helps to fuse house and garden together. (Figure 26)

The path then leads along the edges of the swimming pool on the left hand side of which is a raised five-sided geomorphic planting bed. At the front edge of the bed sits a magnificent beech tree and this provides a focal point from the northeast corner of the house. (Fig.28) It should be mentioned that the form of this planting bed was designed by Rose as a terrace without any vegetation. Again, this space has been lost over the decades to plant material. The path terminates in front of another flight of steps and descends down into a semi-open space, in front of the eastern façade of the house.

Here, there is a nine-and-a-half foot high pergola with climbing wisteria on each post that juts out of the house. (Fig.27) Again, this wooden structure was not part of the original design and has cut the original space in half. This structure makes circulation awkward around the particular area of the house. To the left of the pergola, a red-bricked curvilinear wall has replaced a couple of the obtusely angled terraces. The form of the brick wall and the choice of material seem to be out of context with the overall design of the garden. What originally remains is an upper terrace, in which natural stone pavers have been sunken into the ground and placed into an intricate rectilinear pattern. Today, this space is the only fully intact piece of the original garden design. There is a tall deciduous tree placed in the corner behind which is a six foot high wood wall containing a dense hemlock hedge to screen off onlookers from the alley. To the right of the pergola is another terrace that broadly wraps around the northeast corner of the house, narrowing towards the chimney. This space is a wonderful area for
Figure 28: Generally the spaces have remained the same as they were fifty years ago. Decking has replaced the black top and concrete surface. The upper terrace in the foreground has been filled in with plant material. In the background, the woodland has become denser over the years.

Figure 29: Interior view from dining room with the elegant glass paneled fence replacing the raised planter bed.

viewing the garden and looking down onto the street. There have been a number of changes to this area. Firstly, there is now a tall beech tree near the chimney corner, where there were previously two columnar Cryptomeria. Secondly, red brick, instead of blacktop, pea gravel and concrete slabs has replaced the ground surface. Finally, the holly hedge that used to run along the edge of the terrace has now been replaced with a simple, but elegantly constructed redwood fence painted black with four-and-a-half foot and two-and-three quarter foot bay windows within the timber frame. It is noted that the north façade of the dining and living room is made entirely from glass. (Fig.29) Even today, the transparent quality of this material helps to merge the indoor space of these rooms with the outside world. The tree at the corner near the chimney helps to reinforce the concept of spatial fusion.

Returning to the pergola, a small flight of stairs made from wood decking ascends along the east side of the house and turns abruptly towards the storage shed and service area. There is a small, three-and-a-half foot raised area between the kitchen and the servant’s room, in which a tall beech tree stands proudly in this space and is surrounded by a layer of pea gravel. (Fig.30)

Figure 30: The service area and kitchen is concealed from the raised terrace. A mature beech tree frames this small-enclosed space.
At the house’s southeastern corner, moving past the wooden gate, a wood wall is to one’s left and two weeping cherry trees to one’s right. (Fig. 31) Perennial flowering plants cascade over the wood retaining wall and ground cover plants fill up the planting bed. Looking further back a double row of hemlock trees provide privacy from the alley. As one walks between the cherry trees and the wood wall, the gravel path divides with one way leading eventually up to the alley, and the other leading down to an open terrace covered in red brick. The brick terrace at the south side of the house contains a small circular raised bed that contains three oaks growing tightly within one another. The brick terrace has been extended to accommodate the addition without losing the existing oak trees. While the curvilinear walls have changed the edges of the space the spatial volume remains. (Fig.32) The brick wall is divided into two halves. The first half possessing a height of three-and-a-half foot high and terminates by the addition to the house. The second half possesses a height of two foot high and borders a path that leads to the interior swimming pool and studio.

Behind the brick wall, there are two terraced planting beds containing rhododendrons and some perennial plants. The path leads to a wooden gate, where one can enter back to the parking area from the south side. (Fig. 33)
Atrium

There have been a couple of small changes to the atrium. (Fig.34) Firstly, the dogwoods in the central planter bed have been replaced with wood decking and a small sculpture piece placed on one of the corners. Access was difficult to the atrium, so the Macht’s decided to add wood decking to the north side of the atrium. On the peripheral edges of the atrium Japanese maples continue to flourish. The main point is that the atrium is still a part of Rose’s conceptual theme, namely the fusion of indoor and outdoor spaces.

Figure 34: The Crytomeria trees and Japanese maples continue to flourish in the atrium.

Part 4
Sources of information
Original architectural drawings from the office of Donald Radcliffe, revised on 9/30/1955.
Original topographical survey from the office of Albert E. Poumer done on 1/3/1954.
Carol Macht (daughter of the clients) from Hord, Coplan & Macht (Architects, Interior and Landscape Designers), 2526 St. Paul St., Baltimore. Maryland. 21228.
Chapter 6: A series of digital images taken of both models depicting changes between 1955 and 2002

The purpose of this chapter is to compare changes between the house and garden of today with the past, drawing any insights from these changes. All digital photography was taken using a Sony ‘Mavica’ digital camera with picture quality of 640 by 480 pixels.

The top (left) photo shows that there was a planting bed in front of the house’s north façade, which has been replaced by a timber glass paneled fence, which now runs along the terrace edge as shown in the bottom (left) photo. Since the removal of the planting bed, the terrace space has slightly extended. From here there are views looking down at the garden and the nearby main road. Two Cryptomeria trees nearest the chimney have been replaced with one mature oak tree.

Overlooking the north facades of both models. (Top photo – 1955: bottom photo – 2002)

On the ground surface, asphalt has been replaced with brick. What has remained is the house’s glass curtain wall on the north side, in which the material’s transparency allows for fusion to occur between indoors and outdoors. Notice how the size of the dining and living rooms and its subsequent large windows allow for maximum openness and light.
The top (right) photo reveals the dramatic edge from the eleven-foot high wood retaining wall. The height of this wall edge dramatically reveals the severity of the site’s slopes. Also, it shows how Rose managed to fit the one story house into the landscape. This is an extraordinary accomplishment since Rose had to deal with a large footprint (over 5,000 sq. foot) size of the house. What is even more remarkable is that rose managed to save all the existing oak trees on the site. At the bottom of the wall, an open space was originally meant to allow room for the construction of an addition. This addition never transpired. Today, two planted terraces, as seen in the lower photo, have filled in this space. The spatial result is that the lower space has been reduced to a path, in which there is no direct access to the house.
The railroad tier stairway of 1955 (left photo) has been replaced by an asphalt stairway. Next to the stairs there was a rectilinear planting bed containing small dogwoods. This has been replaced with geomorphic planting beds containing rhododendrons. Today’s planting beds have been extended out from the house and have completely obscured the edge from the wood retaining wall. The construction of these beds and denser vegetation has meant that it is harder to see and appreciate the existing topography of the site. The spaces just in front of the house’s north façade with its two Cryptomeria trees and shrubbery have not changed over the decades.
There have been a number of changes to this side of the house. In 1955, there was a space just in front of the house’s west façade, in which its functional use was for quiet contemplation for the children. Access to this space was easy as each child’s bedroom had a doorway directly to it. This space was separated from the parking area by a three-foot high holly hedge, raised up on a three-foot high terrace. Today, this space has now been lost to an addition placed onto the house’s west façade. The original purpose of the addition was to serve as another child’s bedroom. Today, all children’s bedrooms have been converted into small office or spare guest rooms. The remaining space has now been completely enclosed by a wooden fence, of which access is only possible from one of the spare rooms. A cherry tree has now filled up the volume of this space. The parking area has not changed over the decades and accommodates approximately six cars. In conclusion, fusion between the house’s west façade, plantings and the parking area have become fragmented.

Overlooking the west facades of both models. (Top photo – 1955; bottom photo – 2002)

In 1955 small trees were placed between the parking area and the house front entrance. They provided an edge and created a transition zone between the house and parking. Here is an example of a modernist characteristic, in which edges are used in a way to blur the movement between spaces. Today, the six-foot high wooden fence (not shown in bottom right photo) clearly separates the house front entrance from the parking area.
Overlooking the southwest corner. (1955)

The most obvious change has been the addition to the west façade of the house. Today, from the outside there is no access to this side of the house. On the bottom of both digital images, there can be seen a series of steps that meander towards the alley located on the eastern side of the garden.

Overlooking the southwest corner. (2002)
In 1955, there was a play space designed by Rose for the children that was surrounded by open terraces. This is another example of how Rose designed for modern family living. An east to west passageway with doorway provides easy accessibility into this space. The top (left) photo shows how the planting of small trees was used to soften the corners. Notice that the adjacent playroom and its subsequent large windows allow for maximum freedom and lightness. Where there was once an open space adjacent to the servant’s room there now stands two cherry trees. These trees do not block access to the east side of the house.

Although, the vegetation has grown considerably from Rose’s time, the space in front of the house is as evident today, as it was in the past. Today, there have been some changes applied to this area. For instance, the space has been extended and accommodates a group of three oak trees, as shown in the lower (right) photo. A curvilinear brick wall has been replaced the geomorphic wood retaining wall. While, the form of these edges have little to do with Rose’s overall design concept, fusion between the indoors’ and the outdoors’ has not been affected.
The photos reveal that there have been some small changes to Rose's original design. The top photo reveals how Rose avoided adding shrubs to fill the designed open spaces. The concept was to maintain an openness and easy access to all parts of the garden. Today, some of the terraces have been filled with shrubs, a jacuzzi and a metal sculpture. The placement of these objects has resulted in awkwardly subdividing the spaces and creating circulation difficulties. For example, the jacuzzi is placed next to the metal sculpture and seems to be out of place. Perhaps, it may have been better to place it nearer the house, adjacent to the southern end of the pool.

As seen in the top (right) photo, the mature oak tree died and has been replaced by a pergola as seen in the bottom (right) photo. The pergola has now filled up the space and partially obstructs views from the house's dining room. Also, the pergola provides a clumsy connection between the north and east facades of the house. Again, a brick wall has been replaced the wood retaining walls. One of the reasons for the curvilinear form of the brick wall was that the clients disliked Rose's geomorphic edges. At least, unlike the introduction of the pergola, these edges do not drastically affect spatial volume.
During Rose’s time, there was a stairway that directly connected the lower space, as shown in the top (right) photo, to the house. Today, there is no direct access. The structural integrity of this eleven-foot high wood retaining wall was always questionable. It is known that Rose never intended that this was to be a permanent feature in the garden. The wall was eventually replaced by two terraces, in which today’s walls are constructed from nine by nine inch timber beams. It is unfortunate that this wonderful space has been reduced to a path, which circulates around the house rather than to it.

**Atrium.**
There has been only a small change to the atrium, since Rose’s time. Decking has been added to the north side of the atrium to allow for access. The atrium is central to Rose’s concept of fusion between the interior architectural and the exterior landscape space. Over the decades, the quality of this space has not been compromised. Inevitably, there have been minor changes to several areas of the house and garden, some of which have enhanced the spaces, while others have not. In conclusion, these minor changes have not affected the overall and original design intent of Rose. Namely, the connections and the spatial fusion (a modernist characteristic) between house and garden still remain.
**Conclusion.**

The project has identified some gaps in the existing HABS/HAER/HALS guidelines for documenting process a Modernist house and garden. Important characteristics of Modernism, such as the fusion of interior space of the house with the exterior space of the garden, have not been always been within the guidelines. This failure has meant that the descriptive narrative described the physical characteristics of the house and garden, often ignoring their peculiar spatial characteristics. The opportunity for revealing the designer’s concept, in such cases, has been missed. This project/thesis began by describing three case studies highlighting three different types of spatial fusion. The Lovell house designed by Richard Neutra is an example of the fusion between house and the surrounding nature. It is one of the few modernist architectural examples that have been documented by HABS. The Glass house designed by Philip Johnson is an example of the fusion between the house and the pastoral landscape. These two examples experimented with the fusion concept, but dealt with it on an abstract basis. The most relevant example to this project/thesis is the Miller house and garden designed by Dan Kiley and Eero Saarinen, because the concept of fusion between the house and a modern landscape for living is germane to the Macht house in Baltimore. Other important characteristics of Modernism such as a concern for space rather than any preconceived pattern were discussed and then highlighted in the documentation process of the Baltimore site. A list of Modernist characteristics came from Marc Treib’s article, “Axioms for a Modern Landscape Architecture”. Treib’s comments however are not entirely adequate to determine the documentation process of the Macht residence. For example, the Macht residence has been designed from a multitude of axis rather than (as Treib’s comments) “the destruction of the axis”.

Modernist design characteristics were then identified and James Rose’s conceptual thinking about the Macht residence in Baltimore was determined. This is missing part of a more through HABS/HAER/HALS documentation process, as was discovered by evaluation of the existing documentation guidelines. The existing process is divided into three parts: writing a historical report; recording building structures and facades with measured drawings; and using black and white photography. There are through and extensive guidelines for these steps. There is little guideline information, however, on how to document other spatial aspects of the historic landscape or garden. The guidelines suggest that previous site surveys will provide valuable insights as what changes have occurred over time.

The often-cited dilemma regarding historic landscape preservation is that landscapes constantly change and evolve over time. This leaves the documentation process with two problems. Firstly, how does one determine the period of significance with a historic landscape or garden, in particular, a Modernist house and garden where a basic idea was to allow the garden to evolve with the environment and the changing needs of modern living? Secondly, modernist houses and gardens barely fall under the fifty-year guideline for historical significance. Modernist houses and gardens therefore have to be defined as “exceptionally significant” before they qualify for documentation purposes. This explains in part why so few modernist houses and gardens have been documented to date.
Rose spent much of his professional career exploring the idea of fusion between modern indoor living and outside space and how this fusion would change over time. It seems reasonable that the Macht residence should be documented as a comparison study, detailing the changes between original and present day conditions. This is one of the amendments suggested in this project/thesis, providing valuable insights into the documentation process.

The comparison study attempts to address the problem of a constantly evolving landscape. This can be resolved by providing a past and present standard plan, and mass/void and axonometric drawings of the Macht residence. Rose’s design intent was to explore the powerful relationship between indoor and outdoor space; however, plan and mass/void drawings are limited as a graphic tool for interpreting and understanding space and its relationship to the surrounding environment. Even axonometric drawings, which do reveal the spaces of the house and garden, have two distinct disadvantages. Firstly, the forty-five and sixty degree angles of the drawing itself seem to distort the spaces. Secondly, the nature of the drawing allows only the front façade of buildings and freestanding objects to be seen, while the space behind these structures is hidden. Another suggested amendment is the inclusion of scale models, in which they have the advantage of revealing the relationship between mass and space with a certain amount of realism. A model has the added advantage that interpreting and understanding space is an easier task than reading through a plan drawing. However, the model has the disadvantage of being difficult to store or preserve in an archive. Taking digital photography, once the model has been accurately constructed, and archiving the digital images can resolve this problem.

The documentation of the project itself revealed many changes, more so to the garden than to the house. The only significant change to the house has been an addition in 1956 to the western wing of the house to accommodate a growing family. The original design to the garden has not fared so well. At the north side of the garden, the once eleven-foot high wood wall has been subdivided into two smaller terraces due to structural problems. Spatially, it has meant that the once dramatic and voluminous lower space has now been reduced to a corridor. The sculpture and jacuzzi have now filled in the once open space at the northern end of the swimming pool. Other terraces at the eastern wing of the house and garden have been filled in with plant material. A significant change has been the replacement of some of the obtusely angled wood walls for a more permanent, curvilinear, brick wall. The brick construction seems out of context with the overall design organization of the garden. The same fate occurred to the wood wall at the southern end of the garden, where there was once a play yard.

Although, the documentation procedure of drawings, photographs and a descriptive narrative of past and present helped to interpret the changes to both house and garden. The house, however, was designed by the Modernist, James Rose, in which one of the main design characteristics is (as Treib et al. have commented) “that space is more important than any preconceived pattern”. It is clear that models are more apt as a design tool to interpret the spatial changes, such as fusion between interior and exterior space of this Modernist masterpiece. Therefore the introduction of models to the documentation process is the major amendment and is essential in documenting a Modernist house and garden. Digital overall views and close up images could easily be taken from both models and spatial changes compared, noted and discussed. Insights can then be
determined into the significance of these changes and may well serve as an advisory tool in the future, for educating and enlightening clients on how to best preserve their historic designed properties.

New issues of how to restore a historic house and garden are outside the realm of this project/thesis, which is concerned with documentation. With the inevitable changes over time, the Baltimore house and garden have undergone many minor changes, which have compromised some of the spaces. There have been some additions to the garden, however, that may have enhanced the original design, such as the wooden and glass paneled fence adjacent to the northern façade of the house. In the main, the overall organization and fusion of the outdoor spaces of garden and atrium and the indoor spaces of the house have generally remained intact. In the final analysis, the original Rose concept of fusion -- a modern house merged with a modern garden for living -- has remained in place over the decades.