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ABSTRACT

The history and significance of Helena Rutherfurd Ely (1858-1920) and her gardens at Meadowburn Farm are relatively unknown. At the turn of the century, Ely was one of America’s most influential writers on practical gardening: her first book, A Woman’s Hardy Garden, was an extraordinary and lasting success. She was also a founding member and subsequent Vice President of the Garden Club of America. While her name has faded from common household knowledge, Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn Farm still remain, and the owners have begun to consider possibilities for preserving and opening the gardens to public visitation.

This study clarified the significance of Ely’s gardens, assessed the feasibility of their preservation, and suggested applicable preservation models for the owners to consider. Research methods relied on qualitative data gathered through site visits, historical record research, and interviews with professionals and community leaders, complemented by quantitative survey data. Results indicated that Ely’s gardens are historically significant as the surviving personal gardens of an influential figure in American horticultural history. The characteristics of Meadowburn Farm and the surrounding community suggest preservation efforts will capture interest and patronage. Preserving these significant gardens will require investment of resources and dedicated leadership.
PROLOGUE

REDISCOVERING THE STORY OF HELENA RUTHERFURD ELY

At the turn of the century, a woman named Helena Rutherfurd Ely built gardens surrounding her country home, Meadowburn Farm, in Sussex County, New Jersey. Over 100 years later, her gardens still remain, having been continuously cared for by three generations of the Furman family gardeners, and stewarded by the Coster Gerard family who have owned Meadowburn since 1930. To make a case for the preservation of these exceptional gardens, it is necessary to first understand the story of the woman who created them. This prologue offers a glimpse into the life and work of Helena Rutherfurd Ely, and her importance within the horticultural history of this country.

A Brief Biography

Helena Rutherfurd Ely was born on September 28, 1858 to Charlotte Livingston Rutherfurd and John Rutherfurd. Both sides of her family descended from prominent colonial families. Her father, John Rutherfurd, was the son of politician John Rutherfurd who served as the first United States Senator of New Jersey, and Helena Magdalene Morris, the daughter of General Lewis Morris who signed the Declaration of Independence (Browning 1891). On her mother’s side, Ely descended from old colonial families such as the Livingstons, Beeckmans and Alexanders (New York Times 1900a).
Ely and her three brothers, Morris Rutherfurd, Livingston Rutherfurd, and Arthur Elliot Rutherfurd, grew up spending winters in Newark and summers at Maple Grange, the family farm in Sussex County, New Jersey (Meade 1951). Later, she wrote fondly of her childhood memories of Maple Grange working alongside Old Tweet, the family’s Scottish gardener, riding a “black pony of wicked temper” (Ely 1903b), or reading *Little Woman* high in the branches of an old apple tree (Ely 1911). As a teenager, she was sent to study at Brooke Hall in Media, Pennsylvania. Like many young ladies of her class and era, Ely was taught painting, music, and French, required to do her lessons strapped to a backboard to insure good posture (Meade 1951).

In 1880, the young Helena Rutherfurd married Alfred Ely of Newton, Massachusetts, a direct descendent of the Mayflower passenger William Brewster (Sussex Independent 1914). Alfred Ely studied law at Columbia University, and later became a prominent lawyer and partner in the New York firm Agar, Ely & Fulton. He also served as the director of the Lehigh and Hudson River Railroad.

For a wedding gift, the widowed Charlotte Livingston Rutherfurd gave Ely Meadowburn Farm, one of the Rutherfurd’s many tenant farms in Sussex County, New Jersey. The 350-acre property, whose boundary was partly measured by “fifty links from the wild cherry tree that grows in Warwick Creek,” was technically given in trade for “natural love and affection and the sum of one dollar” (Rutherfurd 1880). The newlywed couple quickly fell in love with Meadowburn, and thus began a lifelong tradition of summering at their beautiful farm in the Warwick Valley.

The Elys spent nearly every summer at Meadowburn from May until November with their two children Helena and Alfred Jr. Mr. Ely dedicated much of
his time perfecting the operations of their dairy farm, which became recognized as an exemplary model dairy farm (Sussex Independent 1914). Ely dedicated her time to developing the gardens, which would eventually lead to her recognition as an authority on practical horticulture and the publication of her famous books on hardy gardening.

The Ely’s primary residence was 175 Second Avenue in Manhattan (Ely 1903a). Mr. and Mrs. Ely were both prominent figures in the elite New York social circles. They entertained regularly, patronized local charities, attended numerous cultural events, and were members of several social clubs. Alfred Ely was a member of the exclusive Kane Lodge No. 454 of the Free Masons, the Mayflower Descendants, Sons of the Revolution, and the Corinthian Yacht Club (Sussex Independent 1914). Mrs. Ely’s name frequently appeared in society news along those of other prominent persons such as Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Mrs. Henry Clay Frick, Mrs. Moses Taylor Pyne, Mrs. Charles Scribner, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, Mrs. Charles A Peabody, Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt, and Miss Cooper Hewitt, to name a few.

Ely’s children attended dance classes with the Pratt children (New York Times 1902), while her bull terrier, Florio, competed against the Rockefeller spaniels and Whitney terriers in dog shows hosted by the Colonial Club for society ladies (New York Times 1913). She took first place for the bull terrier class with Florio, who is presumably the dog pictured in *The Practical Flower Garden*.

Ely was an active member of the Colonial Dames, and a passionate student of her family’s genealogy (Ely 2013). She served as the Secretary of the Loan Committee for the New York Chapter of the Colonial Dames, a committee responsible for the collection and care of antique treasures from old colonial families that were displayed in the Metropolitan Museum (New York Times 1907). Many of the family treasures
were from relatives of Ely, such as the Stuyvesants, Van Renssalaers, Schuylers, Rutherfurds and Livingstons.

The Elys frequently entertained guests, whether for tea at their Manhattan home, their daughter’s debutant ball at Sherry’s on 5th Avenue (New York Times 1900b), or summer parties at Meadowburn that would sometimes last for days (Ely n.p.). The Meadowburn guest book that Ely kept from 1899 until 1916 recounts the festivities and unmatched hospitality in poetry, song lyrics, and clever illustrations.

The Ely family followed an annual rhythm travelling between Manhattan and Meadowburn, interspersed with extended trips abroad. It is clear that Ely was happiest in her garden at Meadowburn, and when apart, she yearned for its company and fretted for its care. If she had to be in New York during growing season, she had twelve buckets of fresh cut flowers sent to her Manhattan home on a weekly basis so that she could fill every room with beautiful bouquets (Ely 1903b). Touring gardens was always a primary interest during Ely’s many travels. She often came home with treasures to ornament the gardens at Meadowburn, such as sculpture or a pair of ancient iron gates salvaged from a demolished papal palace. But she could not stand to be away from her gardens for too long, for nothing compared to the happiness she gained from working in the gardens at Meadowburn (Meade 1951).

In 1883, Ely hired Albert Furman, Sr., the seventeen-year old nephew of the tenant dairy farmer, to be her assistant gardener (Furman 1999). Furman, Sr. was the “strong, willing and intelligent” (Ely 1903b) young helper who Ely trained in everything she knew about gardening. For nearly forty years they worked together in the gardens, and as Furman, Jr. recalls, “Mrs. Ely was always head gardener” (Sandfort 1999).
Mr. Ely passed away in 1914 after a sudden stroke (Sussex Independent 1914). Three years after his death, Ely married Benjamin T. Fairchild, a principal of the New York pharmaceutical company Fairchild Brothers & Foster. The Elys and Fairchild had been good friends. Fairchild’s wild gardens in Connecticut were featured in a chapter titled, The Wild Garden, in Helena’s third book, published in 1911.

After her second marriage the time that Ely (now Mrs. Benjamin Fairchild) spent at Meadowburn dwindled. Ely invested increasing time and energy in establishing new gardens at the Fairchild home, Faryewold, in Greenwich, Connecticut (Metzger n.d., Furman 1999). She moved her favorite furniture and her finest potted boxwoods and bay trees from Meadowburn to Faryewold (Ely 1920). The time she dedicated to Meadowburn waned, as did the records of her activity. Furman, Sr. continued to tend the gardens as he always had, and changed nothing in her absence. There is little known about Ely’s life with Fairchild and her living relatives know very little about her second marriage.

In May of 1920, Ely died at the age of sixty-two after suffering from pneumonia. She was buried alongside Mr. Ely in the Warwick Cemetery. Her belongings were dispersed among her children: blue flower pots divided, stone vases and figures in Fayrewold’s blue garden to Helena, 16th century iron garden gates to Alfred, one tall bay tree to Helena, one bay tree to Alfred, and so on and so on. She left a sum of $1000 to Furman, Sr., her “faithful friend and gardener…as a token of remembrance for his faithful services” (Ely 1913). Ely’s will is a wonderful testament to how she cherished her plants, and “the best friend” (Ely 1903b) of her garden.

Meadowburn Farm was willed to Alfred Jr., who kept it until his first wife said she would have nothing to do with it. In 1930 Meadowburn was sold to Henry Coster
and his Italian wife, Vicenza Giuliani. Alfred, Jr. returned with his second wife to see if he might buy it back, but Coster had long since fallen in love with Meadowburn, which remains in his family to this day. Coster continued to employ Furman, Sr., and eventually Furman, Jr., as the trusted Meadowburn gardeners. Upon the death of Furman, Jr., his son, Walter DeVries, stepped in as the gardener and continues to work at Meadowburn, representing the third generation of the Furman family’s 120 year legacy tending Ely’s gardens.

**An Influential Book**

One of the key accomplishments of Helena Rutherfurd Ely’s life was the writing of a significant book on gardening. *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* (1903) is widely recognized amongst scholars as the most influential practical garden book written by an American woman at the turn of the century (Harris 1994, Begg 2000). Ely was not the first women to write a gardening book, nor the first woman to write a gardening book for women, nor about old-fashioned flowers, boxed edging, or her personal experience in the garden. In 1871, Sophia O. Johnson, under the pseudonym of Daisy Eyebright, wrote *Every Woman Her Own Flower Garden*, a small manual of information on select flowers and vegetables and their culture for women. Anna B. Warner wrote *Gardening by Myself* (1874), about her experience in her garden arranged by month. Celia Thaxter published *An Island Garden* (1895), painting a whimsical and poetic picture of her lovely garden and the bug-friends and flowers that lived within, yet offering little practical guidance. Alice Morse Earle’s *Old Times Gardens* (1901), called notice to the simple beauty and cultural heritage of colonial gardens, with boxwood and old-fashioned flowers. Marianna Griswold Van
Renssalaer wrote convincingly on garden design as art in *Art Out of Doors* (1893). Aside from the books written by American women before 1903, there were books by American men, such as Liberty Hyde Bailey’s *Garden Making* (1898) and horticultural magazines were available, such as *Forest and Garden*, and *Orchard and Garden*. Clearly, literature on gardening was available for the American audience. Yet the publication of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* (1903), Ely’s first book on practical horticulture, swept across America like “the first breath of spring that blows the winter fug from a chilly front parlor” (Lovejoy 1990). When *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* hit shelves in the January of 1903, it was snatched up so fast by eager buyers that it was printed a total of four times in the first year (MacMillan Co 1916).

*A Woman’s Hardy Garden* filled a need that had not previously been met. It advocated for the use of hardy plant material and continuous bloom, at a time when the concept was unfamiliar in American home gardens. It offered detailed, yet easy to follow practical advice in a manner that was accessible and unintimidating for the beginning gardener, drawing on personal experience in her garden. Furthermore, it was authored by a woman of prominent New York society who saw gardening as a common language all women might turn to to improve their own lives and society as a whole.

**Hardy Gardening**

Ely’s gardening philosophy was rooted in the use of hardy perennials and annuals sown directly in the ground, apt to thrive in her region with little care. She prided herself for not having a glasshouse or conservatory, not even for starting seeds. She celebrated the use of old-fashioned flowers, borders of hardy perennials in
continuous bloom from May until November, boxwood edging, and gathering native ferns, rhododendrons, and small trees from the woods. Her style was a product of her constant observation of the growing things around her, whether in a pot outside a modest storefront, in the woods of New Jersey, or in the gardens of an English country manor.

The first gardens Ely planted at Meadowburn in the early 1880’s were consistent with the Victorian bedding-out trend of the era, but she quickly grew bored with monochromatic annual schemes and fed up with the impracticality of the garish bedding-out style (Meade 1951). Ely began to experiment with some of the hardy perennials she often admired in the dooryards of farmhouses. While driving through the countryside, she kept a sharp eye on the gardens of farmer’s wives, befriending those with the flowers she admired and trading roots and divisions (Ely 1903f).

Garden books were another source of inspiration for Ely, and she read everything she could find on the subject of horticulture (Meade 1951). In 1883, William Robinson’s *The English Flower Garden* was published, in which he effusively advocated the annihilation of high Victorian garden styles and encouraged naturalists plantings and borders of hardy perennials. This book had a significant impact on Ely (Meade 1951), and it is evident in her writing and garden designs that she embraced his principles enthusiastically.

The “hardy gardening” philosophy and practices where uncommon in America during the turn of the 19th century. While the demise of the Victorian bedding out fashions had begun to shape in England under the influence of Robinson, the movement had yet to cross the Atlantic to the United States. The prevailing garden trend in America was still to plant geometrical beds cut from the turf, full to the brim
with brightly colored annuals and tender perennials, arranged by like kind or in ribbons and bands. As a result, home gardens were often considered costly and time consuming, only afforded by the wealthy, as the yearly and seasonal replanting of annuals and tender perennials involved intensive labor and glasshouses for propagation (Ely 1903f).

Ely was one of the early American home gardeners and writers to embrace the hardy and naturalistic gardening style, and *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* did a great deal to popularize this philosophy within America. Ely avidly studied Robinson and the early books of English garden writer Gertrude Jekyll, and while she was able to use recommendations on design and color, little of their practical information was translatable to the Eastern United States (Ely 1903f, Meade 1951). To this note Ely writes, “the most attractive books on the subject are English; and yet, beyond the suggestions for planting, and the designs given in the illustrations, not much help is to be derived in this latitude from following their directions” (Ely 1903f).

There is no doubt that Robinson’s work was an important guide for Ely, despite climate differences. But Ely’s style was more than an American translation of Robinson’s. Like many of her American contemporaries, she celebrated the natural landscape and regional flora. With Alice Morse Earle she cherished the heritage of old American gardens, and the resilient flowers of her grandmother’s era. She borrowed and traded ideas, seeds and cuttings with farmers in the countryside. She collected ideas from the many gardens visited throughout England, Spain, Italy, France, Switzerland and beyond. With determination and the help of her trusty gardener, Albert Furman, she tested and tried, planted and removed, cursed and celebrated. Born of her curiosity, determination, and constant observation of the
growing things around her, Ely birthed gardening practices that were her own, and that would be emulated throughout the country for years to come.

One of the primary objectives of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*, as reflected in the title, was to show how a woman could have a simple garden of hardy perennials and select annuals sown directly in the ground, doing much of the work herself, for a minimal cost (Ely 1903f). Victorian bedding-out was the antithesis of the hardy garden, as Robinson candidly expressed in England. Ely gracefully echoed his call to her readers in America, writing, “the years when gardening consisted only of bed of coleus, geranium, verbena, and bedding out plants have passed away, like the black walnut period in furniture,” (Ely 1903f) . Ely’s contagious enthusiasm for hardy gardening quickly caught on amongst her friends and readers. This is reinforced in Elizabeth Martin’s account of the founding of the Garden Club of America (GCA) in *The Bulletin* of 1920. Martin, Founding President of the GCA, begins the history by recognizing Ely’s impact:

*Nearly sixteen years ago there swept across this Country a rage for gardening. Helena Rutherford Ely, one of the first Vice-Presidents of the Garden Club of America, had in the Woman’s Hardy Garden inspired and bidden women to care for and work in their gardens. The call was answered, and bedding-out plants (the joy of the professional gardener) disappeared, and in their places came Delphinium, Columbine, Fox-glove and hundred of other charming plants which had once blossomed in our grandmother’s gardens but had long been neglected or forgotten. With our hands we sowed the seeds and planted the tiny seedling in permanent border, and had the joy of seeing them bloom; then we lived among the beauty of these new found friends (Martin 1920).*

Ely charted the unfamiliar territory of hardy gardening in her region. She gathered information were she could, but most importantly, experimented in her
gardens at Meadowburn. As her daughter, Helena Meade, noted in the biography she wrote of Ely thirty years after her death: “There was no one to help her as no one had done it before” (Meade 1951). *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was a product of the knowledge she gained in nearly two decades of experimentation.

**Personal Experience**

*A Woman’s Hardy Garden* differed from other horticulture publications in America at the time in the sense that it was written by an amateur for other beginning gardeners. Ely was a hands-on, self taught gardener, who was not ashamed to get dirty in her garden. She started gardening as a child along side Old Tweet, her father’s Scottish gardener whom she considered one of her very best friends.

*Under this old gardener I learned, even as a child, to bud roses and fruit trees, and watched the transplanting of seedlings and making of slips; watched, too, the trimming of grape-vines, fruit trees and shrubs; so that when I was very young I knew more than many an older person of practical garden work* (Ely 1903f).

Other than informal lessons from Old Tweet, everything Ely knew about horticulture was learned from personal experience or gleaned from her collection of gardening books and catalogues. Ely writes, “through trials and tribulations and hardly learned patience, I have gained some of the secrets of many of our best hardy flowering plants and shrubs” (Ely 1903f). Throughout her book, practical knowledge was offered from the familiar perspective of a beginner, thus the practical instruction was palatable for any woman (or man) with little or no experience with gardening.
Chapters arranged by subject contained basic yet thorough information on subjects from soil preparation, to choice plant species and varieties, to propagating from seed, and pest control. The quantity of information was not overwhelming, yet, as one critic noted, it provided enough guidance that “there is no reason why a similar garden should not be attainable…under the guidance of this little book, which is a model of explicit statement” (New York Times 1903).

Ely balanced practical advice with her personal philosophies and biographical anecdotes, which further contributed to the accessibility of her writing. Planting techniques and plant lists were complemented with memories of childhood and conversations with friends or neighbors. A review in the New York Times recognized this, writing, “with an intimate and casual style that very well suits her subject, the author develops aesthetic suggestions into working plans that he who reads may follow” (New York Times 1903). Additionally, Ely frequently used metaphor to connect the familiar domestic realm of women to the more physical work of gardening. For example, she compares the necessary judgment when watering the garden to that of seasoning a soup. The use of metaphor became more explicit in later books; for example, when advising on pests and pathogens in her third book, Ely suggests that one should tour the garden “with a keen look out for trouble that is as necessary in the flower garden as in the nursery of young children” (Ely 1911), or while fertilizing, “nitrate of soda should be used as sparingly as one sprinkles sugar upon berries or cereal” (Ely 1911). Personalizing gardening with memories and metaphors allowed readers to relate to Ely, but also made gardening a safe and familiar venture.
Numerous illustrations further contributed to the appeal of A Woman’s Hardy Garden, and enabled readers to visualize what may otherwise have been foreign ideas. Black and white photographs taken by Charles Frederick Chandler, an accomplished chemist and professor at Columbia University, pictured areas of the garden, specific plantings, and flowers arranged in vases. Six rudimentary garden designs for areas of a home garden were included, with bed and pathway measurements and planting schemes to be easily imitated. The ample illustrations made the written advice accessible to the first time gardener, and provided visual proof of the satisfying results of hard work.

Ely was forthcoming in the introduction of A Woman’s Hardy Garden that she was novice, both with gardening and writing. While her naiveté as a writer was noted by her publisher and critics, it was also recognized as a reason for her success. A review in the New York Times wrote, “many experienced writers would be justified in envying the clearness of her explanations and the orderly arrangement of her subject matter” (New York Times 1903). Her inexperience as a writer continued to be highlighted by critics even after the publication of her third book The Practical Flower Garden (1911). A review in The Nation comparing E. P. Powell’s How to Live in the Country to Ely’s The Practical Flower Garden noted that the latter, “as an example of bookmaking cannot compare with the work of the trained writer” (Elmer 1911). But this weakness was also her strength. With her colloquial language and fearlessly experimental approach, Ely reached out to her audience not as an authority but as an equal, making gardening a safe venture for a beginner to pursue, and Ely their friendly mentor.
Woman and a Gardening Fellowship

Ely set a personal example for women throughout America, showing that the physical act of gardening could be embraced by all women no matter their social standing. Dressed in a sunbonnet, suede gloves, and a gardening dress, she set out each day to tend to the needs of her garden. She was her own head gardener, and even though she had a full time gardener and often several more hands to assist in the daily chores, it was under her scrupulous direction. The garden was a realm in which Ely had unwavering authority, and was a physical expression of her individuality.

In the mid-nineteenth century, Andrew Jackson Downing advocated gardening as a leisure activity for women that would improve the physical and emotional health of women while beautifying the home grounds. This attitude was indirectly promoted by the handful of women garden writers of the second half of the nineteenth century, such as Johnson, Warner, and Thaxter. Landscape architect and historian Thaisa Way states, “by the turn of the century, garden design and gardening were considered by most advocates for women to be logical extensions of the gendered domain of domestic work” (Way 2009). Ely shared Downing’s opinion of the benefits of gardening for women, which she overtly expressed throughout her book. “If the rich and fashionable women of this country took more interest and spent more time in their gardens, and less in frivolity, fewer would suffer from nervous prostration, and the necessity for the multitude of sanitariums would be avoided” (Ely 1903f).

Not only did Ely share Downing’s opinion, she made a living example of it, and thus was able to give first hand legitimacy to its truth. She writes, “with trowel in
hand and joy in my heart, I set out hundreds of little Box plants, transplanted Columbines, Foxgloves, and Canterbury Bells. Big robins were hopping tamely about, calling to one another; blackbirds and meadow-larks were singing their refrains; the brave plants were pushing their way through the earth to new life, and I thought how good it was to be alive, to have a garden to dig in, and, above all, to be well and able to dig” (Ely 1903f). Woven throughout her practical instruction and plant lists is her personal testament to the gratification found in gardening, and heartfelt encouragement for other women to follow suit. Alice Morse Earle recognized Ely’s success to this end, writing, “it is a good book, a wholesome book; it influences you in the reading, just as working in the garden does in the doing…turning over the soil, pulling weeds, nursing up a drooping plant, getting close to the ground; you feel better and truer” (Earle 1903).

Ely was of a generation when women of her class were trained in music, art, and French while strapped tightly in corsets – a far cry from digging in dirt and working in manure. Ely and her contemporaries were combating generations of social status quo with every hole they dug and top selling book they wrote. As architectural historian Dianne Harris states, “[Ely] was as close as a woman of her class could come to having any sort of professional activity within her community” (Harris 1994). Perhaps this is why Ely never referred to herself as anything but “amateur,” regardless of the recognition she received as an authority in horticulture. Nonetheless, Ely was subject to scrutiny from members of refined society due to her affinity for garden work. The following recount of a conversation in *The Practical Flower Garden* illustrates this perfectly:
Shortly after my first book was published, a somewhat elderly man whose mind is delightfully cultivated, whose sole recreation is the study of English literature, and who knows no more about gardening than about the construction of flying-machines, remarked that it was painful to make such a criticism, but it seemed shocking that a nice woman (the nice probably meaning refined) should so often refer to manure...[This was] far more painful for me to hear than for him to say (Ely 1911).

Following this passage, Ely describes how she confided in a new gardening friend, “an excellent and enthusiastic gardener, whose sensibility even Jane Austen might have admired” (Ely 1911). That new friend was Nellie Doubleday, author of The American Flower Garden (1916), who consoled Ely by telling her, “without manures nothing could be done,” and further, when asked by her husband what she wanted for her birthday Doubleday requested “two cartloads of manure for the garden” (Ely 1911). The two lady’s interaction over manure is telling of the kinship brought forth by the shared love of gardening, in an era still marked with the “prejudice against the physical contact with the soil,” as one historian described it (Nevins 1985).

It was Ely’s intention in writing A Woman’s Hardy Garden to show that all women with even limited means are able to create a garden with little expense (Ely 1903f). The intended audience was not limited to women of her class. Nonetheless, Ely was unavoidably affluent. While her fearless approach to the physical requirements of gardening was impressive for a lady of refinement, there is no overlooking the hired help, resources, and leisure time at her disposal: a fact often highlighted by her critics. A review in The Nation wrote, “Mrs. Ely…enjoys luxuries of trained workmen, unlimited supplies, and the pursuit of beauty alone” (Elmer
1911). After reading the comments of an editor at the MacMillan Company in which attention was called to her economic status, Ely wrote her publisher, “I should be really obliged if you could dissuade your reader’s mind of the opinion that I am an ‘affluent’ woman. The term so horribly sounds of a calico gown and diamond earrings!” (Ely 1902c). Ely combatted accusations of her economic standing by critics, not because it was false (it was not), but perhaps because it falsely defined her as a society woman who was only a gardener in the sense that she orchestrated a crew from afar, not the “dirt” gardener she truly was. This implication undermined her, and her objective of encouraging women to be hands-on gardeners.

Stretching across social boundaries may have contributed to the accessibility of Ely as a mentor to women throughout the country regardless of social status.

Interwoven throughout every chapter of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* is the theme of neighboring, sharing plant material, and connecting with others around the subject of gardening, and the “delightful tie, fondness of gardening makes between people” (Ely 1903f). For Ely, this “delightful tie” occurred regardless of gender, social status, or race. Driving about the countryside, Ely would keep a sharp eye out for special flowers growing in front of houses along the road, and befriend the owner in hopes of trading plants. She writes, “some of the nicest things I have in my garden came to me in this way, and it is great fun!” (Ely 1903f). Architectural historian Dianne Harris argues that the sharing across social boundaries provided a sense of liberation to the Victorian woman (Harris 1994). Such interactions enabled Ely to form friendships that were unconventional for the era.

Perhaps it was Ely’s enthusiastic exaltation of the delightful friendships born of a shared love of gardening that encouraged admiring readers to send copious letters
to the Ely’s mailboxes. Soon after the release of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*, Ely had a constant flow of fan mail that continued for twenty years after her death (Meade 1951). Some letters arrived accompanied by seeds or bulbs for Ely to experiment with, such as the Brazilian Lily pictured in *Another Hardy Garden Book* (Ely 1905). Some requested cuttings of hard to find plants, others offered long descriptions of their gardens and requested advice, and most letters requested response. The letter of an anonymous author epitomizes the desire for gardening fellowship sparked by *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. Addressed to “Dear Lady Gardener”, the letter reads:

_I like flowers. That is my excuse for daring to write to you, a stranger, though I feel more as if you were a near neighbor for I read your book _A Woman’s Hardy Garden_ so often that I almost know it by heart. Of all the garden books I have read, it suits me best because it teaches me most* (Ely 1913).

She goes on to describe her simple city lot, and the difficulties in making it pretty, namely, her husband:

_First, I have a husband who thinks a potato patch is as pretty as a rose garden. Then, as we cannot afford help, all that I cannot do myself has to be coaxed, begged and waited for. ‘Tis a good thing that I am strong and healthy* (Ely 1913).

This letter represents the longing for women across the country to have a forum to share ideas and seek support from like minded women. It represents what Harris describes as “a network of support created out of printed words…that illustrated the importance of both the advice book and of the garden in the daily lives of numbers of women around the turn of the century” (Harris 1994).
Anna Gillman Hill, author of *Forty Years of Gardening* and made famous for the creation of Grey Gardens, initiated a correspondence with Ely on the topic of delphinium (Hill 1938). The correspondence resulted in a visit to Meadowburn during which Ely told of the brewing plans to travel to Philadelphia to discuss the development of a national garden club (the future Garden Club of America). Ely’s enthusiasm was contagious once again: upon returning to her home in New York, Hill initiated her own regional club. In *Forty Years of Gardening*, Hill gave praise to Ely’s first book:

_Thirty-one years later came the book that has done more to popularize modern gardening than all others - the book that no beginner can do without – Helena Rutherfurd Ely’s Woman’s Hardy Garden. In the years before the first garden clubs it filled a very real need_ (Hill 1938).

Hill’s praise is further testament to the impact of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* – both as a catalyst for hardy gardening, as well as a medium for one beginning gardener to share her experience with the next. Ely had stirred a desire among middle and upper class women: a desire to garden, and a desire to create connection with other garden lovers. Ten years after the publication of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*, this same desire spawned the incorporation of the Garden Club of America.

**The Success of A Woman’s Hardy Garden**

The success of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was not anticipated by Ely or by her publisher, George Brett, of the MacMillan Company. When Ely first submitted her manuscript in November of 1902, the editor apparently was not impressed, suggesting
that it needed to be “twice or three times as long…to make it acceptable” (Ely 1902b). Additionally, the editor wanted a chapter on rose culture, information on raising cannas from seed, and how to garden under a dripping overhang. In a fierce letter to Brett in response to the critique of the editor, Ely wrote, “I have no words in which to tell you of my abject and depressed condition of mind…I can only reply that both you and the reader, look at the book from an entirely different point of view from my own in making it” (Ely 1902b). Ely in fact did offer several more words of reply in her ten-page letter, toward the end exclaiming, “the reader evidently has tried to garden in a swamp” (Ely 1902b).

The correspondence between Ely and her publisher sheds light on the unique and unconventional nature of Ely’s visions for *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. The MacMillan Company was not new to horticultural publications. They were familiar with the trends in garden writing, and what Ely proposed clearly did not fit. It was not a fictional garden novel, like Mary Annette Von Arnim’s *Elizabeth’s German Garden* (1898) or Mabel Osgood Wright’s *Garden of a Commuter’s Wife* (1901). Nor was it rich in colonial garden history or formal design, like that of Alice Morse Earle’s *Old Times Gardens* (1901). But Ely’s vision for her book was intentional, and from that vision she would not drift. Ely’s manuscript was heavy with practical advice for the culture of only the plants that she grew. She recognized herself as an amateur and only wanted to tell briefly of her own personal experience in her garden, not write a treatise on the subject of horticulture. She felt “that books on gardening are all too big and, tell too little” (Ely 1902b).
Ely also had a clear idea of what she wanted the book to look like and how it was to be organized. It was to be a small book, with pages formatted similarly to those of Jekyll’s *Lilies for English Gardens* (1901), with copious illustrations. She provided Brett with a sketch of what the cover should look like, although it is not evident if that sketch was indeed the inspiration for the final cover design (Ely 1902c).

Many of Ely’s desires for her book were further articulated in letters from her husband, Alfred Ely to Mr. Brett. As a man in an era when women had little clout, Mr. Ely brought additional persuasive weight to the topic.

*Your reader has, it seems to me, entirely misconceived Mrs. Ely’s idea in what she wrote. It is not a manual on hardy flowers and not intended to be a general book of instruction. Her idea was to describe her own garden and those plants, etc., which she had found suitable for this climate with her treatment of them. She, particularly, did not want a big book, but had in mind a small book about the size of the English one on lilies. The suggestions of your reader as to size seem to me to conflict with her idea in writing what she did and with the object she had in mind…. I have looked over and am more or less familiar with a great number of the recent books on gardening and plants, and in my opinion the majority of them are not worth reading by anybody not an expert, and at the same time would not be valuable even to the latter, because they have so many pages which apparently have no meaning other than to make inches of paper between covers. They are all dull reading* (Ely 1902a).

Succeeding letters between the Elys and George Brett grew more amiable, and eventually Ely accepted a few of the reader’s recommendations, such as “avoiding exaggeration”. In some cases she sent in proof to negate accusations of exaggeration, such as a pressed flower of her phlox to prove the size of a silver dollar. That phlox is pictured on a plate next to a bouquet in the book as further proof for disbelieving readers, with the caption reading “single blossoms actual size” (Ely 1903f).
Even after incorporating Brett’s suggestions, there was still no telling of the pending success and eventual impact of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. Before publication, Ely wrote in a letter to Brett, “If only the book should sell a few hundred thousand copies it might be worth the while!” (Ely 1903e). Shortly following publication of the book and the release of several glowing reviews, Alfred Ely wrote to Brett, “I only hope that the sales will be sufficient to compensate you for the business side of the venture” (Ely 1903b). These comments suggest it was understood that the MacMillan Company was taking a risk with Ely, a strong-minded amateur gardener who had never written a book before in her life. But Brett, perhaps because he was an “appreciative and sympathetic publisher”, as Alfred Ely described, or because of Ely’s prominent status in New York society, took a chance with Ely’s book that he would never regret.

Before long, praise for *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was sung throughout the news. *The New York Tribune* proclaimed Ely “the wisest and most winning teacher of the fascinating art of gardening that we have met in modern print”, and “A book to be welcomed with enthusiasm by the willing novice in gardening…really practical directions for making a charming, but not too ambitious flower garden” (New York Tribune 1905). Alice Morse Earle glowingly reviewed *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* for *The Dial*, exclaiming, “at last we have a book on [gardening]…an American book, by an American woman, about an American Garden. Let us sigh with gratitude and read the volume with delight” (Earle 1903). Earle prefaced her review with a recount of a friend’s disastrous gardening pursuit, “carried into extravagance both of money and hopes by the charm of Miss Jekyll’s delightful *Wood and Garden* and *Home and
Earle concludes her review with a hope for a “second and even more detailed book on Mrs. Ely’s Hardy Garden” (Earle 1903).

Eight months after publication George Brett wrote Ely inquiring about when she would write her next book. Ely responded, “how can I think of writing a book when a great [basket] full of letters that have accumulated during my absence call upon me for another? Most of them, Alas! Have stamps enclosed” (Ely 1903c).

The success of her first book gave Ely confidence in her ability as an author and horticulturist. The book sales likely gave Brett confidence in her ability as well, and her future manuscripts were never put under the same scrutiny as her first. When Ely received the first royalty check for five hundred dollars from the MacMillan Company, she wrote to Brett in giddy appreciation, “It is the most interesting check that has ever passed through my hands…as it was the first money I have made” (Ely 1903c). Ely soon wrote her second and third books, Another Hardy Garden Book (1905) and The Practical Flower Garden (1911).

As demand for her writing grew, so did her confidence as a businesswoman. She approached succeeding contracts with the MacMillan Company discerningly, with keen attention to royalty agreements. In response to a letter in which Ely questioned the royalty percentage, Brett wrote “I can only assure you that its terms are better than those which we give to any of our authors for books of this character, and equal to the terms on which we publish our most popular books for the best authors” (Brett 1910). If this was indeed fact, it suggests that Ely was compensated more than Liberty Hyde Bailey and on par with Jack London – impressive for an amateur gardener and novice writer.
The success of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* persisted long after its first publication, and remained Ely’s most popular book. In 1917, despite an explosion of similar garden books written since its publication, *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* continued to be the practical guide for beginners. This is seen in *The Countryside* booklist’s review in 1917:

*Here is another young American Classic. Though drawn from the experience in the making of one of our most noted gardens, so easily come at are the perennials and the shrubs and the few annuals included and so clear the advice that this is one of the best popular reference books for anyone wishing to make even a small bit of ground lovely* (Smith 1917).

The popularity of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* persisted. *The Nation* notified its readers that “the Second edition, in press, has been delayed by the largely increased demand for the book, but will be in the hands of booksellers by Wednesday the 18th” (New York Tribune 1976). *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was printed four times in the first year, a total of sixteen printings in the first ten years, selling 41,000 copies by 1930.

**Further Publications by Ely**

In addition to her three books, Ely wrote for prominent magazines, further stretching her influence and reach. For *Scribner’s* she contributed two articles, *Some Gardens in Spain* (1904) and *The Color Arrangements of Flowers* (1910). The latter featured full-page color photographs of her perennial borders. The photographs themselves were color autochromes, one of the early techniques for color photography processed by the Lumiere Company of France. Upon the personal request of editor
Edward Bok (Ely 1912, Ely 1903a), Ely contributed an article titled *Autumn Work in the Flower Garden* (1911) to *The Ladies Home Journal*. Publications in these magazines greatly increased the scope of Ely’s influence reaching over one million readers per issue (Clayton 1997).

Other publishers began to harness Ely’s prominence to market their own publications. *Dreer’s Garden Book*, a catalogue published by prominent Philadelphia nurseryman Henry Dreer, hired Ely to write an article on phlox to be displayed amidst the cultivars for sale. Incorporating articles by “leading horticulturists of America” was Dreer’s marketing strategy in a competitive nursery market, which he extensively advertised in popular home and garden magazines. In *Garden Magazine* a large advertisement states, “we secured the cooperation of a number of the leading horticultural authorities, including: Helena Rutherfurd Ely…Prof. L.H. Bailey,…Mr. William Falconer…Mr. George Oliver…Mr. W.C. Egan…..The result is that Dreer’s Garden Book for 1909, in addition to being the most complete catalogue published, is now the most valuable guide to the growing of vegetables, flowers, etc., that has ever been printed” (Dreer 1909). Ely is not only being recognized as a popular figure in horticulture, but is listed next to some of the countries most prominent professional horticulturalists.

In 1912, *Suburban Life Magazine* rode the wave of Ely’s success. They recognized the popularity of Ely within their target audience, and approached the MacMillan Company to request use of *The Practical Flower Garden* as a promotional material for the magazine. A special printing was run for the promotion, and a copy was offered at a reduced cost for new magazine subscribers (Suburban Life Magazine 1912).
Lecturing was another way that Ely’s reached her audience. This study found one record of a lecture that Ely gave for her “pet charity”, the Eastside Settlement. The lecture anticipated an audience of 400 – 600 guests (Ely 1912). A biography of Ely written by her daughter, Helena Meade, states “I do not remember any time when she lectured for a fee, unless it was to make money for some pet charity” (Meade 1951). Existing records of her lecturing is limited, but the account of her daughter suggest that Ely did indeed lecture often.

Ely was recognized as an authority on horticulture and one of America’s most famous authors of the time. The New York Times wrote of her summer plans at Meadowburn in the column Authors in Vacation Time, alongside other writers such as Jack London and Winston Churchill (New York Times 1905). She was frequently referred to in the New York social news as the woman made famous by her “hardy gardening books” (New York Times 1914).

The Book as a Model

*A Woman’s Hardy Garden* contributed to a significant shift in the landscape of American garden writing. Contrary to the nineteenth century, garden literature in the twentieth century was dominated by women authors, both professional garden designers and amateur gardeners, telling of their own experience and design philosophy for a predominantly female audience (Begg 1991, Harris 1994). The popularity of the books of Ely and her early contemporaries such as Earle and Jekyll, paved the way for the multitude of gardening books and magazines produced until War World II, a period in which horticultural literature reached an apex (Begg 1991).
Among the well known authors who followed pace behind the early pioneers were Louisa Yeomans King, Louise Beebee Wilder, Louise Shelton, Nellie Doubleday (as Neltje Blanchan), Mrs. Edward Harding, Mrs. Stout, Frances Duncan, and many more. The explosion of horticultural literature is a testament to the increasing popularity of home gardens in America during the first half of the twentieth century, a trend that King, Hill, and Martin credit to the impact of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. As a pioneering author on practical horticulture for women in America, Ely helped break ground for other women not only to garden, but to share their experience and passion through writing.

**The Garden as a Model**

Unlike her contemporaries who practiced as professional landscape architects and spread their influence with their designed landscapes, such as Beatrix Farrand and Martha Brooks Hutcheson, Ely’s only avenue of influence was through her writing, her infectious passion, and the beauty she created in her own gardens. The evidence of gardens designed by Ely is limited to three instances. Meadowburn Farm is the most significant, as it was the garden which she made for herself and served as her laboratory for experimentation and palette for personal expression. The only other garden she created for herself are the gardens at Faryewold, the house of her second husband Benjamin T. Fairchild in Greenwich, Connecticut. The minutes of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County in May of 1918 speak of touring Ely’s (now Mrs. Fairchild’s) gardens of iris, lilies, tulips and forget-me-nots: “so different from the garden at Meadowburn and yet quite as delightfully characteristic of its maker” (Metzger n.d.).
There is evidence of one garden that Ely created for someone else, although the possibility that there were others is quite possible. In The Practical Flower Garden, Ely describes designing an ‘Evergreen Garden’ for a friend, likely on Long Island (Ely 1911). The garden was set within the foundation of an old barn overlooking the sea. The plantings consisted of a variety of small evergreens, with ferns planted within stone crevices.

Ely’s influence was in inspiring others to create gardens of their own through her writing, personal passion, and the beauty she created in her own gardens. Thus, Meadowburn served as a model garden for those who visited, as well as those who read Ely’s books and articles throughout the country.

Meadowburn was recognized as one of the treasured gardens of America in its time. An article in the New Jersey Herald states, “Among the noted gardens of America, is one made famous by ‘A Woman’s Hardy Garden’ by Helena Rutherfurd Ely, and many a pilgrimage has been made by garden lovers to this mecca of their desires” (New Jersey Herald 1910). Such pilgrims included Mrs. John D. Rockefeller (Abby Aldrich), Mrs. Macy, and Mrs. Hill, who called upon Ely at Meadowburn “to look over her notable flower garden”, accompanied by her daughter and their friend, Helena Rutherfurd Ely Meade (Sussex Independent 1909).

Among the garden lovers to visit Meadowburn were twenty-six members of the Garden Club of Philadelphia, led by Elizabeth Martin, who visited in June of 1912 and again in May of 1915 (Ely n.p.). After visiting Ely in 1912, Beulah H. Jenks Woolston of Germantown, Philadelphia, stated in a thank you poem: “You have shown us treasures fine: your garden gave me much for mine” (Woolston 1912).
gracious statement is an affirmation of the influence of Ely’s innate gardening ability and the uniqueness of her gardens.

The records demonstrate a constant stream of guests, both invited and unannounced, visiting Meadowburn. Ely remarked in her third book, “for the past three years, hundreds of people have tramped over my grass paths” (Ely 1911). The son of Ely’s original gardener, Albert Furman Jr., remembers people coming all the time (Furman 1999). The written record of visitors is by no means exhaustive: the guest book mainly includes social guests, and other accounts must be found in the written accounts of visitors and newspaper articles. Thus the extent of visitation to Meadowburn during Ely’s life is not completely understood. What is evident is that it was vast.

Louise Shelton featured Meadowburn in Beautiful Gardens in America (1915), concluding her description of the gardens with a semi-promotional plug for visiting Meadowburn. Shelton writes,

*Twenty miles to the west of the Hudson River is Meadowburn Farm – famous for its owner, the author of “Hardy Garden” books. Two photographs not hitherto published, must alone present the acres of bloom on this interesting place... A rare treat for garden lovers who visits there by special arrangement* (Shelton 1915).

This statement suggests the visitation by strangers and fellow garden lovers was much greater than existing records show, and that strangers with no formal connection with Ely were coming from all over the region. It also reinforces Meadowburn as a rare and exceptional garden in its time. Also interesting is Shelton’s
recognition of the previously unpublished photographs, an implication of the reader’s familiarity with Meadowburn through other publications by 1915. Shelton elevates her own book by offering readers new perspectives of the famous garden.

In addition to those who journeyed far and near, Ely’s social guests, often prominent scholars, artists, and businessman and their families, were inspired and likely influenced by Meadowburn. The extensive list of prominent friends the Elys hosted for multiple day festivities at Meadowburn includes Junius Morgan Jr., Conde Montrose Nast, Thomas Hastings, Charles Scribner Jr., Ripley Hitchcock, George Wharton Edwards, the Pierreponts, the Prentices, Pynes and many more (Ely n.p.). The guest book at Meadowburn that Ely kept active from 1899 to 1916, is full of praises sung for both Ely’s hospitality and the beauty of the gardens. A poem inscribed in the book by Julia Dey Martin illustrates the impact that the gardens at Meadowburn had on her guests, and the likely possibility that it directly influenced many other country gardens in the region.

All of us have city houses,
Some of us have country places,
A few of us have little gardens,
But none of us will ever learn,
Just how to rival Meadowburn.

With its dear house
And red brick terrace,
Stately trees and marble fountains,
Rows of poplar, hedge and flower,
And its vista from the bower,
All combine in rare selection,
See Meadowburn to make perfection.

And last, but really first of all,
To the clever brain and garden knowledge,
All praises be, and [consideration]
That evolved this transformation –
Dear Helena.

-Julia Dey Martin, September 15, 1911

In comparison to the country homes of many of Ely’s friends, Meadowburn may have been relatively modest in size and opulence, but nevertheless her gardens were the most beautiful. Dey’s poem is a testament to the unique nature of the gardens at Meadowburn, and supports the understanding that it was recognized as the ‘ideal’ garden in an era brimming with luxurious country homes and tended grounds.

The vast distribution of Ely’s books and magazine articles throughout upper and middle class American home gardeners constitutes an enormous span of influence. It is estimated that 61,000 copies of her books sold within her lifetime (Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties 1983). Articles she wrote for Scribner’s, including The Color Arrangement of Flowers (1910) and Some Gardens in Spain (1904) and for The Ladies Home Journal reached audiences by the millions (Clayton 1997). Thus, Meadowburn served as an inspiration and a model for new home gardens throughout the country.

In 1909, Mrs. Anna Condict won fourth place in the American Homes and Gardens garden competition with her new hardy garden in Essex Fells, New Jersey which she built after A Woman’s Hardy Garden inspired her to take up gardening (Condict 1910). In an article about her prize-winning garden, Condict wrote, that after reading Ely’s book “I was filled with enthusiasm to have a flower garden…I would strive for ‘masses of color’ and ‘succession of bloom’. Not one plant of a kind, but a
hundred of each, all of my own raising: that should be my ambition” (Condict 1910). Bursting with phlox, delphinium, cumbine and aster, Condict's garden represents thousands of gardens that were similarly developed by avid readers of Ely.

Ely’s book was on the shelves of many of America’s prominent home gardeners and estate owners of the early 20th century, such as Junius Morgan Jr., Helen Lincklaen Fairchild, Anna Gilman Hill, Pierre S. Du Pont, and later Elizabeth Lawrence. Many gardens of the era could be attributed to an influence of Ely when observed in historic images and written description, but to prove a direct influence would require in depth research beyond the scope of this study. However, similarities can be seen in comparing historic photographs and the descriptions of some old gardens.

An article titled *A Woman’s Two-Year-Old Hardy Garden from Seed* by Adaline Thomson, was featured in *American Homes and Gardens* in March, 1909. While there is no mention of Ely, the title, content, and illustrations of her garden suggest a direct influence.

There are a few instances where the composition of a garden is so similar to Meadowburn that it is difficult to imagine that Ely was not an influence. The perennial border at Mariemont, the home of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Emery, is such a garden. A hand colored glass lanternslide in the collections of the Library of Congress depicting the flower border shows a striking similarity to that of Meadowburn. A rendering of this image is also featured as the front piece in *Beautiful Garden in America* (Shelton 1915). The image shows lush perennial borders lining a long grass walk. Within the abundantly blooming borders appear to grow catalpa standards in regular intervals for the length of the border. The grass walk is intersected with a perpendicular walk,
marked by a sundial. At the far end appears to be a vine draped pergola or summerhouse. While the pergola, sundial and perennial border were ubiquitous garden elements by 1914, the composition of the whole is exactly that of Ely’s perennial border. Furthermore, the catalpa standards are an iconic feature of Ely’s perennial border, seldom used the same way in other gardens of the era. In *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*, the treatment of the catalpa standards is described at length, and they are featured in many of the photographs. Thus it seems likely that the Emerys used Ely’s border as a model.

Another garden that has similarities to Meadowburn is Pierre S. DuPont’s early gardens at Longwood, in Kennet Square, Pennsylvania. DuPont began to build the gardens in 1906. By that time *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was well established as the go-to handbook on hardy gardening in America. Du Pont had Ely’s book in his personal collection, and like Ely, he planned his gardens himself without the assistance of a landscape designer or architect.

The descriptions of the first gardens at Longwood, as described by Betsy Ney in *The Early Flower Gardens of Longwood*, suggest that Du Pont could have very likely used Ely’s books as a reference and inspiration in their planning. The layout of gardens in relation to the house has a striking resemblance to the overall layout of Meadowburn. The main feature was the Flower Garden, consisting of a long walk bordered on either side by perennial borders edged with boxwood, and is set away from the house to the south (Ney 1988). Du Pont said of these first gardens, “the flower-garden adjacent to the old park is modern, but laid out in keeping with the oldtime character of the property” (Ney 1988).
Ney emphasizes the importance of color and bloom cycle in Du Pont’s planting plans, and states that he planned the flower borders to have successions of bloom from May until September. The plantings were predominantly of perennials, often iris, lilies, hollyhocks, dahlias and sunflowers, but biennials and annuals were used to fill in the composition. When Du Pont was planning these borders, *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* was the foremost book on hardy gardening for the region that explained just how to plant such borders of successional bloom, with detailed cultural requirements specific to the regional climate.

In addition to design similarities, the influence of Ely is also seen in Du Pont’s horticultural practices. Ney notes, “seeds were sown in seed beds to be transferred to permanent locations as they reached appropriate size” (Ney 1988). This practice is a trademark of Ely, who describes the detailed preparation for and advantages of the use of a seedbed in her chapter dedicated to the subject titled *The Seed Bed* in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*.

There is no known record of Du Pont having visited Meadowburn, but he very likely was influenced by the detailed descriptions of Ely’s gardens in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. Other than the fact that Pierre S. Du Pont had Ely’s books in his collection, and the incredible similarities seen in his layout and planting designs and horticultural techniques, suggest that the early gardens at Longwood were influenced by Ely. It is also probable that similarities are born from inspiration drawn from visiting many of the same gardens in Europe. But the exact timing of Du Pont’s first gardens corresponding with the popularity and recognition of *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* as the premier book on hardy gardening for the beginning home gardener is
too timely to ignore the plausible influence of Ely on the development of these gardens.

The Garden Club of America

Ely’s significance as a figure in American horticulture is expanded with her involvement in the founding of Garden Club of America and the subsidiary Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.

Ely was one of the twenty-three women who met in the spring of 1913 in Germantown, Philadelphia, upon the personal invitation of the founders of the Garden Club of Philadelphia, Miss Ernestine Goodman and Mrs. Elizabeth Martin (King 1920). At this meeting the Garden Club of America was formed, to inspire “a better knowledge of horticulture among amateurs, for the improvement of our national taste, the preservation of our natural beauty, and for war on its disfigurement” (King 1920). Among the first orders of business was the appointment of the executive committee, for which Mrs. Martin was appointed President, Mrs. Patterson as Honorary President, Miss Goodman as Secretary and Treasure, and Mrs. Ely, Mrs. King, Mrs. Russell, and Mrs. Brewster as Vice Presidents, and Miss Beatrix Jones (later Farrand) and Miss Elizabeth Lee as Garden Consultants. This meeting would later be remembered as the “preliminary meeting of god-mothers” in GCA literature (Martin 1920).

One month later, on June 2nd, 1913, Ely invited her friends, Mrs. Morris Rutherfurd, Mrs. Alloway, and Mrs. Fuller, to Meadowburn to discuss starting a regional garden club for the Orange and Duchess counties of New York (Metzger n.d.). Ely’s proposal of forming a regional garden club was met with enthusiasm, and the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County (GCOD) was formed on that day in
June, in the gardens at Meadowburn. They decided the Club would welcome women and men from both counties on either side of the Hudson River, as many of their Manhattan friends had country places in one or the other (Sandfort 2012). The first official meeting took place ten days later at the home of Mrs. George Douglas in Tuxedo (Metzger n.d.). In the months after founding, the GCOD welcomed several new members, including Dr. Partridge, Mr. Foster, Mrs. Francis Stetson, Mrs. Vernplanck, and Mr. Montgomery Hare. Miss Mary Rutherfurd Jay, a recent graduate of MIT’s school of Landscape Architecture, was elected Honorary Member and Garden Consultant (Metzger n.d.).

As Founding Member and Vice-President, Ely helped create the foundation on which the GCA would build. She was among the small group of founders who lead the Club through its juvenile stage. They chose a name, constructed a mission and by-laws and membership policy, identified project priorities, and created the tone and culture of the Club that remains to this day.

Additionally, Ely helped lead the GCA during some of the most significant projects of its early years. In March of 1917, one month prior to Wilson’s declaration of War on Germany, Ely hosted the GCA Executive Committee at her home on 5th Avenue in New York City. This meeting launched the GCA’s war efforts, including the immediate call for increased production of fruits and vegetables “as a means of reducing the cost of living and as a practical step toward preparedness in case of emergency” (Goodman 1938). Home gardens were planted in fruits and vegetables and canneries were established. The culmination of their efforts was the development of the Women’s Land Army in America, a partnership between the Garden Club of
America, the Women’s National Farm and Garden Association and the Department of Defense (Seale 2012).

Until her sudden death in 1920, Ely was one of the leading figures of the Garden Club of America and the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County. She was an active committee chair, hostess of club events and meetings, and contributed articles to *The Bulletin*. Ely’s books were considered one of the crowning achievements of the GCA, and among other member’s publications had done “much to create the gardening impulse in America” (Goodman 1938, Martin 1920). She served as Vice President of the GCA for five years, until her resignation at the Fifth Annual Meeting in May of 1917 (Goodman 1938). Upon her resignation from Executive Office, the minutes of the GCA meeting recorded:

*From the organization of the Club, five years ago, Mrs. Fairchild’s [Ely’s] unfailing interest, clear, true judgment and broad, practical knowledge of gardening have been of greatest possible aid to the Executive Committee, and to all the members of the Garden Club of America...The Club has most reluctantly accepted this resignation, and in so doing desires to record its deep regret and send to Mrs. Fairchild [Ely] this Minute of appreciation and sincere thanks for all the time, thought and unceasing interest she has continually given the Club* (Brewster 1917).

It is unclear why Ely felt the need to resign from office, however the timing corresponds with a major shift in her personal life. After her marriage to Benjamin T. Fairchild in 1916, she began to invest increasing time and energy in establishing new gardens at his home Faryewold, in Greenwich, Connecticut (Metzger n.d., Furman 1999). The time she dedicated to Meadowburn and the Garden Club of America
waned. There is little evidence that she was actively writing for *The Bulletin* or other publications.

Just after Ely’s death in May of 1920, the impact of her work surfaced again when she was considered for the first Emily D. Renwick Achievement Award for her “invaluable contribution to gardening in America through her book, entitled, *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*” (Brewster 1920a). The committee agreed Ely was a deserving recipient, but in order to qualify for nomination her book must be published the same year the award was issued—she did not qualify. The Committee postponed the Emily D. Renwick Award until 1921 (Brewster 1920a). Perhaps the deferment in its own right was a gesture of recognition of Ely in the year of her death.

Regardless of an official award, the impact of Ely’s accomplishments did not go unrecognized. At the June meeting of 1920, Mrs. Charles Biddle offered a eulogy to Ely:

> It is with heartfelt sorrow and a deep sense of personal loss that the members of the garden Club of America record the death of Mrs. Benjamin T. Fairchild [Ely], one of the Founders of the Club and Vice-President for five years. With her keen interest, practical knowledge, experience and originality, Mrs. Fairchild [Ely] brought to the Club great inspiration, and vitalizing energy, and gave lavishly and unreservedly of her time and talents for the advancement and development of the Club. To her books much that is beautiful and satisfying in our gardens owes to its existence. In the people of the country at large she re-awakened the sense of the possibility to create their own gardens, and in her death they have lost a guide, counselor, and friend (Brewster 1920b).

A resolution was passed to record the eulogy in the club minutes, seconded by Mrs. Bayard Henry and accepted by the meeting at large (Brewster 1920a).
As a founding member and Vice President, Ely’s contribution to the development of the GCA and the causes it pursued was significant. The recognition of Ely throughout the documented history of the GCA illustrates the role she played as a visionary, a leader, and a force of unparalleled energy. The publication of *A Woman's Hardy Garden* is widely recognized as the seminal work that inspired women in America to invest in themselves and their homes by developing hardy perennial gardens. It is accredited within the founding members of the GCA as an instigator for gardening fellowship and the eventual development of an official support network of amateur gardeners in the form of garden clubs. As a leader, Ely helped lay the groundwork for the Garden Club of America, one of the most influential clubs in American horticulture to this day. Furthermore, it is clear that Ely brought enthusiasm and energy to the endeavors she pursued and inspired those she worked with.

**Other Club Involvement**

In addition to her involvement with the Garden Club of America, Ely participated in several other garden related clubs. The Women’s National Horticultural and Agricultural Association, later the Women’s Farm and Garden Association, was established in 1914 to “promote agriculture and horticulture interests among women and to further such interests throughout the county by practical fostering of a love of flowers and of outdoor occupation” (King 1914). Ely is listed as a member of the Women’s National Agricultural and Horticultural Association (American Fruits 1914), although this study did not discover the extent of her involvement. Several of Ely’s GCA friends were involved in this association, such as Louisa Yeomans King who served as President, and Jane Haines.
Jane Haines was also the founder of the Pennsylvania School for Horticulture, what is now Temple Ambler (American Fruits 1914). Haines asked Ely, King, and Beatrix Farrand to join the board of the Pennsylvania School for Horticulture (Way 2009), however they must have declined, as there is no evidence of their participation on the board.

Ely’s club involvement included the International Garden Club, founded by Mrs. Charles Frederick Hoffman in 1914 (New York Times 1915). Ely served on the club’s Reception Committee and Advisory Board (International Garden Club 1915). The Reception Committee and Advisory Board was composed of many distinguished horticulturists, botanists, garden writers, and prominent businessmen of the time. Included in the 1915 roster for the committee were Dr. N. L. Britton of the New York Botanical Garden, George Nash of the New York Horticultural Society, Charles Sprague Sargent of the Arnold Arboretum, Henry Francis DuPont, author Marion Schuyler Van Renssalaer, architect William Adams Delano, and Helena Rutherfurd Ely. The International Garden Club was headquartered at the Bartlow-Pell Mansion in Pelham Bay Park, New York (New York Times 1915). One of the club’s early endeavors was to restore the mansion and its gardens, for which they hired William Adams Delano’s firm, Delano and Aldrich (Taylor 1917). An article printed in 1915 in the New York Times reported on the replanting of the infamous Treaty Oak, the original of which was planted in 1643 at the Bartlow-Pell Mansion and had been struck down by lightning a few years prior (New York Times 1915). Governor Whitman performed the honorary planting of the tree with a silver spade, accompanied
by the club executives and committee members including Dr. N.L. Britton, Helena Rutherfurd Ely, and William Adams Delano (New York Times 1915).

Over 100 Years of Influence

In the ninety odd years since her death in 1920, the story of Helena Rutherfurd Ely has faded from popular garden discourse. Today Ely’s name is seldom recognized, except by the few scholars and garden enthusiasts that know the role she played in American horticultural history.

Ely’s initial impact was long lasting, as seen in the fan mail she received for two decades after her death (Meade 1951), and the fact that A Woman’s Hardy Garden was printed consistently through the 1930’s. But after the middle of the century, Ely was seen through an historical lens. Buckner Hollingsworth included a chapter on Ely in her book, Her Garden Was Her Delight: Famous Women Gardeners (1962), which recognized Ely’s first book of prime importance in the history of American gardens (Hollingsworth 1962). Hollingsworth writes:

Looking through the book today, it is hard to realize how great was its impact and influence. Its author advocated the planting of flowers that are such commonplaces in modern gardens that it is all but impossible to bring them to the attention of her generation of American gardeners. Here was the revolutionary idea that a fine garden could be made by growing hardy perennials and by raising annuals from seed sown out of doors (Hollingsworth 1962).

Ely has been recognized by scholars as an important figure in American garden history for the impact she had on American gardens, American women, and the landscape profession at large (Harris 1994, Way 2009, Begg 2000).
Ely still transcends beyond academia. Ely continues to surface as a sustaining influence in American horticulture. Four decades after Ely’s death, when a multitude of practical garden books were available, home-making icon Martha Stewart chose to follow Ely’s direction in creating her first gardens at Turkey Hill. In an interview with the Town Vibe Bedford, Stewart comments: “Helena Rutherfurd Ely had a great Jersey estate and wrote A Woman’s Hardy Garden, which I read voraciously. I did everything she said…I read that when I was 19 years old, just married and trying to have a garden” (Morris 2007). There is something to be said for that fact that the most influential home-maker of the late 20th and early 21st century found her first gardening inspiration and guidance from Ely. Indirectly that influence has been compounded through Stewart’s own vast span of gardening influence in this country.

In 1990, A Woman’s Hardy Garden was republished by Collier Books as an “American Gardening Classic”, and again in 1999 as a Horticulture Magazine “Garden Classic”, by Lyons Press. Garden Design Magazine featured a list Fifty Things Every American Gardener Should Know in the November 1998 issue. (Kalins 1998). At the top was Ely as one of the “ten great garden writers whose voices ring true”, alongside other garden authors such as Louisa Yeomans King, Anna B. Warner, Elizabeth Lawrence and Henry Mitchell.

The story of Ely resurfaced in 2004, when garden writer Ken Druse took interest in the “gardener who planted a revolution” (Druse 2004). Druse may have had one of the very last interviews with Albert Furman Jr., the second generation of the Furman family to tend the gardens at Meadowburn. The result of Druse’s study was a chronicle of Ely’s legacy as a writer and gardener, published as a two-page color spread in the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune.
Conclusion

Helena Rutherfurd Ely was one of the most influential garden writers of the 20th century. She was a paragon for women gardeners throughout the country, her book was an inspiration for aspiring writers, and her garden was a model for thousands of American home gardens. Helena Rutherfurd Ely never considered herself professional, despite recognition as an authority on horticulture. When she wrote her first book, landscape architecture had been recognized as a profession for a mere four years, with only two women recognized within the professional ranks (Way 2009). Ely created a catalyst that helped to propel women into the home gardens, contributing to the garden renaissance that swept through the country up until WWII (Begg 1991). In so doing, Ely helped pave the way for women in the field of horticulture and landscape design (Way 2009).

While her name has faded from common household knowledge, Ely’s garden at Meadowburn Farm, which stretches across the New Jersey/New York border, still remain. The gardens have been continuously tended by three generations of the original gardener Ely trained. There is an opportunity to preserve Ely’s legacy so that future generations of students, gardeners, history enthusiasts, and the local community can benefit from her vision and knowledge.
INTRODUCTION

Meadowburn Farm is a picturesque estate located in the highlands region of New Jersey, featuring historic gardens and residences, a dairy farm, and vast agricultural and natural lands. Meadowburn was once the country place of Helena Rutherfurd Ely (1858-1920), a pioneering figure in horticulture at the turn of the century and founding member of the Garden Club of America. Surrounding the main residence, Ely built her gardens and developed the practical horticultural knowledge that informed and inspired the publication of her three best-selling and widely influential books on hardy gardening. In her day, Ely was considered one of the premier garden experts in America and her gardens at Meadowburn were recognized as among the finest in the country.

Meadowburn has been in the ownership of the Coster / Gerard family since the 1930’s. Under the stewardship of Charles Henry Coster and his nephew Charles Henry Coster Gerard, the gardens have remained relatively unchanged since Ely’s era. Both men saw value in preserving the gardens and in continuing the employment of three generations of the Furman family trained by Ely to tend to the gardens. In 1993 the residential and garden core were inducted into the New Jersey State and National Register for Historic Places based on their association with Helena Rutherfurd Ely. Today, Ely’s gardens remain much as they were in the early 1900’s.

In 2012 the children of the late C. H. Coster Gerard contacted the Garden Conservancy to discuss the possibility of preserving the gardens at Meadowburn and opening them to public visitation. The Gerard Family have continued their inquiry into
the preservation of the gardens, in hopes of finding a way to preserve the gardens while generating income to balance the cost of maintenance.

This thesis represents the first investigation into the preservation of the gardens at Meadowburn Farm. The objectives were to delineate and clarify the significance of Ely and her gardens, and thus pose a case for preservation; to identify options for preservation; and to assess important factors impacting feasibility of preservation.

Chapter One contains a review of literature supporting elements of this study. Chapter Two provides a summary of the materials and methods employed during this research.

Chapter Three contains the results of an investigation of a variety of elements that impact the feasibility of preservation including location, community receptiveness, necessary site improvements, management and maintenance, and existing documentation of the gardens. Additionally, this section includes an overview of for-profit garden models, non-profit garden models, easement models, and a family trust model that may be appropriate for a future venture at Meadowburn to emulate. The chapter is concluded with a section representing the results of a survey distributed to historic gardens open to the public in order to identify patterns of preservation, use, financing and leadership.

Chapter Four presents a discussion of the significance of the gardens, the value of their preservation, recommended models for preservation, and elements that affect the feasibility of preservation. The chapter concludes with a set of recommendations to be considered in future planning, as well as further research to conduct.

It is the author’s hope that this research provides a foundation for the current owners of Meadowburn to build upon. The scope of this research is by no means
exhaustive. The objective is to demonstrate the value in preservation, while posing
options for the owners to consider in planning for the long-term preservation of
Helena Rutherfurd Ely’s historically significant gardens.
Chapter 1
LITERATURE REVIEW

Garden Preservation

Over the last half century there has been a growing interest in preserving the gardens of our cultural heritage, both for their intrinsic beauty and as a means to “appreciate the tastes and techniques of the previous generations” (Plumtre 2007). This can been seen in the proliferation of regional historic garden societies (Adams 2004), and over 80,000 listings of historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places since its founding in 1966 (NPS 2011). The establishment of organizations supporting the preservation of gardens, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1947, the Garden Conservancy in 1989, and the Cultural Landscape Foundation in 1998, are a further testament to the interest in preserving America’s landscape heritage.

The U.S. Secretary of the Interior developed standard significance criteria for properties applying for the National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service 1990). In 1993, Meadowburn Farm’s residential and garden core was recognized by the New Jersey State and National Register of Historic Placed as an historic district for association with Helena Rutherfurd Ely (DuPont, Dodd 1993). In preparation for nomination, a history and description of the house and grounds of Meadowburn Farm was created. The study included a detailed history of the land’s ownership from 1792
to the present, including an account of Mrs. Ely’s gardening career (DuPont, Dodd 1993).

The Secretary of the Interior also developed standards for preserving historic landscapes, which are distilled into four categories, or preservation treatments; preservation, restoration, reconstruction and rehabilitation (Birnbaum, 1992). The appropriateness of a given treatment is based on available resources, documentation, historic integrity and condition of the landscape, and objectives for interpretation and use (Birnbaum 1994). Developing a treatment plan requires a multidisciplinary approach to the preservation of a landscape drawing on expertise in science, history, architecture and horticulture.

The processes, techniques, and nuances of garden preservation have been researched and discussed in depth by gardeners, designer and scholars. Any preservation plan must start with thorough historic research and an assessment of the current condition of a garden (Birnbaum 1994, Favretti, Favretti 1991). During the planning process it is important to consider how the intended use of the garden, accessibility laws, advances in horticultural technology, and increased cost of labor may impact the preservation of the garden (Favretti, Favretti 1991, Watkins, Wright 2007, Gouldty 1993). For example, deer herbivory is a threat faced by many gardens on the East Coast, and for the first time strict management systems are required to protect vegetation (Grande, Katz & Slifer 2010, Grande, et al. 1998).

A critical element of any preservation project is the establishment of a plan for the long-term care, management, ownership and use of the property. In some cases, developing a non-profit organization to own and operate a garden is the most feasible preservation option (Byers, Noble 2006, Hanna 2004, Gagliardi 2009). Other gardens
partner with existing non-profit organizations (Byers, Noble 2006), which benefit from transparency, leadership, and clear expectations (Publow 2010).

Some owners of significant historic gardens donate preservation easements to ensure the historic characteristics of their garden remain in perpetuity (Garden Conservancy n.d.), while others operate their historic estate and gardens as an historic inn or headquarters for a business (Shopsin 1994).

Developing revenue streams to support operations is often a critical aspect of preserving an historic property (Shopsin 1994). Non-profit organizations usually rely heavily on donations and grant funding, however studies show an increasing trend towards business-like enterprise as a means of diversifying revenue streams (Foelich 1999, Dart 2004). On the other hand, some museums and gardens have developed for-profit subsidiaries to generate income without jeopardizing non-profit status (Barr 1992).

**Agritourism**

Agritourism activities are increasingly incorporated into farm operations to enhance farm revenue and contribute to the viability of the farming operations (Schilling 2006, Rilla 2011). The state of New Jersey, the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council, and the Vernon Township, have recognized the preservation of open space, and the support of heritage and agricultural tourism, as key priority areas in future planning (Wiengart 2008a, Litvack 2010, Caldwell 2010, Wiengart 2008b).

Common agritourism activities include on-site direct marketing of products, educational tourism, on-farm entertainment, cheese-making, jam making, gardening classes, horseback riding, fly-fishing, bird-watching, farm tours and more (Schilling
Farm stays are increasingly popular, as tourists want to participate in farm activity to complement a nice place to stay (Donaldson, Momsen 2011).

A study by Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing of Rutgers University, shows “farmers with greenhouses, garden centers, and other floriculture activities are likely to attain higher income levels compared to those without these facilities (Govindasamy, Pingali & Hossai 1998). In 2003, nursery owner Tony Avent noted that for a retail nursery business, “a one-person operation can usually generate up to $50,000 in sales without much problem and without a lot of expense. A single person with some part-time help can probably reach the $100,000 barrier” (Avent 2003). Avent expresses the importance of a clear mission statement and thorough business planning. Additionally, studies show a positive impact of agritourism on small nurseries, showing that agritourism activities such as u-pick flowers, CSA programs, demonstrations, garden tours, festivals, and value-added goods, can contribute to the viability of farming productions and reduce risk for nursery growers by diversifying income (Brumfield, Mafouna 2002, Bachman 2006).
Chapter 2
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental Design
This study followed a mixed methods model, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative research techniques. A concurrent embedded strategy was employed to allow for a comprehensive perspective of this study (Creswell 2009). Specifically, qualitative research predominated but was supported by secondary quantitative data.

Primary Sources
Primary source research was conducted in order to establish the significance and influence of Ely and Meadowburn in the context of American horticulture of the early twentieth century. Primary sources included Ely’s published writing, correspondence, deeds and wills, critiques of Ely’s work, mentions of Ely and evidence of her influence in published in bulletins, newspapers, and magazines from 1900 to 2012, oral histories, and historic photographs. Additional primary sources included horticulture books published from approximately 1850 to 1920 in order to understand Ely within a larger context of garden writing during that time.

Site Studies
Site visits to Meadowburn assessed the feasibility of preserving Ely’s gardens, and were made an average of once a month. On site studies consisted of photographic
documentation throughout the year, identification of heritage dahlias, measurements, and survey of the condition of garden features.

Interviews

Interviews (on-site and via telephone) were conducted using the “interview guide approach,” in which topics are outlined in advance, but sequence and wording of questions is developed during the interview (Patton, 2002). Individuals were selected for interviews based on the following criteria: association with Meadowburn, association with Helena Rutherfurd Ely, association with the communities surrounding Meadowburn Farm, academic credentials within the field of landscape architecture and landscape history, association with an entity involved in preserving an historic garden, and association with a for-profit garden open to the public. Selected interviewees included:

- Parker Andes, Director of Horticulture, Biltmore House and Gardens
- Dr. Tomasz Anisko, Curator, Longwood Gardens
- B. Danforth Ely, Grandson of Helena Rutherfurd Ely
- Walter DeVries, Meadowburn Gardener, Son of Albert Furman, Jr.
- Jerry Fritz, Owner, Linden Hill Gardens
- Louise Hyde, Owner, Well Sweep Herb Farm
- Michael Johndrow, Director, Warwick Chamber of Commerce
- Rachael Kane, Owner, Perennial Pleasures Nursery
- Alena Kaufman, Facility Rentals Manager, Glynwood Farm
- Russell Keil, Owner, Keil Cove
- Kate Kerin, Board Member, The Beatrix Farrand Gardens at Bellefield
- Dr. Daniel Krall, MLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture, Cornell University
- Dr. Richard Lighty, Former Director, Longwood Graduate Program
- Michael Newhard, Mayor, Village of Warwick, NY
- Barbara Peelor, Board Member, The Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield and Member, the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties.
• Charles and Joan Platt, Trustees, Platt House and Garden
• Dia Steiger, Executive Director, Wing Haven
• Kathleen Stradar, Member, the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties
• Clifford van Strander, Meadowburn Gardener, Brother-in-law of Albert Furman, Jr.
• Deborah Sweeton, Owner, General’s Garden
• Judith Tankard, Garden Historian and Author
• Dr. Thaisa Way, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Washington
• Jane White, Member, Anne Spencer Garden and the Hill Top Garden Club

Questionnaire

Additional qualitative data was gathered through a questionnaire developed for the Gerard Family, the current owners of Meadowburn. The objective of the questionnaire was to understand their sentiments regarding the preservation and use of the garden, as well as ability and interest in supporting such efforts. The nineteen questions were responded to in a collective voice from the members of the Gerard Family.

Historic Garden Survey

A survey was developed and administered to discover patterns in ownership and operations of selected historic gardens owned by a government agency, non-profit organization or educational institution, and to identify specific gardens suitable for follow-up research. Approximately 461 historic gardens throughout the U.S. were selected to receive the survey and were initially targeted based on their association with the Garden Conservancy, membership in the American Public Garden Association, and from specific suggestions from other professionals. A complete list of survey questions is listed in Appendix H.
**Institutional Review Board**

The methods employed for the survey and interviews, as well as specific questions contained therein, were reviewed and approved by the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board (Appendix A).
Chapter 3

RESULTS

3.1 Feasibility

This section presents results on the feasibility assessment guided by the criteria published by the Garden Conservancy in the Preservation Handbook Volume 1, *Taking A Garden Public: Feasibility and Startup* (Byers, Noble 2006). The Garden Conservancy is a non-profit organization that supports private gardens transition to public through horticultural, technical, management and financial expertise (Garden Conservancy 2013). The guidelines presented in *Taking A Garden Public: Feasibility and Startup* were established to “help organizers assess the feasibility of both preserving a garden and establishing an organization to manage the garden and open it to the public” (Byers, Noble 2006).

3.1.1 Location

Meadowburn Farm is situated between the villages of Warwick, New York and Vernon, New Jersey. While the 525-acre farm spans the New York/New Jersey border, the residential parcel that includes the gardens is technically within the state of New Jersey, in Vernon Township in Sussex County. The historic gardens and residential core consist of approximately four and one-half acres along Meadowburn Road. This parcel is as an historic site on the state and national register of historic
places, and is surrounded on all sides by Meadowburn’s agricultural acreage. Directly across the road is the farmstead, which currently operates as a dairy.

Because of this location Meadowburn has a history with two townships that differ in demographics and government regulations. Vernon Township has an estimated population of 23,943, with a median household income of $81,404 (U.S. Census Bureau 2013). Meadowburn is approximately four miles from the closest incorporated village of Vernon. Vernon Township is located within the New Jersey Highlands. Over half of the Township acreage is in public open space, which includes parts of the Wawayanda State Park and the Walkill National Wildlife Refuge (Caldwell 2010).

Warwick Township has an estimated population of 32,065 with a median household income of $86,304 (U.S. Census Bureau 2013). The Township includes three incorporated villages; Warwick, Florida and Greenwood Lake. The village of Warwick is approximately five miles north of Meadowburn Farm on Route 94. Many Warwick residents commute 55 miles to New York City for work. The proximity to New York City makes Warwick a popular area for recreation and tourism, as it is an easy day or weekend trip for city residents.

3.1.2 The Farm

Meadowburn Farm has operated as a dairy for over 100 years. After a tragic fire burnt the dairy barn to the ground in 2010, the landowners have recently completed a rebuild of the dairy barn and cheese room. The previous dairy and cheese production proved to be incredibly successful for the farmer. The cheese room sold cheese and fresh baked bread from a wood fired oven, in addition to offering popular cheese-making classes for the public. A new farmer has moved onsite to take over the
dairy operations, and cheese production and sales is scheduled to commence in the June of 2013. A business plan is in development, and includes plans for retail and wholesale sales of artisan cheese, milk, yogurt, and ice cream. Recent investments have been made in improving the farmstead facilities and building a heard of Jersey cows and Nubian goats. The owners plan to compliment the dairy operation with field grown market vegetables, herbs, honey, and more.

3.1.3 The Neighborhood

The historic residential and garden core and farmstead are completely surrounded by Meadowburn’s agricultural lands. The only rights of way are for the electrical company and the railroad. Thus, it is unlikely that neighbors will be negatively impacted by changes of use and increased activity at Meadowburn Farm.

3.1.4 The Landowner

Meadowburn Farm is owned by the Meadowburn Trust established for the benefit of the Gerard family parents and children. It is the desire of the trust beneficiaries to keep the property within the ownership of the Meadowburn Trust. A questionnaire completed by the beneficiaries for this study stated, “We would love to see Meadowburn maintained as a beautiful and perhaps significant house, garden and farm for the enjoyment of our family, friends, and open to the public”.

Meadowburn Farm is costly to maintain, and currently is a drain on the Trust’s resources. In order to keep the property, revenue must be generated by the farm and garden to cover the ongoing costs of the property. The landowners are amenable to
public visitation of the historic gardens while the family still lives in the main house, and would consider the following activities while still a private residence:

- Scheduled tours
- Open visitation hours during weekdays
- Open visitation hours during weekends
- Events open to the public
- Private event rentals of garden and designated facilities
- Educational programs
- Nursery production
- Nursery retail sales
- Photography / Film shoots

Should the family ever not actively reside at Meadowburn, overnight accommodations could be considered.

The landowners understand that opening the gardens to the public will require changes, including adapting buildings to new use, designating space for parking, and enhancing safety and accessibility. They will consider such changes, if part of a well researched plan that is in keeping with the residential uses and farming operations.

3.1.5 Community Receptiveness

3.1.5.1 The Ely Family

B. Danforth Ely is the son of Alfred Ely, Jr., and grandson of Helena Rutherfurd Ely. He currently serves as a Trustee for the 1772 Foundation and the Hamilton Partnership for Paterson, two organizations dedicated to historic preservation in New Jersey. Mr. Ely and his wife Deborah Ely have remained in touch with the Gerard family and visited Meadowburn on several occasions over the years. The Elys are very supportive of the idea of preserving Meadowburn. If a non-profit is
formed to care for the gardens, there is possibility that they would be interested in being involved in some capacity.

Kimberly Ely, daughter of Brewster Ely, and great-granddaughter of Helena Rutherfurd Ely, is also very supportive of the idea of preserving Meadowburn. She is very knowledgeable about her family history and is a valuable resource for future historical research.

3.1.5.2 Warwick and Vernon Community

Throughout this study, members of the Warwick, Vernon, and horticultural communities expressed encouragement for the preservation of Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn Farm. Several community leaders were interviewed regarding their perception of how the local community might respond to the preservation of Meadowburn and public visitation.

Michael Newhard, mayor of the Village of Warwick, is a lifelong resident of Warwick. He currently owns and runs a local retail business on Main Street. Mayor Newhard knew Albert Furman, Jr. and visited him at Meadowburn on several occasions prior to his death in 2004. Mayor Newhard is very enthusiastic about the possibility that Meadowburn might be preserved and open to the public. He believes that the Warwick community will definitely embrace the idea. Mayor Newhard stated, “it has been a personal dream of mine to see Meadowburn restored.” Mayor Newhard sees great potential in creating a horticultural education center at Meadowburn, as there are none in the area. He also recognizes food production and farming as ever popular in the area. One amenity that Warwick is in need of is a conference center. Mayor Newhard believes that money and deer are the two primary obstacles facing the preservation of the gardens at Meadowburn.
Michael Johndrow, Director of the Warwick Valley Chamber of Commerce, believes the Warwick community would be very enthusiastic about Meadowburn opening to the public. He would be surprised if there was not good financial support for Meadowburn. Johndrow expressed, “Warwick is a community that is passionate about its village and proud of its history. We also value gardening”.

Other community members expressed enthusiasm and encouragement for the preservation of Meadowburn through personal communication with the author. This includes members of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County, the Warwick Historical Society, and local business owners. Deborah Sweeton, owner of the General’s Garden Center and Techni-Growers Nursery sees potential in Meadowburn as an event and wedding venue, and recognizes potential value in marketing the heirloom plants that remain in the gardens. Ronald DuPont, Vernon Township Historian, believes that any efforts to preserve Meadowburn, or open it to public visitation, would be reacted to positively by the Vernon community. Attempts to interview Vernon Township and Village officials were unsuccessful.

There are three aspects of Warwick and Vernon that suggest the preservation of Meadowburn, and the accompanying educational, social and economic opportunities it could create, would be welcomed by the local community: history, horticulture, and agri-tourism.

3.1.5.2.1 History

Warwick is listed as an Historic District on the state and national register of historic places. Warwick has a strong pride in its local history, as seen through the very active Warwick Historical Society. The Warwick Historical Society currently owns and cares for nine historic properties in the area. The Warwick Historical
Society hosted the author of this thesis research for a lecture on the history of Ely and Meadowburn and its potential preservation, during which there was much enthusiasm expressed for the idea from the audience.

The Vernon Township Historical Society promotes the history of Vernon through preservation and education. Meadowburn Farm is an important historic site for Vernon Township, as the original part of the main house was the home of the first Vernon settler, Thomas DeKay. The Rutherfurd Family also played a significant role in Vernon’s history. Meadowburn was included in the 1993 Historic House Tour of Sussex County, organized by the Sussex County Arts and Heritage Council. Ronald DuPont, the Vernon Township Historian, was an integral figure in the nomination of Meadowburn Farm to the state and national historic register. While the Vernon Township Historical Society is not as well funded as the Warwick Historical Society, and it is uncertain how community support would manifest for the preservation of Meadowburn, DuPont believes that the Vernon community would react positively if Meadowburn opened for public visitation.

3.1.5.2.2 Horticulture

Several horticultural businesses, organizations, and initiatives in the region surrounding Meadowburn Farm suggest the local community has a considerable interest in horticultural activities. The following section outlines a number of horticultural related entities that may provide valuable partnerships for a future venture at Meadowburn.

The Garden State Garden Consortium: This is an association of 20 New Jersey gardens, whose mission is “to increase public awareness of and appreciation for
New Jersey’s public gardens by promoting their horticultural, educational, historic and artistic value and to facilitate the collaboration of allied professionals in order to promote public garden visitation, stewardship and support” (Garden State Garden Consortium 2013).

The association operates as a non-profit 501(c)3 organization, and membership is limited to gardens with non-profit status. The consortium operates a website featuring the twenty member gardens, listing the amenities of each, links to individual garden websites, and a map indicating the location of each garden. The benefits of membership include participation in large scale events, publicity, group purchasing power, networking and professional development, and joint programming.

**Earthly Delights:** Earthly Delights is an annual benefit event produced by the Friends of Earthly Delights in partnership with the Land Conservancy of New Jersey. The purpose of the event is to promote and support open space, public parks, and public gardens in New Jersey.

Earthly Delights is a three-day event in early June, hosted in the home garden of a private donor. The event features a cocktail party, vendors of garden antiques, accessories, rare plants, and art, a silent plant auction, and a lecture series. Each year the proceeds of the event go to a selected New Jersey organization. Beneficiaries of past Earthly Delight events include Buck Gardens (2011), and New Jersey Keep It Green Campaign (2012).

**The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties:** The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties (GCOD) is a member club of the Garden Club of
America, and is one of the 12 original affiliate clubs. Helena Rutherfurd Ely founded the GCOD in 1913 at Meadowburn Farm. For the past one hundred years the GCOD has continued to recognize their founder as an important part of the club’s identity. In 1998, the GCOD documented Meadowburn for the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian. The GCOD used Meadowburn as the site for their 50th anniversary celebration in 1963, and the GCOD have toured Meadowburn on a few occasions since. The year 2013 marks the centennial anniversary of the GCOD, and the story of their founder surfaced at the center of activity. The GCOD centennial flower show is developed around the theme of Ely and Meadowburn. Currently, Warwick Township is home to the majority of GCOD club members.

One of the ways the GCOD shows a commitment to public horticulture is through club projects within the community, including a variety of parks and gardens, such as the Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield in Hyde Park, the Lewis Woodlands in Warwick, the 1810 Garden in Warwick, Mills Mansions in Straatsburg, the Jane Colden Native Plant Sanctuary in Vails Gate, the Cary Arboretum in Millbrook, Hill Hold in Monroe, and Downing Park in Newburgh. The involvement of the GCOD in each of these sites depends on the specific needs of the project, but the main form of support is hands-on help with garden maintenance. Other assistance has included creating designs for areas of a garden, maintaining specific areas of a garden, or providing funding for a specific area in the garden such as the rhododendron dell at the Cary Arboretum. The Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield benefited as a project of the GCOD through hands-on help, and eventually small financial gifts when it was awarded the GCA Founders Fund Award as a runner up on two occasions.
The GCOD has expressed much enthusiasm regarding the preservation of Meadowburn. In June of 2012, the GCOD, in partnership with the Warwick Historical Society, hosted the author of this thesis research in Warwick for a presentation on the history of Meadowburn and the potential for its preservation. There was much interest in the Meadowburn expressed by individual members.

**Warwick in Bloom and the Warwick Valley Gardeners:** The Warwick community is deeply committed to horticulture. In 2010, the Village of Warwick won the international “Communities in Bloom” award for their commitment to community beautification, civic pride, and environmental responsibility. This effort was spearheaded by Warwick in Bloom, a non-profit association that works to beautify Warwick through a variety of projects. Among the group’s many annual projects are planting numerous small garden plots, baskets and planters around the Village of Warwick, tree replacement, and the restoration of the historic gardens at the Lewis Woodlands (Warwick in Bloom 2010). The Warwick Valley Gardeners, a local garden club, also participates in the Warwick in Bloom efforts. Ronald DuPont gave a presentation to the Warwick Valley Gardeners, who were very interested in the history of Ely and Meadowburn.

**Nurseries and Flower Farms:** There are several nurseries and flower farms in the area that contribute to the horticultural interest of the Warwick Valley. The General’s Garden Center and Plant Market is a large retail garden center working in partnership with Techni-Growers Greenhouses. They offer a full range of plants and garden goods and offer a few educational programs throughout the year. Sheuermann
Farms and Greenhouse produces a variety of perennials, annuals, and baskets. High Meadow Flower Farm is a wholesale, specialty cut flower farm providing seasonal cut flowers to Hudson Valley florists. Grammy’s Garden operates as a specialty flower farm and florist, and sell at the Warwick Farmer’s Market. Emmerich Greenhouses produces cut flowers, annuals and perennials, and sell at Warwick Farmer’s Market and New York City Greenmarkets. There are several apple orchards in the valley, which draw tourists in fall for the U-Pick harvest.

3.1.5.2.3 Tourism

Located within “a days drive of over 20 million people” (Wiengart 2008b), Meadowburn Farm is within a region that has access to a significant tourism market. Warwick and Vernon Townships both offer a range of four-season tourism attractions. Located 55 miles from New York City, the Warwick Valley is a convenient day or weekend trip for city residents. The fall season features Apple Fest, which draws 35,000 visitors annually, and is one of biggest fall events in the Hudson Valley. Spring and summer tourists visit the lake and nearby parks, and winter offers a variety of snow sports. The Village of Warwick has an active year round event schedule, with events such as Taste of Warwick, the Bridal Trail, Wind and Jazz Festival, Ladies Night Out, and live music.

Vernon Township’s motto is, “New Jersey’s Four Season Recreation Community;” The Wawayanda State Park and Walkill River National Wildlife Refuge run through Vernon Township, and host 20 miles of the Appalachian Trail. The Vernon Township website states:
Vernon thrives as a year round destination for outdoor enthusiasts of every persuasion. The convergence of skiers and snowboarders during the winter months gives way to hikers, golfers, mountain bikers, kayakers, campers, picnickers...you name it. Vernon definitely lives up to its billing as New Jersey’s four season recreation community (Litvack 2010).

In March of 2012, the Warwick Valley Chamber of Commerce rolled out the “Discover the Warwick Valley” tourism plan, to include and benefit all towns and hamlets within Warwick Township, New York, and Vernon Township, New Jersey. The tourism plan was “designed to draw visitors from throughout the tri-state region and beyond and will highlight all of the four-season activities, dining options and accommodations that will enable people to discover their own experience of a beautiful area that is only a short drive from their homes” (Gavan 2012). A website has been developed highlighting the range of local attractions, accommodations, events, and recreational activities. There is no shortage of activity in the Warwick Valley. Michael Johndrow lists the following as some of the Warwick Valley offerings:

- 40 eateries, from 5 Star dining to cafes
- 17 B&Bs
- 6 apple orchards
- 4 wineries
- Black Dirt Region
- Organic Agriculture
- Greenwood Lake
- 5 ski areas
- 7+ golf courses

Michael Johndrow states, the Warwick Valley “is in the perfect location… It is the perfect place to seek country solitude from the city.”
**Heritage Tourism:** The *New Jersey Heritage Master Plan*, developed in 2010, presents strategies to actively support and promote heritage tourism, including develop a management and partnership system to support and advocate for New Jersey’s heritage tourism industry, develop heritage products and infrastructure, enhance state-owned heritage sites as centerpieces for heritage tourism, and build a strong marketing network (Litvack 2010).

Historic resource protection is a focus area of the *Highlands Regional Master Plan*. Historic sites, properties and structures are recognized as important regional resources that provide the public with “an understanding of how the land and the people of the Highlands Region have changed over time” (Wiengart 2008a). Policies that support the protection and promotion of historic properties include, but are not limited to:

*Policy 4A7: To promote historic and cultural heritage tourism in the Highlands Region.*  *Policy 4A9: To advocate on the federal and state levels for grants and financial incentives to aid landowners in the preservation and maintenance of historic, cultural, and archaeological resources* (Wiengart 2008a).

**Agri-tourism:** Agri-tourism, defined as “the business of establishing farms as travel destinations for educational and recreational purposes”, has been recognized by the New Jersey State Agricultural Board as a development strategy to increase the viability of the state’s agricultural industry (Schilling 2011). Since 2006, the New Jersey Department of Agriculture (NJDA) has invested in agri-tourism research to determine its viability as a model for New Jersey Farmers, and is one of the few states
that has comprehensively studied the impact of agri-tourism on the state farming industry. Reports proved that agri-tourism was an effective model for farmers to generate income, with statewide revenues greater than $57.7 million in 2006, and additional increased revenues from unrelated tourist spending (Schilling 2011). The NJDA has since committed to the agri-tourism industry by developing strategic partnerships, advancing consumer promotion, and supporting industry education (Wiengart 2008b). The NJDA has appointed an advisory council to research and recommend strategies to support and expand agri-tourism in New Jersey, and maintains a website titled, Jersey Fresh, that links consumers to agri-tourism activities (New Jersey Department of Agriculture 2013). The Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council has committed to working with the NJDA to further expand agri-tourism in the Highlands region. The Rutgers New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station continues to study trends and provide resources for farmers (Rabin 2011).

Agricultural sustainability, viability and stewardship is a key area of focus in the Highlands Regional Master Plan, which outlines goals and strategies to promote sustainable agricultural operations in the region. The plan states:

_In order to enhance agricultural viability, agricultural operations need to evolve over time to meet ever changing market demands. The Highlands Council will promote and encourage innovative agricultural practices including, but not limited to direct marketing, organic farming, agri-tourism such as farmers markets and roadside stands, niche markets and community supported agriculture businesses. Additional business opportunities should be provided to the owner/operators of farms to increase the economic potential of the farm unit_ (Wiengart 2008a).
Policies that support sustainable and viable agriculture in the region include, but are not limited to:

Policy 3B4: To support incentives and funding opportunities for the control of invasive species, white-tailed deer reduction programs, and the water value of well managed agricultural lands. Policy 3B5: To promote and enhance innovative agricultural practices and programs that promote long-term viability of the agricultural industry including, but not limited to, direct marketing, organic farming, agri-tourism such as farmers markets and roadside stands, niche markets, and community supported agriculture (Wiengart 2008a).

Vernon Township is also committed to supporting agri-tourism activities. In the 2010 Vernon Township master plan, an Agricultural Eco-Tourism District along Route 94 was designated as a development zone that permits “limited commercial development related to tourism generated by agricultural uses and outdoor recreation” (Caldwell 2010).

Agri-tourism is identified as one of the pillars of interest on the Discover Warwick Valley website, serving as a directory for users to locate u-pick farms, wineries and farmers markets (Warwick Valley Chamber of Commerce 2012). There is a long tradition of agriculture in the Warwick Valley. The Black Dirt Region, located in Warwick Township, is recognized as premier agricultural land in the area. The three regional farmers markets, Florida Farmers Market, the Warwick Valley Farmers Market, and the Pine Island Black Dirt Farmers Market, draw local customers and day-trippers from New York City.
3.1.6 Site Improvements

3.1.6.1 Land Use and Zoning Regulations

The majority of the Meadowburn acreage, including the historic residential core, is located in Sussex County, where land use is restricted and subject to Vernon Township zoning regulations and the Highlands Preservation Area regulations. The historic Meadowburn residence and garden are zoned Residential 2 (R-2). The surrounding acreage is zoned “Agricultural,” and is now under an agricultural conservation easement held by the Sussex County Agricultural Development Board.

Under the New Jersey Right to Farm Act, Meadowburn Farm, including the historic residential parcel, is permitted to produce agricultural crops, operate a farm market, and conduct agricultural education and recreational activities.

Craig Roland, Zoning Officer for Vernon Township, was consulted regarding the possibility of rezoning to allow for enhanced commercial activity, such as a shop or garden open to the public, on the historic residential and garden parcel. Roland noted that this may require a zoning variance, applied for through the Land Use Board, and special events may require prior permitting. Because the property is historic, Roland suggested rezoning as a “historic landmark.” This requires communicating with the Vernon Township Historic Preservation Commission (VHPC).

Vernon Township Historic Landmark zoning designation protects the historic features of the property while allowing an owner to make improvements and change the use of a site, provided any changes are approved by the VHPC in addition to traditional permitting processes. The benefit of this designation for Meadowburn would be allowing for changes in use. Vernon Township Historian Ronald DuPont, Jr., expressed that given that the residential core is already listed on the national...
register, the only preservation benefit to the current landowners is further securing the preservation of the site under future ownership.

According to the Highlands Regional Master Plan, Meadowburn Farm is located within the Highlands Preservation Area, which requires municipal and county conformance to the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act (Wiengart 2008a). Furthermore, Meadowburn is located within a region of the Highlands Preservation Area that is noted for critical wildlife habitat, high watershed value, wetlands, significant natural areas, and cultural historic sights. Two key areas of the Highlands Regional Master Plan are ‘historic resource protection’ and ‘agricultural sustainability, viability and stewardship’. Under these two focus areas the master plan promotes the enhancement of agricultural and heritage related business and tourism. Development and site improvements directly related to the farm and historic garden may be acceptable under the current zoning regulations, however further inquiry is necessary.

3.1.6.2 Observation of Current Condition of Garden Features

While the gardens were frequently changing during Ely’s time, no significant features have been removed or dramatically changed since. Due to the continued stewardship of Meadowburn by the Coster/Gerard family and the continued maintenance by the Furman family, the hardscape and layout of Ely’s original garden design remain much as they did in the early 1900’s. Reduced maintenance, increased deer pressure, age and weather damage have taken a toll in the past several decades, and the integrity of the garden planting has deteriorated substantially.
**Hemlock Hedges:** The hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) hedges enclose the formal garden and flank the driveway (Figure 1). These hedges were planted with hemlocks set 18” apart prior to 1905. The hedges are in poor condition, as they were pruned up after intense deer damage and many sections have either died out or are damaged from weather.

**Perennial Borders:** Four perennial borders measuring 76’ by 22’ are intersected by two 8’ wide grass walks. Currently the borders contain varieties of *Phlox paniculata*, *Salvia grandiflora*, varieties of *Anemone japonica*, *Hibiscus moscheutos*, *Stachys byzantina*, mixed *Narcissus*, and *Liriope sp* (Figure 2). The plantings of the perennial borders have fluctuated over the past 120 years. In Ely’s era, beds were edged with box. Catalpa standards measuring five feet high were planted in intervals in each border. The sundial was placed in the center of the intersection, originally planted with a crimson rambler rose. Heirloom plants still remain in the borders, but there is no particular design to the plantings.

**The Pergola Garden:** The pergola garden consists of a 70’ long cedar pergola, and a bed located between the gravel path and stonewall to the South. The beds are planted with ferns and wisteria vines. To the West of the pergola is a small bed planted with roses (Figure 3).

**Peony Borders:** Behind each perennial border is a 2’ by 72’ peony border. Two additional peony borders to the West of the formal garden measure 2’ by 95’ and 2’ by 117’ feet. The borders are densely planted with herbaceous peonies that date to Ely’s era. Total peony border linear footage is approximately 500’ (Figure 4).
Figure 1: Hemlock hedge flanking the driveway, June, 2012.

Figure 2: The perennial border in the Formal Garden looking South toward the Pergola, May, 2012.
Figure 3: Pergola gardens looking East, perennial border on left, May, 2012.

Figure 4: Peony border, May, 2012
The Grass Walk: The grass walk measures approximately 6’ wide by 280’ long, and runs along the easterly hemlock hedge of the Formal Garden and the Pool Garden, flanked on the East by mixed shrubs and trees (Figure 5). The overall condition is good, however the shrub row will require maintenance. The grass walk pre-dates 1902.

The Pool Garden: The Pool Garden measures approximately 115’ by 45’, and features a round pool with cherub and fish fountain (Figure 6). The pool contains water lilies (*Nymphaea sp.*) in summer. Three benches are placed at the edges of the garden. Several large cedars (*Thuja sp.*) grow along the West and South end – these were originally small pyramidal features in Ely’s design. The Pool Garden is flanked on the East by the hemlock hedge, and to the West by an Arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*) hedge. The arborvitae hedge was added after 1917, and was originally intended for the Fairchild garden in Connecticut.

Greenhouse Garden: The Greenhouse Garden consists of two borders measuring approximately 10’ by 105’, with a gravel path between (Figure 7). Currently the borders include, but not limited to, a variety of iris species and cultivars, balloon flowers (*Platycodon*), and three pear trees (*Pyrus*). The iris date to the Ely era and Coster era. These borders, along with the dahlia and annual beds, are the last remaining beds of the Picking Garden and Vegetable Garden, which used to occupy the majority of the lawn area West of the Formal Garden and Pool Garden.

Dahlia Beds: The two dahlia beds measure approximately 2’ by 115’, and are separated by a narrow gravel path bordered with periwinkle (*Vinca minor*) (Figure 8). In June the beds are planted with dahlia tubers dating to the Ely era. The overall
condition of these beds is good, however the gravel path and periwinkle edging is weed ridden.

**Annual Beds:** The two annual beds measure approximately 6’ by 30’, and flank the sides of the path running perpendicular to the main garden axis. The annual beds are planted each summer with assorted annuals.

**The House Gardens:** The plantings around the house mainly consist of healthy boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*) and yews (*Taxus baccata*) that are showing damage from deer damage. Several large trees have been removed from around the house in the past few years, including black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) and a silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*). Old stumps of trees remain in terraces, and some evergreens are damaged. The tubbed bay laurels were propagated from cuttings of the original plants, but are not trained as standards (Figure 9).
Figure 5: Grass Walk looking North, September 2012
Figure 6: The Pool Garden, looking towards the perennial borders, June, 2012

Figure 7: The Greenhouse Gardens in iris season, May, 2012
Figure 8: Dahlia beds with annual beds on upper right, August, 2012

Figure 9: The South terrace showing bay laurels, May, 2012
The Evergreen Garden: The Evergreen Garden measures approximately 90’ by 115’, and consists of a stone terrace stepping down to a rectangular lawn (Figure 10). In the center is a rectangular pool with ellipsis on the ends. The garden contains ornamentation dating to the Ely and Coster eras. The East, West and North ends are heavily planted with mixed evergreen shrubs and trees. This garden was designed circa 1910’s, and planted with a variety of evergreen material. This area is in poor condition: the conifers are over grown and exhibit extensive deer and weather damage and several evergreens have been removed. The physical integrity of the stone terrace is suspect and the pool does not function properly.

Hidden Pathway: The hidden pathway is a stone path that runs along the bank from the Carriage House to the Southwest corner of the Evergreen Garden. The pathway is overgrown, and clearly has not been used for a long time. This pathway and bank may represent the location of the May Flowering Hillside garden noted in Beautiful Gardens in America, by Louise Shelton.

The Cedar Walk: The Cedar Walk is approximately 20’ wide and 100’ long, gradually curving up a hillside and terminating at a large oak (Quercus sp.) and bolder. The pathway is flanked by mature yew (Taxus baccata) and white pine (Pinus strobus) (Figure 11). The trees appear to be healthy, although the area is rampant with weeds and poison ivy (Toxicodendron radicans). The Cedar Walk dates to Ely’s era, prior to 1911. Just inside the rows of cedar Ely planted a variety of perennials, such as Boltonia and Nicotiana sylvestris. In the Coster/Gerard era, the yews and pines were planted to replace the cedars, and under planted with Rhododendrons (Rhododendron maximum) and Mountain Laurel (Kalmia latifolia), which have since been eaten by deer.
**Vegetable Garden:** The vegetable garden measures approximately 40’ by 90’, and is surrounded by a woven wire deer fence. The vegetable garden is planted annually with vegetables propagated in the greenhouse.

**Missing Gardens:** There are several gardens described in historic documentation that no longer exists, including the orchard (Figure 12), the rose garden, and the May flowering hillside mentioned in Louise Shelton’s *Beautiful Gardens of America* (1915).

![Figure 10: The Evergreen Garden looking South, September, 2012](image-url)
Figure 11: Looking towards the Cedar Walk, March, 2012

Figure 12: Detail of aerial photograph showing orchard, date unknown. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family
Heirloom Plants

There are several heirloom plants in the garden at Meadowburn that are historically and regionally significant, and contribute to the value of preserving the gardens.

Dahlias (*Dahlia hybrids*): The dahlias have been stored every winter and replanted every spring for over 100 years. They were always present during Ely’s residence, and were one of the few plants she protected in the winter. According to Albert Furman, Jr., the second-generation gardener, and his son, Walter DeVries, the third generation gardener, the dahlias that exist today are indeed the dahlias Ely planted. In the summer of 2012, seven distinct cultivars of dahlias remained and presumably dated back to Ely’s era. Albert Furman, Jr. maintained meticulous records of the dahlia cultivars and planting schemes. Unfortunately, these records were thrown out after his death in 2004, and no records remain today, other than very general descriptions in Ely’s books and occasional photographs from the 1970’s to 2012. The seven cultivars were examined by heirloom dahlia expert Scott Kunst of Old House Gardens. Due to the vast quantity of dahlia varieties available in the early 1900’s and current limited records, Kunst recommended identifying heirloom characteristics rather than attempting to match each variety to a named cultivar. Kunst confirmed that several of the varieties possess heirloom characteristics. Figure 13 illustrates one of the seven heirloom dahlias photographed in the summer of 2012.
Peonies (*Paeonia lactiflora*): The herbaceous peony borders at Meadowburn are also original to the Ely era with evidence that Ely purchased peonies in the early 1900’s from Kelway’s Nursery in England. No peonies have been added since Ely’s time, according to Furman and DeVries, and approximately five varieties still exist today.

*Iris (Iris sp.)*: The iris date back to the Ely era (1881-1930) and the Coster era (1930-1970), and primarily include varieties of *I. germanica* and *I. sibirica*. To date, these collections have not been researched.

**Garden Phlox (Phlox paniculata):** Garden Phlox was one of the iconic perennials of Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn. She was recognized as a phlox authority.
in her time (Dreer 1909). In the summer of 2012, several varieties of *Phlox paniculata* grew in the perennial borders and according to Furman, DeVries, and the Gerards, these phlox were original to Ely. A few varieties showed no sign of mildew until early October, which suggests a high degree of mildew resistance, a highly desirable trait.

**Bay Laurel (*Laurus nobilis)*: The tubbed bay laurels date back to Ely. To this day, they are an annual feature on the brick terrace, and are stored in the Carriage House each winter. Ely’s original bay laurels were trained as standards. They were willed to Alfred Ely, Jr., but he left them at Meadowburn when Henry Coster bought the property in 1930. Historical records indicate that the New York Botanical Garden wanted to acquire these standards for their collections in 1993, when they would have been over 100 years old. Unfortunately, these standards died sometime after 1993, and were never given to the New York Botanical Garden. The present-day bay laurels were propagated from cuttings of the original standards. They are not trained in standard form.

**Other:** Additional plants that may be of historic merit include the wisteria growing on the pergola, lilacs, hibiscus, hemlocks, campanula, narcissus, and other woody material.

### 3.1.6.3 Deer Management

The intense deer pressure at Meadowburn requires an effective deer management plan in place before an investment is made in restoration of the plantings.

**Option 1 - Permanent Deer Fence:** A good deer fence is the most effective means of preventing deer damage, but also the most intrusive to the design intentions and visual aesthetic of the garden. The design of a deer fence protecting the residential
core and surrounding garden at Meadowburn must: 1) employ aesthetic sensitivity to historic design of the garden, including plantings, hardscape, vistas, and layout, 2) be visually unobtrusive, 3) allow easy access for residents, visitors and facilities maintenance needs, and 4) be strong and high enough to prevent deer access.

The cost of the deer fence depends on several variables, including the number of gates needed, materials selected, and exact height and linear footage. Figure 14 illustrates a possible placement for a deer fence, based on a 2,870 linear foot measurement of the circumference of Meadowburn’s residential and garden core.

One significant disadvantage of the deer fence option is that it aesthetically compromises the design of the garden. The relationship of the garden to the road, the vistas to the countryside, and the historic gates will be negatively impacted by a deer fence according to the scheme in Figure 14. This could be avoided by fencing a larger area, but at this time the cost would be prohibitive. If the deer fence option is selected, it is recommended that a landscape architect be consulted to develop a fencing plan that is sensitive to the design of the garden.
Figure 14: A possible deer fence surrounding the historic core measures 2,870 ft.

**Option 2 - Garden Dogs:** Another option to prevent deer pressure is to use resident garden dogs to keep deer at bay. An invisible dog fence installed around the perimeter of the garden will keep the dogs in the desired location, and the presence of the dogs will inhibit the deer from entering that area.

An invisible fence system can be installed using materials purchased online, or professionally installed by a contracted company. Breeds that are inclined to dig wholes should be avoided in order to minimize damage to the garden. Breeds that are known to be aggressive towards people should be avoided for the safety of staff and visitors.

The advantage of this option is that it eliminates the physical barrier of a deer fence, and requires a relatively small initial investment. A disadvantage of this option
is that it may not be completely deer proof. Due to the large amount of evergreen plantings in the garden, dogs would need to be in the garden throughout the winter.

The garden dog method is used for the vegetable terrace at Monticello, in Charlottesville, Virginia. An important aspect of the historic vegetable terrace is the relationship to the overall scheme of the garden and the vistas over the valley, which would be destroyed by a deer fence. Instead staff installed an invisible dog fence surrounding the garden. Four dogs with invisible fence collars inhabit the garden at night. When the gardens are open to guests during the day, the dogs are kept in a fenced yard near the greenhouses in the staff only facilities area. This has been a successful alternative for a deer fence at Monticello.

**Option 3-Portable Electric Fencing System:** A portable electric fence system could be used to protect small areas on an occasional basis. A portable electric fence consists of a battery, electric netting and hot tape, and typically is 42” high. The Rutgers Cooperative Extension has studied the effectiveness of portable electric deer fencing to prevent deer damage with positive results (Grande, et al. 1998). This option could be used in conjunction with other strategies to protect seasonal vegetation. If a permanent deer fence is not installed, a portable electric fence could be used to protect the evergreen hedge during the winter season.

### 3.1.6.4 Garden Facilities and Visitor Amenities

The site is large enough to accommodate improvements or additional development of facilities, amenities and utilities. Given the presence of existing structures it is likely that all facility needs can be met with the existing buildings.
Table 1 lists existing structures within the historic residential core and farmstead, and their current use. In some cases repurposing the buildings may be appropriate. Structures available for garden related support facilities depend on the eventual needs of the current residents and the dairy production.

**Garden Support Facilities:** Facilities needed for garden staff and operations include office space, equipment and tool storage space, nursery facilities, and compost area. The Garage and the lower level of the Carriage House are currently used for tool, equipment, and supply storage for garden operations. The compost bins are currently not used and need to be repaired. The glasshouse is small but functional, the adjacent cold frames are missing lids, and there is no designated nursery area. Furthermore, there is no designated office space for gardeners.

**Visitor Amenities:** There is limited parking at the main house and in front of the garage/equipment shed but additional parking is available across the street at the farmyard. Restrooms are located in the upstairs of the Carriage House, as well as across the street at the cheese shop. Additional restrooms are located in the residential homes. Meadowburn has never operated for public visitation, thus there is no specific reception area, gift shop, or multipurpose programming space at this time.
Figure 15: The Carriage House dates to the Ely era, July, 2012

Figure 16: The Greenhouse, May, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main House*</td>
<td>Ely Era</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Residence of Mrs. Gerard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House*</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Offices upstairs, storage, garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse*</td>
<td>Coster era</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Used in spring to start annuals and vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Shed*</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Not currently used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage*</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Storage for farm and garden equipment and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent House and Sheds*</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Residence of Mrs. Ethel Furman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm House</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Residence of dairy farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant House</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Barn</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>In transition to use as dairy barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Barn</td>
<td>New rebuild</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>In transition to use for farm and dairy operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Shop and Cheese Room</td>
<td>New Rebuild</td>
<td>Reconstruction in progress</td>
<td>Will be used for product sales, including cheese, bread, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor Barn</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Farm equipment storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken Coop</td>
<td>Ely era</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Registered historic structures.

Table 1: Existing structures in the residential core and farmstead
3.1.7 Management and Maintenance

The Gardens: The gardens at Meadowburn require maintenance on an ongoing basis. As of the summer of 2012, the gardens contain over 4,840 square feet of perennial beds, which require weeding, deadheading, staking, amending, and dividing. There is no automated irrigation system so watering is done by hand or with moveable sprinklers. There are over 945 linear feet of evergreen hedges that are currently sheared once a year. The quantity of mixed shrub rows, conifers, and deciduous trees makes for constant pruning projects. The lawns require frequent mowing in the growing season.

Historically there was at least one fulltime gardener and several assistant gardeners that maintained the gardens. Since the death of Albert Furman Jr., his son Walter DeVries has served as the Meadowburn Gardener. Mr. Gerard sent DeVries to horticulture school when Furman, Jr. needed to reduce his time as he grew older. A few years ago DeVries was reduced to part-time, working approximately five hours a week in the garden. The majority of his responsibilities involve grounds maintenance, planting dahlias and vegetables, turf care, and general upkeep. Large projects, such as hedge trimming and tree removal, are often contracted out. Mrs. Gerard performs all other garden care, and she has expressed feeling burdened by the amount of work required.

The Farm: The landowners currently manage the majority of operations at Meadowburn Farm, and oversee administrative duties. Walter’s son works part-time caring for the farm acreage. A recent agreement was formed with a farmer to run the dairy and cheese operations.
Equipment: Meadowburn Farm is well supplied with a variety of farm equipment and tools. Increasing the level of maintenance of the gardens may require replacing or purchasing new tools.

3.1.8 Documentation

Existing historic documentation of Meadowburn Farm spans a time period from approximately 1724 to 2013. Existing documentation includes historic photographs, written descriptions in books, newspapers and magazine articles, deeds and wills, and interviews.

DeKay Era (1724 – 1851): The limited documentation from this period mainly tracks the chain of title for Meadowburn Farm. The original deed of 1,200 acres from Benjamin Aske and Lancaster Symes to Thomas DeKay is displayed in the Main House at Meadowburn.

Rutherfurd Era (1851-1881): The New Jersey Historical Society holds the Rutherfurd family archives, which include deeds, property maps and surveys, and wills of John Rutherfurd, Charlotte Rutherfurd, and Helena Rutherfurd Ely.

Ely Era (1881-1930): The primary sources of garden documentation for this era are written descriptions and photographs in Ely’s three books where she explains her design principles, planting design strategies, the plants she used and their horticultural treatment. Every book is illustrated with numerous photographs taken in her garden. Diagrams of simple garden plans were included in A Woman’s Hardy
Garden (1903), which illustrate some of the early designs at Meadowburn (Appendix C). A list of plants described in her three books is provided in Appendix E.

A significant collection of photographs of Ely’s garden exists, including black and white photographs of the gardens and color autochromes using the Lumiere Brothers process of France.

Descriptions and occasional photographs of Meadowburn and Ely’s gardening philosophies are documented in newspaper articles, magazine articles, and books published between 1903 and 1920.

Coster/Gerard Era (1930 – Present): Photographs of the Meadowburn garden during this era illustrate the period from Coster ownership through the Gerard era. These photographs capture the garden broadly and not of specific garden elements.

The application for nomination to the New Jersey State and National Register of Historic Places documents the buildings and landscape features present in the historic residential core as of 1993. The application includes a map of the gardens and structures, with corresponding descriptions, a brief history of Helena Rutherfurd Ely and her gardening and writing career, the chain of title from 1724 to 1977, a verbal boundary description, and floor plans of the main house.

The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties documented the gardens in 1998/1999 for the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian. Candace Sandfort and Kathleen Stradar, both members of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties, conducted an oral history with Albert Furman, Jr. in 1999, whose transcription resides in the archives of the Club. They also photographed the garden
through four seasons, of which select 35mm slides are in the Smithsonian archives. Several images from the GCOD collection are included in Appendix B.

In 1999, B. Danforth Ely and Deborah Ely recorded an interview with Albert Furman, Jr., in which they discuss his memories of the garden, which included his recollections of Albert Furman, Sr. and the Elys.

Interviews were conducted as part of this research with Walter DeVries, the son of Albert Furman Jr., who has worked at Meadowburn off and on throughout his life. Clifford Van Strander, Furman, Jr.’s brother-in-law, was also interviewed about his recollections working in the gardens.

The garden was documented with photographs in all four seasons from December 2011 thru May 2013 by the author of this thesis, a selection of which are provided in Appendix B and D. These photographs are complemented by an existing condition plan drawn at a small scale, to illustrate the composition and presence of landscape features and structures in the historic garden core, provided in Appendix C.
3.2 Models for Preservation

This section outlines a selection of models that have proved successful for other small gardens. The areas of focus include gardens operated in conjunction with a for-profit business, a private garden that has developed a unique system in conjunction with a family trust, gardens operated by a non-profit organization that have developed strong partnerships or non-traditional revenue streams, and gardens with conservation easements. Patterns within non-profit ownership and operations are supported by qualitative data from the survey results at the end of the section.

3.2.1 For-Profit Business

3.2.1.1 Perennial Pleasures Nursery
63 Brickhouse Road, East Hardwick, VT, 05836
www.perennialpleasures.net

Overview: Perennial Pleasures Nursery is owned and operated by Rachel Kane, who started the business in 1980 to grow heirloom perennials for historic garden restorations. Today, Perennial Pleasures is a retail and mail-order nursery selling over 900 varieties of heirloom perennials and medicinal herbs, including 137 varieties of Phlox paniculata, a species that is also significant for Meadowburn. The retail nursery features a display garden, tea café and gift shop.

Display Garden: There are three acres of display and production gardens open to the customers during business hours. The gardens include an herb garden, primrose garden, phlox border, pergola garden, shade garden, heather garden and a croquet lawn. The display gardens serve many functions: they inspire customers, promote nursery stock, and function as a production area. Kane feels the display garden
enhances the value of the experience for customers; it helps them relax and keeps them interested.

**Nursery Production:** The majority of the plants are field grown for two years on site, using organic methods, prior to sale. Occasionally, Perennial Pleasures will custom-grow plant stock, often for museums or garden restorations.

Perennial Pleasures Nursery specializes in *Phlox paniculata* (Garden Phlox). Several characteristics make phlox the ideal specialty crop for Perennial Pleasures; it was one of the most popular perennials from late 19th to mid 20th century, it grows well in Vermont, it is easy to cultivate, it ships well, there are hundreds of varieties, and people love them. Kane notes that having a specialty is good for marketing.

**Mail Order Nursery:** Perennial Pleasure sells throughout the country, primarily via their website. The mail order business used to be much larger, but Kane found it hard to do both mail order and retail, so cut back on mail order substantially.

**Retail Nursery & Gift Shop:** The retail nursery and gift shop are open Tuesdays through Sunday, May through September, and accounts for the majority of their income. The gift shop is run by Rachel Kane’s mother, and features garden and home goods.

**Tea Garden Café:** Operated by Rachel Kane’s mother, the Café serves tea, scones and sandwiches from Memorial Day to Labor Day. It has been very successful and attracts customers from far and wide. The Tea Garden Café offers special tea events on Mothers Day and Fathers Day.

**Onsite Educational Programs and Events:** Every summer, Perennial Pleasures Nursery hosts a two week Phlox Fest. Rachel Kane started Phlox Fest in 2002 to showcase the phlox during the height of the summer blooming period. Phlox
Fest features daily garden tours, a guest speaker, and cut flower displays, and attracts an average of 70 people per day. Phlox are difficult to photograph in true color, and it is hard to describe the nuanced variation, so Phlox Fest encourages people to observe varieties side by side. Because of Phlox Fest and the Tea Garden Café, Perennial Pleasures stays busy throughout the month of August, when many of the other regional nurseries experience the season’s lull.

Every Sunday during the open season, Rachel Kane hosts a free “Garden Skillshop,” in which she offers horticulture advice to guests. The groups are usually small, which Kane finds most effective. Kane is constantly thinking about how to give the best value and experience to her customers, and recognizes that “people want to learn something when they go somewhere.” There is never enough time in the week to answer all the customers’ questions, so the Skillshop is a way that Kane reaches out to new gardeners. Perennial Pleasures does not offer many other educational workshops because they are very time consuming to organize.

Perennial Pleasures Nursery has experimented with offering event rentals. One section of the garden can be partitioned off, and is available for rentals, but they do not offer the whole garden because they do not want to shut down the retail operation. The Tea Garden Café is available for party reservations.

**Marketing:** Perennial Pleasures Nursery markets primarily to the local market. Kane has no particular strategy, but advertises where she feels it will be effective on a case by case basis. Having a specialty in *Phlox paniculata* and heirloom perennials is a great help. She occasionally attends local flower shows, and she ensures that the website is particularly attractive, giving the company a welcoming and user friendly online presence.
**Staff:** Rachel Kane is the only year-round staff. During the growing season, she hires two seasonal retail nursery staff, two seasonal staff for potting, and one seasonal staff for watering. Kane’s mother manages the Tea Garden Café and Gift Shop, and hires three additional seasonal staff.

**Audience:** The main audience for the retail nursery is regional, mostly women, while the mail order audience is national.

**Recommendations from Perennial Pleasures:**

“Give good value and have enough things going on to keep people interested. If it is interesting, they will come back.” – Rachel Kane

3.2.1.2 **Linden Hill Gardens**

8230 Easton Road (Route 611), Ottsville, Pennsylvania 18942

www.LindenHillGardens.com

**Location:** Ottesville, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. The site is rural, approximately 80 miles from New York City, and 50 miles from Philadelphia.

**Overview:** Linden Hill Gardens is a privately owned retail nursery specializing in rare and unusual plants. Jerry Fritz built Linden Hill Gardens on an abandoned farm site that he purchased in 2000. The original goal was to feed business to Jerry Fritz Landscape Design, Inc., which also operates from the same site. Linden Hill Gardens has become a destination for city dwellers coming from New York City or Philadelphia to spend the day shopping and enjoying the countryside. Linden Hill Gardens became self-sufficient and profitable in 5 to 7 years, although increased marketing early on would have made it profitable sooner.

**Display Garden:** The gardens function as an inspirational and educational display for visitors, as well as a marketing tool for Jerry Fritz Landscape Design. The
extensive gardens also make Linden Hill Gardens a destination for visitors from regional urban centers. The 5-acre garden contains seven areas, including the Deer Resistant Garden, Cottage Garden, Living Patio, Office Borders, the Long Border, and the Parking Lot Beds.

**Retail Nursery:** The retail nursery specializes in rare and unusual plants, and array of garden goods. Most nursery stock is purchased from wholesale growers as ball and burlap or bare root perennials that are then grown on by Linden Hill Gardens. A minimal amount of nursery stock is propagated on site. Wholesale growers are contracted to produce a special Hellebore variety. Linden Hill Gardens’ new specialty is snowdrops (*Galanthus sp.*), which are sold potted “in the green”. *Galanthus* are sold both on site and via website mail order, along with other garden goods.

**On Site Educational Programs and Events:** Linden Hill Gardens hosts approximately 20 educational events and workshops throughout the year, including Mother’s Day Tea in the Garden, Ottesville Fall Festival, Ladies Nights in the Garden, garden tours, plant specific workshops, and more.

Linden Hill Garden annually hosts approximately 5 farm dinners with guest chefs, sometimes coupling a cooking class with the dinner. There is no commercial kitchen on site so chef’s provide their own certification and mobile kitchens. Tickets prices range from $50-$100 per guest.

The Ottesville Farmer’s Market actually takes place at Linden Hill Gardens, and operates Fridays from 4 - 8pm, April through October. The resulting foot traffic through Linden Hill Gardens (400-700 people every Friday) greatly increases garden exposure and sales.
**Off Site Events:** Linden Hill Gardens participates in approximately 5 off site events each year, including the Chelsea Market, Philadelphia International Flower Show, Trade Secrets Garden Show and Earthly Delights. Jerry Fritz also presents 10-15 off site guest lectures each year, which helps to promote Linden Hill Gardens.

**Marketing:** Linden Hill Gardens participates in several annual trade shows and events, which gives the company great local exposure. An attractive website features a calendar of events and retail announcements, and gives the company a strong online presence. E-newsletters are regularly sent to a list of customers, highlighting events and happenings. Loyal customers become part of a rewards program and receive a gift card and a complimentary brunch at Linden Hill Gardens. Additionally, Linden Hill Gardens offers discounts to members of Philadelphia Horticultural Society and Longwood Gardens.

**Staff:** Linden Hill Gardens employs two permanent full-time staff who divide time between retail sales, gardening, and garden design, and they also assist with events and communications. Three to five seasonal employees are hired in the growing season.

**Main Audience:** The primary audience is New York City and Philadelphia residents comprised of women who come for the day to shop, socialize, and have lunch. Visitation is estimated at approximately 10,000/year and the average visit time is 75 minutes per customer, each spending and average of $75-$150.

**Recommendations from Linden Hill Gardens:**

“It will be most successful if the family is passionate about it.” – Jerry Fritz

“Hire the best [staff] you can get.” – Jerry Fritz
3.2.1.3 **Well Sweep Herb Farm**  
205 Mount Bethel Rd, Port Murray, NJ 07865  
www.wellsweep.com

**Location:** Well Sweep Herb Farm is located in Mansfield Township of Warren County, New Jersey, approximately 80 miles drive form Philadelphia and 60 miles from New York City.

**Overview:** Well Sweep Herb Farm is a family owned nursery business, specializing in common, rare, and unusual herbs and perennials. Louise and Cyrus Hyde purchased the property in 1966, where they have lived and worked to this day, and where they established a display garden, propagation nursery, retail nursery, and gift shop.

**Display Garden:** Well Sweep Herb Farm features two acres of formal gardens, including a butterfly, herb, perennial, rock and formal knot garden. The gardens are home to the collection of 1,951 plant varieties. The collections stem from Cyrus Hyde’s personal passion for plants, which he collects and trades everywhere he goes. The display gardens function to inspire customers, support educational programs, and also provide propagation material for the nursery. The gardens are open to the public and Hyde offers tours for a fee, which are popular for garden clubs in the summer.

**Nursery Production:** Well Sweep vegetatively propagates their own plants, the majority of which come from the display garden. Occasionally, they trade with other nurseries but most plants are sold in 3” or 1-quart pots. Cyrus Hyde has introduced a few of his own varieties of herbs, such as *Ocimum basilicum* ‘Well Sweep Miniature Purple’. Select herb species are also grown in topiary forms for sale at the gift shop.
**Retail Sales:** Nursery sales represent the most significant source of income for Well Sweep Herb Farm with most from their on-site retail nursery shop and their mail order catalogue.

The Well Sweep Gift Shop sells a variety of goods, representing the second most significant income after nursery sales. Goods include dried flowers, potpourri supplies, essential oils, dried culinary herbs, and books. The retail nursery and gift shop are open Monday thru Saturday from 9 am to 5 pm.

**Onsite Educational Programs and Events:** Well Sweep produces several educational programs throughout the year, often taught by Louise Hyde or a guest professional. Examples include dried flower crafts, soap making, herbal tea making, educational tours, and topics in horticulture. The main audience for these programs is local homeowners and garden clubs.

Well Sweep also hosts approximately 4 seasonal festivals throughout the year, including a Spring Open House, Mid-Summer Herb Festival, Fall Harvest Celebration, and Winter Open House. The Spring Open House features free lectures and garden tours, and attracts mainly individuals and families.

These programs and events have significantly increased sales; they are offered approximately every two weeks to attract customers.

**Offsite Events:** Well Sweep has also exhibited at trade shows but less so in recent years as the owners get older. The gift shop still exhibits in more trade shows than the nursery, particularly in the New Jersey and International Herb Society Meeting. The Gift Shop participates in occasional trade shows.
**Staff:** Three family members, including Louise, work at Well Sweep full time throughout the year. Two additional employees help with nursery production on a part time basis. Up to three seasonal employees are hired in the growing season.

**Marketing:** The mail order catalogue is the main source of marketing, with the website not far behind. Educational workshops and events do a great deal to market the nursery and gift shop. Well Sweep offers a customer appreciation day and open house, with free tours and lectures. Customers are encouraged to participate in a customer survey in trade for a chance to win a $35 gift certificate.

**Audience:** The main audience for the retail nursery and gift shop is local homeowners, vacationers, and visitors from widespread locations. Well Sweep has approximately 5,000 – 6,000 guests per year. The mail order audience is national and approximately 6,000 catalogues are mailed out annually.

**Recommendations from Well Sweep:**

“I wouldn’t have had my home at my business. People want to come when they want to come.” - Louise Hyde

“If you [have a plant] that is unusual, do not keep it to yourself. Give it away and share, just in case something happens, someone else will have it”. – Louise Hyde

3.2.2 **Non-Profit Partnership**

3.2.2.1 **The Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield**
4097 Albany Post Road, Hyde Park, New York 12538
www.beatrixfarrandgarden.org
Overview: The Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield (from here on referred to as Bellefield) is located on the F.D.R. National Historic Site in Hyde Park, New York. The gardens were derelict from 1976 until 1993, when a group of energetic and committed individuals banded together to restore the gardens designed by the renowned garden designer Beatrix Farrand. The restoration project received early support from the National Parks Service, the Garden Conservancy, the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County, and the Beatrix Farrand Garden Association.

The Partnership: The National Parks Service is the legal owner of Bellefield. The Beatrix Farrand Garden Association (BFGA), a 501(c)3 organization, was established in 1994 to restore and care for the gardens. A memorandum was created in 1994, establishing the BFGA as the stewards of the garden. The BFGA is responsible for the restoration, maintenance, fundraising, and programming for Bellefield.

The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County: The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County (GCOD) sponsored Bellefield as an official project from 1996 to 2002. The Club members helped in the hands-on planting of the perennial beds. As an official GCOD project, Bellefield was nominated and twice selected as the runner up for the Garden Club of America’s Founders Fund. As a runner up, Bellefield received an award of $10,000 on both occasions, which funded the replacement of the hemlock hedges and the installation of an irrigation system.

In 2002, Bellefield became a project emeritus of the GCOD. To this day, many GCOD members continue to volunteer in the gardens, and three members sit on the board of directors of the BFGA. The GCOD receives monthly reports regarding the status of Bellefield.
**Staff:** The BFGA employs one part-time Executive Director who also acts as the volunteer coordinator for garden projects. The majority of garden maintenance is carried out by dedicated volunteers who work every Tuesday morning. A positive and enthusiastic leader is key to keeping things on track, ensuring that projects are prioritized and time is used efficiently.

**Budget:** The operating budget of the BFGA is less than $50,000 per year. The main expenses are the Executive Director’s salary and costs for garden restoration and maintenance projects and supplies.

Income is generated through educational events, a membership program, personal financial contributions from the community, an annual appeal, and grants. The annual appeal and annual Design Lecture are the biggest fundraising efforts of the year. Other successful fundraising events include occasional cocktail parties and auctions. Past grant income has come from a National Parks Service matching grant program, capital project grants from private foundations, and the two Garden Club of America Founders Fund awards.

**Recommendations from Bellefield:**

“Collect enough partners and uses to a point where there is critical mass.” – Kate Kerin

“Set reasonable goals and take intermediate steps.” - Kate Kerin

“Having professional leadership is so important. And finding the right personality for that leadership is just as important”. – Kate Kerin
3.2.2.2 The Anne Spencer House and Garden Museum
1313 Pierce Street, Lynchburg, Virginia 24501
www.annespencermuseum.com

Overview: The Friends of the Anne Spencer Memorial Foundation is a 501(c)3 dedicated to the preservation and celebration of the legacy of poet Anne Spencer and her husband. The Foundation owns and operates her house and gardens as a small museum, which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The gardens are free and open to the public seven days a week, from dawn until dusk.

Partnership with the Hillside Garden Club: The Hillside Garden Club, an affiliate member of the Garden Club of Virginia, took on the restoration and maintenance of the Anne Spencer garden in 1983. The agreement is in the form of a “ladies agreement,” which does not constitute a legal agreement between the Club and the Foundation.

Under the leadership of Jane B. White, a local landscape designer and member of the Hillside Garden Club, the Hillside ladies planned, funded, and implemented the restoration of the gardens. They continued to supply all of the funds for the garden over the next thirty years, with collective contributions valued over $100,000.

After the initial restoration was completed, the Hillside Garden Club handed the garden maintenance back to the Foundation, under whose care attention to the Gardens dwindled for the next 18 years. In 2007, again under the leadership of Jane B. White, the Hillside Garden Club stepped in a second time to restore the gardens, which they continue to maintain and fund to this day. The Hillside Garden Club’s objective is to provide support towards self-sufficiency, or until the Foundation is able to assume garden operations.

The Anne Spencer Garden receives preservation assistance from the Garden Conservancy, mostly in the form of consultation. The Garden Conservancy prepared a
plan for the short and long-term future of the Garden, which has been very helpful. Jane B. White expressed in an interview, “mostly the fact that Garden Conservancy gave their endorsement was very meaningful. We were not sure we were doing the right thing, but for them to say that we were doing a good job was really helpful.”

Hillside Garden Club has raised all the funds for the restoration and maintenance of the Anne Spencer Garden through grants, fundraising campaigns, and donations from the Club. An established endowment is currently a goal to support its continued care, and the Hillside Garden Club contributes $500 to the endowment each year. The proceeds from Jane B. White’s book, Lessons Learned from a Poet’s Garden (2011), will also go to the endowment.

**Garden Staff:** There are no paid employees of the Anne Spencer Garden. The Hillside Garden Club maintains the garden and pays for contract labor for special projects. Regular, weekly maintenance is performed by three volunteers from the Hillside Garden Club. Additional Garden Club volunteers visit throughout the week to see if anything needs watering. All Club members participate in a garden workday once/year, usually in spring or fall, and by all accounts, the Garden is kept immaculately.

**Recommendations from the Anne Spencer House and Garden:**

“Somebody has got to be passionate about the garden and the importance of saving it. When there is a passion involved, sometimes you find ways to solve these issues.” - Jane B. White
3.2.2.3  The Elizabeth Lawrence Garden
248 Ridgewood Ave, Charlotte, NC 28209
www.winghavengardens.com

Overview: The Wing Haven Foundation owns and operates two historic gardens in Charlotte, North Carolina. In 1970, the Clarksons gave their home and garden, known as Wing Haven Gardens and Bird Sanctuary, to the Foundation. In 2008 the Foundation purchased the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden. Collectively, the two gardens are referred to as Wing Haven. The Wing Haven Foundation purchased the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden from a private property owner who agreed to sell to the Foundation if they donated a conservation easement to the Garden Conservancy.

The Friends Group: The Friends of Elizabeth Lawrence group was formed in 2003 to explore the possibility of preserving the home and garden of Elizabeth Lawrence. The Friends worked under the non-profit umbrella of the Foundation to qualify for grant funding and tax-deductible donations. The Friends group researched the possibility of the property transfer, including documenting the garden, applying for nomination on the National Register of Historic Places, and performing a feasibility study. The Friends of Elizabeth Lawrence dissolved once the Foundation took over the ownership and operations of the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden.

The Conservation Easement: The Wing Haven Foundation donated an easement to the Garden Conservancy in 2008, reducing the property value from approximately $500,000 to $200,000. The local garden club donated a stewardship fund of approximately $50,000 to pay for the ongoing monitoring costs of the easement. The easement preserves the historic house, the garden hardscape and design, and the trees and shrubs. The Garden Conservancy developed a management plant for the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden, which serves as a guide for the Foundation.
The Advisory Committees: Based on the recommendations of the Management Plan, an Advisory Committee was convened to oversee the preservation of the Elizabeth Lawrence house and gardens. The Committee consists of 12 people, one of whom is also a Board Member of the Wing Haven Foundation. The Committee advises on matters of plant curation, as well as on use and programming for the house.

Garden Maintenance: One part-time employee serves as the curator and volunteer coordinator for the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden. Community and Master Gardener volunteers also help with routine garden maintenance.

3.2.3 Private Garden with Conservation Easement

3.2.3.1 Keil Cove
Tiburon, California

Overview: Keil Cove is a privately owned residential property located in Tiburon, Marin County, California. Keil Cove is owned by Russell Keil, and has been in Keil’s family since the 1880’s. Located on the San Francisco Bay, Keil Cove totals 35-acres, including 14 acres of formal gardens, 1000 feet of beachfront, a 5-acre lake, and 3 homes. The first gardens were designed by John McClaren in the early 1900’s. Terrace gardens designed by Thomas Church were added in the 1950’s. The gardens have been continuously maintained in the original design for over 100 years.

Motive for Easement: Prior to the conservation easement, Keil Cove had six multi-million dollar development sites. The property value created a substantial tax burden on the Keil Family, who had no intention of dividing the property for development. The Keils’ initial motive was to find a way to lower the property value, property taxes, and inheritance taxes. Originally, they considered an environmental
conservation easement. Preserving the designed landscape became a motive when the Garden Conservancy informed the Keils of the historic importance of the gardens. Compared to an environmental conservation easement, a garden conservation easement requires the landowner to invest in the continued preservation of the gardens and its structures.

**The Easement:** In 2002, the Keils donated a conservation easement to the Garden Conservancy, with additional funds to cover the cost of drafting easement documents. They also funded a small endowment to cover the ongoing monitoring costs.

The Keils hired a lawyer to develop the easement agreement and the management plan. The easement agreement, which is permanent and unchangeable, was kept simple. The management plan, which can be amended, was used to detail the more flexible aspects of the agreement. For example, the Keils wanted to retain the rights to develop an additional housing site on the property, and identified a site on the bluff in the management plan. Later, the County Planning Commission developed a master plan that prohibited future development on ridges. Because the exact site was only specified in the amendable management plan, the Keils were able to change the allotted development site and not lose the ability to build an additional residence.

The Garden Conservancy monitors Keil Cove annually, providing oversight and guidance for the management of the gardens. Each year the Garden Conservancy develops a monitoring report that prioritizes projects for the next year. The Keils and the Garden Conservancy occasionally have differing maintenance priorities for the property, which may be undesirable from the owner’s perspective, but it compels good intentions and limitations are not onerous. However, financial limitations by the owner
need to be considered. Differing opinions regarding priorities are always resolved amicably and there has never been a situation where they have disagreed.

The easement agreement requires Keil Cove to allow occasional public visitation but the Keils are a private family and reluctantly abide by this requirement. However, to fulfill this obligation, the Keils host a select group of scholars and garden enthusiasts a few times a year. They do not participate in Open Days, as the garden is so big that it would require numerous docents.

**Garden Maintenance:** Mrs. Keil oversees the garden maintenance. Twelve part-time gardeners work on contract throughout the year, and includes skilled horticulturists, garden laborers, and an irrigation specialist. A garden manager will be hired to take on the Mrs. Keil’s role in overseeing garden maintenance should none of the Keil children do so.

**Looking Towards the Future:** Keil Cove will be left to the Keil’s three children and their grandchildren. It is Russell Keil’s hope that his descendants will be interested in the garden but he has indicated that they should not feel obligated to keep the property if it becomes a financial burden. Because of the property’s location and the wealth of the community, they have confidence that they could find an interested buyer despite the conservation easement.

**Recommendations from Keil Cove:**

“There is no justification on financial basis to [have] a conservation easement. The financial benefit is miniscule compared to loss of development value. [They must] have the desire to preserve the property and keep it in the family.” - Russell Keil
“The Garden Conservancy was a good match [for us]. Find the right holder of the easement. That is very important.” - Russell Keil

“Preservation needs to be the motivation.” – Russell Keil

3.2.4 Non-Profit/Private Hybrid with Conservation Easement

3.2.4.1 The E.B Dunn Historic Garden Trust
13533 Northshire Road NW, Seattle, WA 98177
www.dunngardens.org

Overview: The E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust was established in 1994 to preserve Dunn Gardens, a circa 1915 historic estate located outside of Seattle, Washington and designed by the Olmsted Brothers and Arthur Dunn. The Garden consists of 7.5 acres of woodland gardens, spanning across three residential lots. The Trust owns one lot, and holds an easement on the other two privately owned residential lots. The Garden runs contiguously throughout the three properties. The Trust offers a range of educational programs and events for the public throughout the year.

The Trust: Upon the death of Arthur Dunn, the property was subdivided into three separate residential lots measuring approximately two and one-half acres, one for each of the three Dunn children. One lot included the main house, one the carriage house, and a new house was soon constructed on the third lot.

Edward Dunn inherited the carriage house, which he converted into his home, and developed exquisite woodland gardens on the surrounding two and one-half acres. When Edward Dunn died in 1991, his only heirs were his ten nieces and nephews who grew up in the adjacent houses. Lead by cousins Patrick Dunn and Christopher
Bayley, the heirs established the E. B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust to preserve the
gardens and open space of the entire seven and one-half acres.

The two and one-half acres and carriage house previously owned by Edward
were placed in the ownership of the Trust. The heirs established an endowment with
an initial investment of $300,000, with a portion of the funds of Edward Dunn’s
estate. The remainder of the estate was divided amongst the heirs. In retrospect,
Patrick Dunn feels it would have been wise to put all of the funds into the endowment,
as $300,000 initial investment has not been sufficient to cover operating costs of the
Trust.

**The Easements:** Patrick Dunn purchased the central house and lot previously
owned by his mother; his cousin, Chris Bayley, purchased the western-most house and
lot from his parents. Both Patrick Dunn and Chris Bayley donated an easement to their
property to the E. B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust. The residences remain private
homes.

The easement donation reduced the property value of each residential lot by
approximately $150,000, having an immediate tax advantage over two years. Both
properties are now taxed as open space with only the envelope surrounding the house
taxed as residential, which is a very minor yearly tax advantage. The terms of the
easement allow the two residences to be sold, but future owners and inhabitants are
subject to easement restrictions. Chris Bayley sold his residence to another avid
gardener who has been a perfect fit for the Trust and values the mission.

Under the easement, owners of the two residences are subject to restrictions for
the house and surrounding landscape. Additions to the residences are not permitted,
and exterior changes (e.g. paint color) need to be approved by the Trust Garden
Committee. Owners cannot make changes to the garden design or plantings, and are not allowed to perform regular maintenance without permission from the Trust’s Garden Committee and Board of Trustees. Residence owners are required to make a monthly contribution to the Trust to cover garden maintenance equal to what they would otherwise pay for garden care. This amount is currently set at $500 per month, and is not tax-deductible.

At times, the property owners believed the easement to be more restrictive than necessary, especially in terms of what they are allowed to do in their gardens. There have never been any major issues. Patrick Dunn intentionally does not get over-involved in the decisions of the Trust, because he does not want the fact that he is a donor or the Trust founder to affect the decisions.

**Additional Support:** The fact that both property owners are dedicated to the E. B. Historic Garden Trust is a critical aspect that has made the easement agreements work. Both property owners make non-obligatory tax-deductible contributions to the Trust at $1000-$2200 per month. Additionally, Patrick and Sue Dunn have pledged to give an additional $50,000 to the endowment.

The Dunns have recently started to rent their house for weddings, charging $2000 per event, which is then donated to the Trust. There are government restrictions that prevent a non-profit from competing with the private sector, in this case wedding venues. Since the Dunn’s house is owned privately, it is not subject to the same restrictions.

If in the future the Dunn’s children are unable to afford to keep the house, the Dunns will sell the property. Patrick Dunn would require that the individual who purchases the house is personally dedicated and financially able to support the Trust.
At present, they are do not think donating their property to the Trust is financially feasible, but this may be reconsidered in the future.

**Public Visitation:** The Dunn Gardens offers private tours by appointment from April thru July, and September thru October. The gardens are open to the general public for other events throughout the year. Tours scheduled by appointment are lead by the volunteer docents. The gardens are closed during the month of August so that the resident families may enjoy the privacy.

Patrick Dunn has never felt that public visitation was an imposition, and that people are very respectful. There have never been problems with theft or vandalism. The Dunns encourage and welcome their neighbors to enjoy the gardens and use the lawns at any time. Dunn expresses, “the whole idea [of the Trust] is to let people take advantage of it.”

**Staff:** The E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust employs one full time grounds manager, one part time gardener, three part time administrative staff, and a fulltime executive director. Additionally there are two part time curators who live on site, and compensated for their time with free housing and utilities. Volunteers run the docent program and occasionally help with garden maintenance.

**Recommendations from The E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust:**

“This has all been very rewarding. At first we were not sure that if we did this if anyone would care.” Patrick Dunn

“Easements are not a money maker… The benefit is knowing that it will be preserved.” Patrick Dunn
3.2.5 A Family Trust

3.2.5.1 The Platt House and Garden
Cornish, New Hampshire

Overview: The Platt house and garden was the home of artist and architect Charles A. Platt (1862-1933), his wife Eleanor, and their children. Platt bought the undeveloped property in the early 1890’s, and proceeded to design and build the landscape and house. The entire landscaped was sculpted, creating an extensive and intentional composition of vistas, gardens, and house. When the Platt children inherited the estate in 1953, they created a family trust exclusively for the purpose of owning and caring for the property. The gardens continue to be maintained, and while the plantings have been simplified, the bones remain much as they were designed over 100 years ago. The property is not recognized on a local or national historic registry, and there are no preservation requirements or easements.

The Family Trust: The only assets of the Trust are the house and gardens. The terms of the Trust were kept as simple as possible to avoid complications and inheritance issues within future generations. The sole purpose of the Trust is to care for the property.

Three trustees oversee the Trust, all of whom are direct grandchildren of Charles A. Platt Sr. Charles Platt is one of the Trustees. Charles and his wife Joan, serve as the superintendents and operating officers. Currently there are 45 individuals with an interest in the Trust.

Each Trust beneficiary contributes annual dues to cover capital expenses, taxes, and insurance. The amount of the annual contribution is assessed depending on the age of the beneficiary as follows:
Third Generation (~ 60yrs+): $1500/ year
Fourth Generation (~ 40yrs+): $1200/ year
Fifth Generation (~ 20yrs+): $800/ year

Annual operating expenses are accounted for separately from annual dues. Each year a “calendar of use” is created, and each beneficiary is entitled to sign up to use the house with their families. Annual operating expenses, such as utilities, the caretaker’s compensation, and minor repairs, are divided amongst those who used the property in the given year. The exact amount owed per family is determined with a formula that accounts for the number of people per day occupied. The operational fees are kept in a separate account from the annual dues. A rental cottage on the property generates minor additional income.

**Garden Maintenance:** When the children of Charles A. Platt inherited the property in 1953, they simplified the garden to reduce maintenance requirements. In 1992, Joan Platt began to restore a few flowerbeds that had since disappeared, with the help of Bill Noble. She personally funded the project and continues to fund garden maintenance to this day. Joan is personally passionate about the gardens, and is currently the only family member with the “gardening itch”. Joan and Charles spend more time at the Platt house than other family members. Much of their time is spent working in the gardens. Joan hires a gardener to help once a month from late April to September. The lawns are mowed by the caretaker and Charles Platt.

**Public Visitation:** The Platt Family occasionally allows for groups of scholars and garden enthusiasts to tour the gardens. They also participate in the Garden Conservancy’s Open Days Program.
Recommendations from the Platt House and Garden:

“The fewer terms of a trust the family can support the better… Strictures and rules make things fall apart.” - Charles Platt

3.2.6 Event Rentals

3.2.6.1 Willowwood Arboretum

www.willowwoodarboretum.org
14 Longview Road, Far Hills, NJ 07931

Overview: Willowwood Arboretum is part of a 130-acre estate located in Far Hills, New Jersey. Originally the home of the Tubbs family, Willowwood is now owned and operated by the Morris County Parks Commission. It is approximately 20 miles from Morristown, New Jersey.

The Morris County Parks Commissions rents areas of Willowwood Arboretum for private events. Wedding ceremonies and receptions are the most common uses for event rentals. Other common uses include parties and corporate events.

Liability: Renters are required to provide an alcohol permit and certificate of insurance to cover general liabilities, worker’s compensation (if employees are present), and commercial automobile insurance. All caterers are required to provide certificate of insurance.

Facilities: Willowwood’s limited facilities and infrastructure restrict the size and type of events it can accommodate. On site parking is limited, and there is only one restroom facility. Renters are required to provide other amenities needed, such as portable restrooms, tents, tables, chairs, catering set-up, lighting etc. The options for facility rentals at Willowwood are the Stone Barn, out-door tent rental, or in the garden with no tent.
**Fee Structure:** The rental fee schedule varies based on day of the week, hours of the day, residency of renters, and non-profit or corporate status. Government agencies and non-profits whose mission is aligned with the Morris County Parks Commission receive a discount. Friends of the Frelinghuysen and the Willowwood Foundation may rent facilities in business hours for a limited size group without a fee. All hourly rates increase in non-business hours.

The Stone Barn, a 1,032 square foot, one story building that opens towards the gardens rents for $250 per hour, with a four-hour minimum. Tent Events are allowed one-time per month from May until October. Limiting tent events reduces wear on garden grounds and facilities. Rental fees for tent events are $4000 for a one-day, five-hour event, with a $1000 security deposit. This does not include the cost of the tent rental, which must be contracted separately. Several exterior garden spaces are available for outdoor events. The capacity depends on the location chosen. The set fee for outdoor space is $200 per hour.

The Morris County Parks Commission allows for commercial photography and filming in the parks facilities. Commercial Photography fees are $250 for an eight-hour day. Commercial Filming fees are $750 for an eight-hour day, and $1200 for major motion pictures for a twelve-hour day. Studio Photography fees are $150 per person for 30 minutes maximum.

**3.2.6.2 Glynwood Farm**
364 Glynwood Road, Cold Spring, NY, 10516
www.glynwood.org
Overview: Glynwood Farm is a 225-acre non-profit farm dedicated to preserving and supporting sustainable farming in the Northeast. Originally the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Perkins, Glynwood now serves as an educational farm, and offers numerous educational programs and events, as well as operates a Community Support Agriculture program and a mobile slaughterhouse. The Farm is located 60 miles north of New York City.

Glynwood has several buildings that they rent for events to organizations and private parties. Glynwood prioritizes facility rentals for organizations and groups whose work is aligned with the Glynwood mission. Facility availability for “social” events, such as weddings, is limited. This distinction was made because it was important to the organization to be known as a mission driven organization rather than a wedding destination.

Facilities: Several facilities are available for “social” events, including four guesthouses that combined sleep up to 38 people, the Barn with a capacity for 250 people, and the Boathouse with a capacity for 40 people. For mission related organizations, who tend to rent facilities for meetings and conferences, there is a conference room equipped with wifi with a capacity for 50 people is available, as well as several smaller meeting rooms and 27 overnight guest rooms. The Glynwood kitchen offers in house catering for such events for up to 50 people.

Fee Structure: Weddings are charged a flat fee of $8000, which allows for the use of two sites on the Farm. Additional fees are charged for overnight accomodations, which are charged as flat rates for each guest house used. The use of the barn, which is actively used for farming operations, requires an additional $1000 fee to cover the cost of moving the farming activity for the duration of the event. Tents, catering, and
additional amenities are the responsibility of the renting party. Rentals for mission related organizations apply a discounted fee structure.

**Challenges:** The Alena Kaufman, the Glynwood events coordinator, is currently evaluating the rental calendar and fee structures for “social” event rentals in order to determine how many large events Glynwood can support. Since Glynwood is an actively working farm events in the Barn interfere with the daily farm operations. For this reason the Barn is only available for wedding rentals a few times a year. Kaufmen states that a flat area that could accommodate a large party tent would help eliminate the pressure on the Barn.

3.2.7 A Garden Brand

3.2.7.1 Biltmore House and Gardens
One Lodge Street, Ashville, NC
www.biltmore.com

**Overview:** Biltmore is an 8000-acre estate located in Ashville, North Carolina. Once the home of George Vanderbilt, Biltmore is now operated as a privately owned mansion and garden open to the public. In addition to the house and gardens, Biltmore features a hotel, winery, multiple restaurants, and retail stores. While there is overlap between the multiple enterprises, they operate within four separate companies:

Biltmore House and Garden, Biltmore Wine, Biltmore Inn, and Biltmore Brands.

**The Biltmore Brand:** Biltmore’s brand lines include wine, food products, a home line, and a garden line. Products are sold online, in regional retail venues, and
onsite at Biltmore. The home line, which features bedspreads, towels, and picture frames, is the most profitable line in of Biltmore Brands.

The Biltmore Garden Line consists of select plants, plant care products, furniture and garden décor. The rose line features varieties from the Biltmore rose garden as well as newly developed varieties. Biltmore developed a rose trial program, with participation from all of the major rose breeders, testing approximately 35 varieties per year. Roses are tested for two and a half years, and if they prove to be good, they are planted in the 6-acre historic rose garden, and potentially entered into the rose line. Parker Andes, Biltmore Director of Horticulture, states, “the product line is based on Biltmore Rose Garden, but selection is a marketing decision based on what is going to sell. We have great roses, are they going to sell? Maybe, maybe not.” The Rose Line is complemented by the Biltmore Natural Rose Care package. Biltmore hired two rose specialist tied into the rose growing and trialing community to help develop and market the rose line. According to Andes, “Pays to be working with someone that that industry knows. Another reason for taking a few years to start a line – worst thing you can do is to tick everyone off.”

Hydrangeas have recently been included in the garden line. Historically, Biltmore had lots of hydrangeas, so they carry a good history. However the decision to include them in the line, and the selection of the plant, was purely market driven. Netherland bulbs are the best selling, and longest running item in the plant line. Biltmore contracts with the Netherland Bulb Company to produce selections exclusive to Biltmore.
The furniture and ornaments in the garden line, such as cast stone planters and garden benches, are influenced by the designs found in Biltmore’s historic gardens.

**Nursery Production:** The nursery stock is all outsourced to other growers. The one exception is occasional in-house propagation of plant material by the horticulture department. For example, the garden staff propagated *Abutilon* ‘Biltmore Ball Gown’, which is an old species given a name, and sold it in the onsite nursery shop. The horticulture department received 50% of the sales. Andes notes that, “when the gardeners produce plants for sale, and see revenue coming in, it is a real motivating thing them.” The proceeds are used to purchase new equipment for the department.

**Sales:** The Biltmore garden line is sold online, in the onsite shop, and in regional retail venues. A contracted broker helps to market the product. Right now they sell to independent garden centers, but have considered selling to large retailers such as Loews.

**Pros and Cons of For Profit Model:** Andes expressed that a benefit of the for-profit model is the energy involved in the entrepreneurial and strategizing spirit that he never experience working in a non-profit garden. There is constant strategizing about how to make the business work best. A challenge is that there are no volunteers to help in the gardens. Furthermore, all improvements and capital projects need to be funded from profits. There can also be issues with the for-profit motive that hinder the overall guest experience. For example, prioritizing wedding rentals impacts the day-guest experience.
3.2.8 Other Related Interviews

Dr. Richard Lighty, (retired) Director of the Longwood Graduate Program

Dr. Richard Light was consulted about ideas for Meadowburn Farm. Lighty recommends to “take it step by step” and “work in cooperation with people that have something to gain”, such as other nurseries or horticulture businesses.

Dr. Thaisa Way, Professor of Landscape Architecture, University of Washington

Dr. Thaisa Way, a scholar of landscape architecture and history, was consulted regarding the significance of Ely as a woman in American horticultural history and the value in preserving her gardens at Meadowburn.

Dr. Way states, “The bottom line is [Ely] is important...Her garden designs are important.” When asked about the value of preserving Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn, Dr. Way expressed, “[Meadowburn] is really important in the context of women as writers, critics, and editors of popular taste...[as well as] women in the horticulture profession.” Ely and her contemporaries, such as Edith Wharton and Marianna Van Rensellaer, developed a repertoire that built the foundation for the later plethora of gardens and garden writing. Furthermore, it is valuable “to keep a the garden and have someone eventually look at it.” Use and wear are understood tangibly. “We can digitize all we want, but we cannot understand it fully”, she says. Dr. Way also sees value in preserving Meadowburn as a part of the history of the Garden Club of America (GCA). “The only places saved from the early years of the GCA are the sites they saved”, she says. “The GCA has been a huge mover, with a lot of influence...It would be fabulous to see that story told.”
Daniel Krall, MLA, Professor of Landscape Architecture at Cornell University

Professor Daniel Krall was consulted regarding his perception of the significance of Ely and Meadowburn. Krall stated, “Ely’s importance was that she was articulating things that were not being written about by women at that time.” Ely’s gardening and writing career was about 15 to 20 years prior to when women had a greater presence in garden design and writing. The fact that she was self-taught and relatively early, and that the gardens have been maintained over time implies that Meadowburn “is simply one of the few gardens [like it] in existence.”
3.3 Historic Garden Survey

A survey was developed (Appendix H) and distributed to 461 historic gardens owned by non-profit entities, government entities and private universities, and was active from July 18, 2012 through August 7, 2012. There were 110 responses, for a 24% response rate.

Subsequent to the close of this survey, it was determined that only data derived from those gardens owned by private non-profit organizations would be analyzed. A total of 52 respondents selected “Owned by a private not-for-profit organization, trust or foundation,” representing a 60% response rate. The following most salient and meaningful results are reported by question, but question 8, *Who Are Your Major Audiences?* was removed from analysis due to a flaw in the survey system.

Question 2 asked respondents whether there was an easement on the garden or affiliated property (Fig 17). The majority of respondents (65%) reported no conservation easements on their garden or affiliated acreage. The “other” category was selected twice (6%), indicating a “scenic easement” and protection by the National Trust of Historic Preservation. Of those gardens that have a conservation easement, 33% had been donated to the holder of the easement (Figure 18).

Question 6 asked respondents to indicate the approximate times of year the gardens were open to public visitation (Figure 19). The majority or respondents selected “regularly throughout the year” (75%), while “seasonally” was selected by 19% of respondents. Question 7 illustrates the annual visitation reported by each garden according to location (Figure 20).
Figure 17: Responses (n=52) to question #4, showing the presence of conservation easements on the property.

Figure 18: Responses (n=12) to question #4, regarding showing those easements that were sold versus donated.
Figure 19: Responses (n=52) to question #6, showing when gardens are open to public visitation.

Figure 20: Responses (n=52) to question #7, illustrating approximate annual visitation.
In question 14 and 15, respondents were asked about the transfer of property to the current non-profit owner, of which 50% of respondents reported that the property had been donated to the current non-profit owner, while 37% reported that the non-profit owner had purchased the property (Figure 21). Of those respondents that reported the land was donated, 77% reported that additional gift of funds to support garden maintenance were also donated, while 19% reported that no additional funds were donated with the property (Figure 22).

Question 17 asked respondents to identify the individuals who led the process of preservation of the gardens. The most common category selected was “original property owner” (Figure 23).

Questions 18 and 19 asked respondents whether partnerships with other entities were critical in the process of preservation (Figure 24). Partnerships were critical for 40% of respondents, while 43% reported partnerships as not critical. Of those who reported partnerships as critical to the process of preservation, 26% percent selected “Local Garden Club” as the critical partnership. The “other” category was selected by 29% of respondents, which included the following text entries: “local preservation organization”, “The National Parks Service”, “a local business”, and “Master Gardeners of Rhode Island” (Figure 25).
Figure 21: Responses (n=52) to question #14, showing those non-profits who purchased their property or received it as a donation.

Figure 22: Responses (n=26) to question #15, showing whether donation of property as reported in question #14 included funds for continued maintenance.
Figure 23: Responses (n=52) to question #17, showing the individual or group that spearheaded the process of preservation.

Figure 24: Responses (n=52) to question #18, showing whether partnerships were critical to the process of preservation.
Questions 23 thru 25 asked respondents about an affiliated Friends Group. The majority (67%) of respondents reported that there was no Friends Group associated with their garden, while 29% reported the presence of a Friends Group (Figure 26), of which only 7% were reported as incorporated Friends Groups (Figure 27). The most common responsibilities of the Friends Groups, both incorporated and unincorporated, are “fundraising” (29%) and “promotion of garden” (26%) (Figure 28).
Figure 26: Responses (n=52) to question #22, showing those gardens that have a Friends Group.

Figure 27: Responses (n=14) to question #23, showing whether the associated friends group reported in question #22 is incorporated or not.
Figure 28: Responses (n=14) to question #24 identifying the responsibilities of the friends groups reported in question #22.

Question 25 requested respondents to report the annual operating budget for the gardens, of which the majority (54%) reported a budget of “less than $50,000” (Figure 29), while 78% of respondents reported the operating budget in the first year of operations as being “under $50,000” (Figure 30).

Questions 27 thru 31 asked respondents to report on any endowments that support the garden, of which 51% reported the presence of an endowment (Figure 31). Of the gardens that report an endowment, 38% report that the endowment is “greater than $10 million” while 37% report that the endowment in “less than $1 million” (Figure 32). 35% of respondents felt it is “very important” that the property owner make an initial contribution to an endowment prior to asking for support from others (Figure 33).
Figure 29: Responses (n=50) to question #25, identifying the approximate annual operating budget.

Figure 30: Responses (n=45) to question #26, showing the approximate operating budget in the first year of operation.
Figure 31: Responses (n=49) to question #27, showing the presence of an endowment that supports the garden.

Figure 32: Responses (n=24) to question #28, showing the approximate size of the endowments reported in question #27.
Figure 33: Responses (n=48) to question #31, regarding the importance of an initial contribution by property owner to garden endowment.

In questions 32 and 33, respondents were asked about the major sources of revenue for their gardens. The most common sources of revenue were “membership dues” (82%) (Figure 34). “Endowment Income” (29%) was most frequently selected as “major revenue”, followed by “annual appeal” (15%) (Figure 35).

Questions 37 and 38 regard community support for the garden when it opened to public visitation. The most common reason for the community support for the garden to open to the public was “pride in local history” (78%) (Figure 36). The most common obstacle that hindered community support for the garden opening to public visitation was “increased vehicle traffic” (31%), however, the majority of respondent selected “none” (46%) (Figure 37).
Figure 34: Responses (n=49) to question #32, identifying the sources of revenue for the gardens.

Figure 35: Responses (n=49) to question #33, identifying major sources of revenue.
Figure 36: Responses (n=48) to question #37, showing reasons for community support of preservation.

Figure 37: Responses (n=48) to question #38, showing obstacle that hindered community support for preservation.
Questions 40 thru 44 relate to any current partnerships that the historic garden engages in. The most common categories partnerships were with “other non-profit” (41%) (Figure 38). One interesting text entry in the “other” category reported a partnership with a local master gardening program. Of those gardens that reported a partnership, the most common benefit of the partnership was “collaborative programming” (48%) (Figure 39). The other category included text entries as follows: “shared expertise”, “shared promotion”, “advice and management”, “collaborative marketing”, and “research and planning”. The most common disadvantage of partnerships was “conflicting priorities” (29%), however the majority of respondents reported “none” (54%) for disadvantages of current partnerships (Figure 40).

The final question of the survey asked respondents to identify the greatest challenge their historic garden faces. The most common response was “revenue and funding” (77%) (Figure 41) This is also true for the majority of gardens with endowments (Figure 42).
Figure 38: Responses (n=49) to question #40, showing current partner organizations.

Figure 39: Responses (n=29) to question #43, showing the benefits to the garden of current partnerships.
Figure 40: Responses (n=28) to question #44, showing challenges of current partnerships.

Figure 41: Responses (n=48) to question #45, showing the greatest challenges for gardens.
Figure 42: Responses to question #45, showing the greatest challenges for gardens with endowments.
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Significance of Ely’s Gardens at Meadowburn Farm

The following analysis of significance employs the criteria set forth in the Garden Conservancy’s Preservation Handbook (in bold italics), *Taking a Garden Public: Feasibility and Start Up* (Byers, Noble 2006).

*The garden demonstrates a creator’s passionate engagement with plants and design.*

The gardens at Meadowburn are the living legacy of Helena Rutherfurd Ely, which she personally and independently designed over a 40-year period without the help of a trained landscape designer (Ely 1911). They are the physical expression of Ely’s widely read and imitated garden philosophy, which encompassed plant selection and design, horticultural techniques accessible to amateurs, as well as the great joys of creating and working in one’s own garden. Details of the gardens reveal Ely’s personal interests, experience, individuality, autonomy, and the conviction with which she pursued her design vision. Meadowburn was the living laboratory in which Ely developed the practical expertise documented in her writing and emulated by her readers for a century. Meadowburn “is simply one of the few gardens [like it] in existence”, according to Landscape Architect Daniel Krall of Cornell, particularly given that Ely was self-taught, was relatively early to the 20th century gardening scene, and that her gardens have been maintained with little alteration over time.
The garden contains plant collections with historical or regional importance.

The gardens contain historically important heirloom plants, including dahlias that have been stored and replanted every winter since Ely’s era, herbaceous peonies, hardy phlox, iris, bay laurel, lilacs, and more.

The garden represents a distinctive style of the period in which the garden was built or is a significant work of a well-known designer, landscape architect, or person of extraordinary ability.

The design of the gardens at Meadowburn represents the popular gardening style of the turn of the century American country place. The garden illustrates the influence of classic Italian gardens and other characteristics of this era, such as axial orientation of formal gardens, consideration of the relationship of garden to house and countryside, garden rooms defined by hedges, and features such as a pergola, sun-dial, fountain, and statuary (Favretti, Favretti 1991).

Meadowburn is representative of the hardy gardening trend that swept the country in the turn of the century. Ely is recognized as having spurred the popularity of hardy gardening in America (Hill 1938, Begg 1991, Harris 1994). She conceptualized and started her own hardy gardens in the 1880’s, over a decade before the style became popular in America. In 1903, Ely stated that is was the only hardy garden she knew in the region of the size and variety of plants she grew. It was one of the most well known gardens in America in its time (Smith 1917), and served as a model for gardens throughout the country (Condict 1910).

The gardens at Meadowburn have been maintained by three generations of the Furman family for 120 years. This unusual gardening legacy has resulted in gardens that have been relatively unchanged through time.
The garden illustrates the development of a region or the particular relationship between people and the land at a given point in history.

Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn represent an active expression of evolving American cultural values of the turn of the century through garden design and horticulture. Her work and her writings captured the zeitgeist of her time vis a vis women’s roles in the household and home gardens. Dr. Thaisa Way, Landscape Historian at the University of Washington adds that the garden is also significant in the “context of women as writers, editors, and critics of popular taste.”

The garden is associated with a prominent person in history.

Ely was one of the most influential authors of practical horticulture books on hardy gardening in the early 1900’s. The gardens at Meadowburn are significant in that they were the personal gardens of Helena Rutherfurd Ely, and thus represent the purest manifestation of Ely’s design philosophy and horticultural practices.

Furthermore, Meadowburn is an important garden in the history of the Garden Club of America, and it is likely that Meadowburn is the only remaining personal home garden of the 23 original founders (Appendix F). Landscape historian Dr. Thaisa Way recognizes the significance of this connection. “The only places saved from the early years of the GCA are the sites they saved”, she notes. “The GCA has been a huge mover, with a lot of influence...It would be fabulous to see that story told.”

The garden is part of a property with significant amenities or scenic open-space.

The Meadowburn gardens are part of a 525-acre property that includes formal gardens, woodlands, agricultural lands, wetlands, vernal habitat, and riparian habitat.
The Wawayanda Creek, a major tributary of the Walkill River, runs through Meadowburn Farm. Additionally, Meadowburn Farm is home to state-listed endangered and threatened species, and contains one of Sussex County’s important vernal habitat zones (Caldwell 2010).

*The garden is eligible for state or national historic registers or national historic landmark status.*

Meadowburn Farm is listed as an Historic Site on the New Jersey State and National Register of Historic Places fulfilling criteria ‘B’ and ‘C’ of the National Parks Service’s significance criteria (DuPont, Dodd 1993). Criteria B “applies to properties associated with individuals whose specific contributions to history can be identified and documented” (National Park Service 1990). The nomination recognizes Helena Rutherfurd Ely as the person of significance for Criteria B (DuPont, Dodd 1993). Criteria C “applies to properties significant for their physical design or construction” and either “embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction”, or “represent the work of a master”, or “possess high artistic value.” (National Park Service 1990). Meadowburn is recognized under the significance categories of “Landscape Architecture” and “Literature/ gardening books” in connection with the work of Helena Rutherfurd Ely (DuPont, Dodd 1993). The period of significance for the property is recognized as 1770 to 1920, which marks the first construction of the main residence and the death of Helena Rutherfurd Ely.
Period of Significance for the Gardens

This research indicates that the period of significance of the gardens spans from 1881 to 1920, which represents the time in which Ely created her gardens and summered at Meadowburn Farm. The gardens reached a peak from 1910 to 1916: this period represents the time when Ely had refined her plant palette and design preferences and was still actively working in the gardens.

4.2 The Value of Preserving Ely’ Gardens at Meadowburn Farm

This thesis provides ample evidence of Meadowburn’s significance in the history of American horticulture. Furthermore, there is interest in Ely and her gardens in the local community, horticultural community, and the national garden history community. Preservation of these gardens will allow for continued study of the tangible aspects of the gardens Ely created while developing her gardening techniques and design vision. Preservation will enable future generations to learn from and appreciate the gardens as an embodiment of cultural values and attitudes expressed through the home garden at the turn of the century. As perhaps the only surviving personal garden created by a founding member of the Garden Club of America, preserving Ely’s gardens will further the understanding of the inspiration for, and history of this influential Club.

Preserving the gardens will provide new sources of earned revenue and diversify the income of Meadowburn Farm, thereby ensuring its continued financial sustainability. Preservation will also bolster Meadowburn’s agritourism and farming operations. The added attraction of the historic gardens and the educational, leisure, and social opportunities it creates, will reach diverse audiences and provide more
reasons for repeat customer visits. Investing in the preservation of Ely’s gardens will benefit any business venture at Meadowburn Farm by offering the additional attraction of the gardens and Ely’s story.
4.3 Models for Preservation

The two principal models for garden operations examined in this study are a ‘for-profit business’ model and a ‘non-profit organization’ model. Secondary models are included for easement options and a family-trust option. Alternative ownership models were not included in this analysis, as the owners of Meadowburn Farm have no immediate intention to sell the property. Thus, all options are considered in light of continuous ownership under the Meadowburn Trust.

4.3.1 The For-Profit Business Model

Results indicate that developing a small business that draws on the unique qualities of the gardens at Meadowburn Farm could generate revenue while simultaneously preserving the gardens, and help support Meadowburn Farm at large. One business model that is compatible with a vision for Meadowburn and has proved successful from this research is a retail nursery, display garden and horticultural education hub, as evidenced by Perennial Pleasures Nursery, Well Sweep Herb Farm, and Linden Hill Gardens. These three small businesses shared key elements, or “themes,” that contribute to their success: a passionate leader, a display garden, a specialty nursery product, and a variety of activities that keep customers engaged with the business:

Leadership: Business success will depend on engaging competent, creative, and passionate leadership from the start. Each of the three businesses studied was founded by an individual who was passionate about horticulture, which subsequently
became the driving force for the business. Jerry Fritz of Linden Hill Gardens notes that to be successful, it is worth investing in the “best [staff] you can get.”

**Display Gardens:** Display gardens create an attractive atmosphere that keep customers interested, but also serve as inspiration for customers, demonstrate how the plants they sell can be used for different effects, and help market the nursery products. Tony Avent, owner of Plant Delights Nursery, confirms this, writing “display gardens are among the best sales tools available to a retail establishment” (Avent 2003). Additionally, display gardens create a space for hosting programs and events. Well Sweep and Perennial Pleasures also use the display gardens to grow parent plants for propagating nursery stock.

**The Specialty Product:** The three businesses studied in this research had a specialty nursery product that contributes to the unique characteristic of the business. Perennial Pleasures specializes in garden phlox, Well Sweep in herbs, and Linden Hill Gardens in snowdrops and hellebores. Based on the recommendations of Perennial Pleasures Nursery, the specialty product should be marketable over the long term, be attractive and loved by customers, contain ample variety, and be easy to propagate. Given this criterion and the history of Meadowburn, dahlias could be an appropriate specialty for nursery production at Meadowburn.

On-site sales represent the majority of the income of the aforementioned three businesses; however mail order and online sales are used to expand the reach of specialty products to a national market. Mail order and online sales add an additional layer of complexity to the operations of the business (Avent 2003).
**Activities:** Educational, social, cultural, and/or recreational activities help diversify income and provide great marketing opportunities for the three nurseries in this study. Rachel Kane, owner of Perennial Pleasures, recommends generating multiple points of interest for customers, and to keep changing so that customers stay interested and engaged. For example, setting up croquet entertains non-plants people while their friends, parents, and partners shop. A garden café not only provides a gathering place for socializing, but also extends the duration of customer visits, which in turn tends to result in both increased sales and expanded enjoyment of the garden experience. With the addition of robust event schedules, the gardens become an active cultural and horticultural resource for visitors from near and far.

**Benefits of a For-Profit Business Model:** The primary benefit of the small for-profit business model is the simplicity in ownership and oversight. It is conceivable that Meadowburn’s landowners could retain autonomy over the operations of the gardens and enterprise. There are no limitations on what the profits of the business support, and any partnership with the existing dairy production is simplified. Parker Andes, Director of Horticulture at the Biltmore Estate, expresses the benefit of the energetic and entrepreneurial attitude in a for-profit garden, an attitude that is exciting and constantly strategizing about how to make the enterprise work.

**Challenges of a Private Business Model:** For-profit businesses do not qualify for tax-deductible donations, grants, and foundation funding typical of non-profits. Quite often, sizeable financial investment for capital expenses and operations are
shouldered by the owners until the business is profitable. As evidenced by Biltmore’s operations, ongoing improvements must be funded out of profits, which invariably impacts other fund allocation decisions. Additionally, a private business will not have the same draw for volunteer help from the community, not only for garden maintenance but also professional services, and in-kind donations. This will increase the need to hire paid employees to fill positions a non-profit would otherwise fill with volunteer help. Operating as a business may also impact the sense of ownership community members might otherwise develop with a non-profit.

4.3.2 The Non-Profit Organization Model

Operating the gardens at Meadowburn as a non-profit would open doors for funding and community support not otherwise available to a for-profit business. A non-profit organization could be created from the ground up, or Meadowburn could partner with an existing non-profit to oversee operations. Since landowners would like to keep Meadowburn in the ownership of the Meadowburn Trust, an easement or lease agreement would need to be established with a non-profit to oversee garden operations.

The easement model developed by the E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust is an option that would allow for a non-profit organization to operate the gardens while the property is owned privately. This would require donating an easement for the gardens to a preservation trust (see section on easements).

This study found no appropriate examples of a non-profit organization dedicated to running a garden on a privately owned property without an easement present, or plans to transfer ownership to a non-profit organization in the future. That
being said, it may be feasible to establish a lease agreement between a private property owner and a non-profit without an easement. This option would require further investigation and consultation from an expert in non-profit law. As was the case for the “For-Profit Business model, several themes for success emerged from this research to support the “Non-Profit Model,” and some were shared between both models:

**Leadership:** The success of the non-profit model depends upon dedicated and strong leadership. Establishing a non-profit requires at least one individual dedicated to organizing and working with volunteers, fundraising, overseeing the planning process, and providing overall leadership for the project. According to survey results, the original property owners or their families spearheaded the majority of preservation efforts. However, interested individuals and organizations also served as leaders for preservation efforts.

The Anne Spencer Garden and the Beatrix Farrand Garden at Bellefield both stress the importance of passion and professional leadership in the success of their preservation efforts. According to Jane White, “Somebody has got to be passionate about the garden and the importance of saving it. When there is passion involved, sometimes you find ways to solve issues.”

While many individuals have expressed encouragement and interest for the preservation of the gardens at Meadowburn, no individual or group has yet to pioneer a non-profit effort.

**A Friends Group:** Forming an active and dedicated friends group is an effective first step towards establishing a non-profit to oversee the gardens at
Meadowburn, as seen in the examples of the Beatrix Farrand Garden Association at Bellefield, the Friends of Elizabeth Lawrence Garden, and the survey results. A friends group could initially develop a plan to move forward, generating support for Meadowburn, engaging the community, seeking partnerships, continued documentation of the garden, garden maintenance and volunteer oversight, marketing, and fundraising (Byers, Noble 2006). This group would not have 501(c)3 status at first, but could operate under the umbrella of a fiscal sponsor until the friends group is incorporated. Once the friends group is established and a plan forward is developed, the friends group could apply for 501(c)3 status. The Garden Conservancy’s Preservation Handbook, Taking A Garden Public: Feasibility and Startup, outlines important considerations for forming a friends group and a non-profit organization (Byers, Noble 2006), and can serve as a valuable resource if the non-profit model is selected.

**Partnerships:** Developing partnerships can be valuable for the sustainability and success of the non-profit model. According to the survey, partnerships with other organizations were critical in the process of preservation for 40% of respondents. The majority of those organizations benefited from partnering with a local garden club. Those organizations that currently have partnerships largely benefit from collaborative programming with other non-profits. The most common challenge of current partnerships was conflicting priorities. Establishing an effective partnership requires common purpose, clear communication, shared commitment, trust, and leadership (Publow 2010).
The partnership between the Beatrix Farrand Garden Association and the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess Counties (GCOD) could serve as a model for a future partnership between Meadowburn and the GCOD. Support from this club could bring valuable energy, recognition and support for Meadowburn. While the GCOD rarely assists projects financially, they can provide valuable hands-on help and help promote the project, and could lead to an endorsement of Meadowburn from the Garden Club of America. Most importantly, a partnership with the GCOD would help develop a support network throughout Orange and Duchess counties.

Other potential partner organizations include local historical societies, as demonstrated in the survey results. Meadowburn Farm is an important site in both Townships’ histories, thus, there may be opportunity for collaborative programming with the Vernon Township Historical Society and the Warwick Historical Society. A partnership with the local Master Gardener Program, as reported in the survey results, could be valuable for assistance with garden maintenance. Rutgers University Cooperative Extension of Sussex County has a Master Gardeners Program.

**Finances, Funding, and Revenue:** If operated as a non-profit organization, Meadowburn would be eligible to apply for grant and foundation funding, as well as accept tax-deductible donations. Meadowburn could qualify for grant funding from the New Jersey Historical Commission, the New Jersey Historic Trust, the 1772 Foundation, and more. The affluence in the Warwick community and the Hudson Valley region, and enthusiasm expressed by community members, suggest that local financial support via private donations is feasible and likely.
The survey demonstrated that the most significant revenue sources for non-profit gardens are endowment income, annual appeals and private donations, events and fundraisers, and grant and foundation support. This implies that the majority of the organization’s effort is invested in development. Most gardens either have an existing endowment, or are in the process of developing an endowment.

Operating the gardens at Meadowburn as a non-profit does not prevent the development of earned revenue sources. According to survey results, garden admission and tours, facility rentals, educational programs, and retail sales (both nursery and non-nursery), were common sources of earned revenue for non-profit gardens. Yet very few gardens recognized these sources as major contributors to the organization’s income. However, commercial activity and business-like enterprise is becoming more common in the non-profit sector as a means to diversify and stabilize revenue (Foelich 1999, Dart 2004).

**Benefits of the Non-Profit Model:** The opportunity to apply for grant and foundation funding, and accept tax-deductible donations, is a major benefit, with another being the increased involvement and support from the community. Opportunities for volunteer help, board involvement, and community fundraisers engage people in gardens activities, developing community ownership in the preservation efforts and thus a support network.

**Challenges of the Non-Profit Model:** The survey indicated that the greatest challenge is revenue and funding, regardless of whether or not an endowment is in place.
Considering the property owners wish to retain ownership of the Meadowburn, another challenge is the potential for conflicting priorities between the property owners and the non-profit organization. Putting the garden under an easement and passing garden management to a separate organization will limit the autonomy and privacy of the property owners. The residents at the Dunn Gardens and Keil Cove both expressed having occasional conflicts with restrictions on how they can use or make changes to the property.

Moving forward with a non-profit model is not without cost to the property owner. The property owners will need to dedicate significant time in generating support for the organization, and will need to be comfortable asking for help and financial support. Establishing and maintaining an easement is costly, as seen in the case of the E.B. Dunn Historic Trust and Keil Cove. To be successful, the property owners will need to make financial contributions to the organization up front and into the future.

4.3.3 Secondary Option 1: The Family Trust Model

The family trust developed to maintain the Platt House and Garden could serve as a model for the Meadowburn Trust and beneficiaries. An annual dues payment for beneficiaries, combined with a fee structure based on time used, provides for a sustainable system that supports an important family property shared among many people. This system could supplement any non-profit or for-profit ventures for the garden and farm. A calendar of family use could be integrated with facility rentals to further support the cost of maintaining the house.
The relatively large size of the Platt family that participates in the Trust makes the cost of maintaining the property relatively affordable. Due to the high cost of maintaining Meadowburn Farm and relatively small size of the family, it is unlikely that a similar trust could support all maintenance and capital expenses without other sources of income, or high family dues.

4.3.4 Secondary Option 2: The Conservation Easement Model

Conservation easements provide another option for preserving the historic value of a garden in perpetuity. An easement can complement a non-profit organization as with the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden, a private garden as with Keil Cove, or as a non-profit/private hybrid as with the E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust.

A conservation easement indefinitely preserves the historic features of a garden, as it binds all future property owners to its restrictions. The Garden Conservancy holds a number of easements that “protect the gardens in perpetuity by assuring that they will be retained predominantly in their current condition as historic, horticultural, and educational resources” (Garden Conservancy n.d.). The majority of conservation easements are donated, as reflected in the survey results and the examples of Keil Cove, the E.B. Dunn Historic Garden Trust, and the Elizabeth Lawrence Garden. An easement donation can benefit the owner with income tax deductions and reduced property taxes, depending on the value of the donated rights.

Given that the residential core of Meadowburn is currently zoned “rural residential,” any future development rights might already be limited, even without an easement. This would impact the value of any available tax credits. In addition to a donation of development rights, a donation of funds to cover the cost of drafting
easement documents and funds for an endowment to monitor the easement may also be necessary.

Preserving the gardens must be the primary motive for a conservation easement. As seen in examples of the Dunn Gardens and Keil Cove, the combined value of forgone development rights and long-term financial commitments exceeded the value of both short and long-term reductions in taxes. It is important that the property owner’s primary objective is long-term preservation, and that all costs and benefits are carefully weighed.
4.3.5 **Recommended: The For-Profit Business Model**

Based on the findings of this research, it is recommended that the owners of Meadowburn Farm pursue a for-profit business model for the operations of the gardens. A new business entity, established for the purpose of rehabilitating, maintaining, and operating the gardens should work in collaboration with the newly established dairy and farming enterprise, taking a holistic approach to garden and farming ventures at Meadowburn Farm. This recommendation is based on:

- Simplicity of governance.
- Simplicity in relationship of business to the family.
- Maximizes income (profit) to support the farm.
- Congruent with the dairy farm venture.
- Invests energy and current momentum directly into making the garden profitable and self-sustaining.
- Opens opportunities to ally with local and regional economic development organizations, initiatives, and promotions (e.g. tourism and agritourism, horticultural industry, etc.)
- Creates a strong base for future non-profit operations if more practical in the future.
4.4 Feasibility Assessment

Assuming that the recommended for-profit model is adopted, this section discusses elements to be considered when developing a strategic or business plan for the gardens at Meadowburn Farm. Note: Elements of the assessment are applicable to the Non-Profit Model, with additional consideration of advantages and restrictions of non-profit status. If a Non-Profit Model is preferred, additional questions will need to be studied. Discussion of available funding and funding needs is limited, as it was not a central focus of this research.

4.4.1 Community Receptiveness

The results of this study indicate that the community is supportive, encouraging, and enthusiastic about the preservation and public opening of Ely’s gardens. This sentiment was expressed by multiple Warwick community leaders and local residents. The Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County (GCOD) has also expressed interest in Ely and Meadowburn, particularly timely in the year 2013, which marks the GCOD and GCA centennial.

The Vernon community was less accessible, making it hard to gauge the extent of awareness or enthusiasm for the preservation of Meadowburn. Those individuals consulted during this study were helpful and encouraging, commenting that the community would “only react positively” to the preservation of Meadowburn. It will be important to gain the support of Vernon Township officials, particularly in the light of applying for permits and zoning variances, if and when necessary.
4.4.2 Public Visitation

Garden and history lovers have toured Ely’s gardens for over a century. The majority of these visitors are garden clubs, garden and architectural historians, garden writers, and regional historians. As long as the gardens exist and the story is told, there will be continued interest from the public to tour the gardens at Meadowburn.

Meadowburn Farm’s historical significance, agricultural enterprises, horticultural interest, and scenic open space are qualities that make it an ideal destination for local residents and tourists to visit and enjoy. By developing services, products, and programs that leverage these qualities, Meadowburn Farm could become a popular destination for local residents and tourists.

The rural location and beauty of Meadowburn Farm is a draw for city-dwellers who wish to find repose in the countryside. Concerns about distance from major population centers is contradicted by the example of Linden Hill Gardens, whose main audience is New York City and Philadelphia residents who travel up to 80 miles to visit. Hosting events in these urban centers, as well as offering member discounts to horticulture organizations helps market to these audiences.

Interest in horticulture, as seen through a number of garden clubs, beautification initiatives, and local horticulture businesses, suggests that there would be much interest from the local community in participating in and patronizing horticultural enterprises at Meadowburn. The growth in popularity of agritourism, as well as the previous success of dairy operations at Meadowburn, suggest that future agritourism enterprises at Meadowburn Farm could be profitably pursued.

The visitation numbers reported by Well Sweep Herb Farm, Linden Hill Gardens, and the rural non-profit gardens in the survey, suggest that the gardens and horticultural ventures at Meadowburn could expect annual visitation between 5,000 to
10,000 once programs, goods, and services are well established. However, the additional attraction of the dairy production and related agritourism activities will likely increase this number. Visitation numbers will also be positively influenced by the proximity to the bustling village of Warwick and other heritage and agritourism sites, recreational tourism attractions, as well as the efforts to promote tourism in the Warwick Valley.

Offering tours by appointment only or on special occasions could be a transition step into a regular public visitation schedule. Once visitor amenities, infrastructure, and staff can support increased visitation, Meadowburn could open to the general public on a regular basis.

**Seasons of Interest:** Provided that the gardens emulate Ely’s continuous successions of bloom, the season of interest of the gardens span from approximately May through November. Seasons of bloom for specific areas of the garden or certain plants can be capitalized upon for festivals and events, for example a Peony Festival in June or a Dahlia Festival in August. Public visitation could be extended into winter, with offerings of holiday craft workshops and events, highlighting winter blooming garden areas or nursery products. These are successful strategies employed by Well Sweep and Linden Hill Gardens. Opening for occasional winter events when otherwise closed to the public, such as Dunn Garden’s Snowdrop Stroll, maintains a year-round connection to the audience or customer base (Schilling 2006).

Alternatively, public visitation could close completely each winter, as with Perennial Pleasures Nursery, which is open seasonally.
**Garden Tours and Admissions:** Providing guided tours presents opportunities to educate the public; market programs, goods, and services; and generate earned income. Tours of farm operations could complement garden tours, a popular activity offered by New Jersey farms participating in agritourism (Schilling 2006).

Charging admission to visit the gardens without a guided tour is another option, which is a common means of earned revenue for gardens open to the public. However, data from this study show it seldom represents a major portion of earned revenue for non-profit gardens. Alternatively, free admission could promote the sale of goods and services. This strategy is used by the three for-profit businesses in this study.

**Educational Programs and Events:** Offering onsite educational programs and events is a means to educate the public, foster an appreciation for the garden, engage with the community, increase awareness about Meadowburn, and increase earned revenue. Drawing on themes of Ely’s horticultural practices and philosophies, natural ecosystems and agricultural activities, Meadowburn could produce a robust yearly calendar of educational and event activity.

The results of this study indicate that there is a need for horticultural programming in the region, suggesting opportunity for Meadowburn in this area. Jerry Fritz of Linden Hill Gardens has recognized an increased interest from the public in learning about garden and farm related skills, which he has leveraged in his educational programming.
The three nursery businesses offer on-site educational programs and events, transforming the commercial transaction into an educational experience. These programs achieve several purposes: they serve as an excellent marketing tool, bring more customers through the retail nursery, and keep regular customers interested, engaged, and spending. Organizing an event around a winter blooming plant or holiday craft attracts customers in the low season, such as the Hellebore Festival at Linden Hill Gardens, or wreath making at Well Sweep. For Perennial Pleasures, offering educational programs, such as weekly skills workshops, is a way for the owner to give back to her community.

Partnerships with other entities provide an excellent opportunity for collaborative programming, as reflected in the survey results. Potential partners for Meadowburn include the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County, Warwick Historical Society, the Vernon Township Historical Society, local schools, businesses, and non-profit organizations.

**Retail Nursery:** Establishing a specialty retail nursery at Meadowburn Farm could generate income and serve as an additional attraction for public visitation (Govindasamy, Pingali & Hossai 1998). Propagating plants was an important element of Ely’s horticultural practices, and can be leveraged for educational workshops and interpretation.

Determining plants to grow and sell should be based on marketability, ease of production, and alignment with the vision for Meadowburn. Producing plants with a historic tie to Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn, or her gardening practices and philosophies will create a unique angle for a nursery business. The heirloom plants
still present in the gardens carry a unique and marketable story. Consultations with growers suggest there may be cultivars at Meadowburn currently unavailable on the market or that contain desirable characteristics.

Identifying a specialty product will help boost marketing and contribute to the unique character of Meadowburn, as exemplified in the three nursery businesses studied. Hosting special events that highlight the specialty plant during its prime season serve as a further draw for customers.

An important consideration for a retail nursery is the production of the plants (Avent 2003). Both Perennial Pleasures and Well Sweep propagate and grow their nursery stock on-site. Alternatively, Linden Hill Gardens purchases wholesale nursery stock, supplemented by select items propagated and grown on site, the later being most profitable. Given that space is likely not an issue, and the possibility for interpretation and education around the theme of propagation, producing plants on-site is an excellent option.

The relatively remote location of Meadowburn may not be ideal for a retail nursery (Avent 2003). However, with the additional attractions of the Ely historic garden, the dairy production, and educational programs and events, retail nursery sales could likely generate good revenue. Linden Hill Gardens and Well Sweep Nursery are examples of fairly remote nurseries that have succeeded in bringing customers from far away.

The nursery business is an area that may lend itself to partnerships with established local entities, drawing on existing reputation and customer base, as well as reducing potential competitive concerns in the community.
Non-Nursery Retail Sales: Selling gift items and value-added garden and farm products could provide another revenue source for Meadowburn (Avent 2003, Schilling 2006). This is seen in the successful enterprise of the three businesses in this study that complement nursery sales with non-nursery items, such as potpourri supplies at Well Sweep, hats at Perennial Pleasures, and a variety of terrarium craft supplies and garden ornaments at Linden Hill Gardens. Other common items include clothing, tools, books, and value-added goods produced onsite such as dried flowers and fresh bouquets. In each circumstance, the gift shop serves as an additional draw for customers and diversifies income opportunities.

Biltmore provides an example of how heritage and horticulture can be used to create a commercial garden brand. Ideas could be gleaned from their use of marketing plants, garden products, and historically inspired garden ornaments, to develop a Meadowburn Farm brand. For example, a line of exceptional reproductions of the antique statuary and ironwork at Meadowburn could inspire a line of unique garden ornaments.

Food Service: Developing a café at Meadowburn Farm to complement the garden and dairy operations would enhance the experience of visitors and provide an additional attraction (Schilling 2006). The addition of garden cafes within nurseries is a significant trend as retailers recognize the revenue opportunities (Mason 2004). At Perennial Pleasures, the Tea Café helps draw visitors from further distances and keep the nursery busy during seasons that would traditionally not be as busy. Providing picnics enhances the interest in specialized garden tours at Well Sweep, while visiting chefs and food trucks contribute to the bustle of activity at Linden Hill Gardens.
Offering food services keeps customers content and increases the time and money spent in the nursery. Since many visitors to Meadowburn will likely be traveling a far distance to visit, offering refreshments and food will likely be welcomed.

**Cut Flowers:** Growing flowers for cutting and decorating the house was an important element of gardening for Ely, thus the majority of flowers in her garden were suitable for cut flowers. Ely’s Picking Garden could also provide a theme for education and interpretation, such as floral design classes. Fresh cut bouquets can be sold as part of a community supported agriculture program, at farmers markets, or at an onsite farm shop, and could contribute another source of earned revenue to the Meadowburn garden operations (Bachman 2006). Perennial Pleasures Nursery sells cut flowers on request, and also provides custom arrangements, adding further value to the cut flower.

**Facility Rentals:** Multiple Warwick community leaders expressed the need for conference space and attractive wedding venues in the immediate area. Given the need, along with the fact that Meadowburn Farm possesses significant scenic beauty and charm, could make facility rentals a viable source of revenue for Meadowburn.

Glynwood Farm and Willowwood Arboretum offer rentals for small gatherings with discounted rates for mission-related organizations. Many gardens only rent tent sites and require the renting party to provide all additional amenities and portable facilities. Offering a built structure for wedding rentals increases the attraction of a site as well as the associated fee. Willowwood Arboretum requires renting parties to purchase insurance and any necessary permits.
Renting facilities for conferences, meetings, and small gatherings could be a manageable entry point if Meadowburn Farm were to move forward with event rentals. Small groups could be accommodated in the barn or in the downstairs of the main house if no longer a residence. It is important to consider the carrying capacity of the site. The number of large gatherings should be limited to control the impact of wear and tear on the grounds and facilities.

**Overnight Accommodations:** Offering overnight accommodations, such as farm stays or bed and breakfast stays, has proven to significantly increase the income of small farms in New Jersey and California (Schilling 2011, Donaldson, Momsen 2011). Glynwood Farm offers overnight accommodations in conjunction with facility rentals for weddings and conferences. Meadowburn Farm lends itself to overnight stays, provided the houses are not in permanent use by the landowners or tenants. A Meadowburn farm-stay program could integrate with other garden and farm related educational offerings.

**Publicity:** Word of mouth is the most effective form of marketing for New Jersey agritourism operations (Schilling 2006), and the three nursery businesses in this study. Networking and exposure will be important in establishing a presence within the market. Participating in regional garden tours, such as the Garden Conservancy’s Open Days Program, or the Warwick Valley Gardener’s Annual Garden Tour, could be valuable to increasing awareness about Meadowburn.

Presence at regional and local farmers markets provides exposure as well as a venue for direct sales (Bachman 2006). This is reflected in Linden Hill’s success at the
Chelsea Market, which has established a city audience for the business. Data from this study shows that participating in offsite events, such as garden and trade shows or offering horticultural lectures, provides great marketing opportunity for small nurseries and garden shops.

A well designed, attractive, and user friendly website can be an excellent marketing tool. Maintaining active communication with customers and members through e-newsletters has proved helpful for Linden Hill Gardens. Furthermore, linking to other online directories has been noted to bring in customers (Schilling 2006). Developing a presence within social media should also be pursued for marketing.

4.4.3 Site Improvements

Opening Meadowburn Farm and the historic residential and garden core to public visitation will require improvements to the infrastructure, buildings, and grounds. Such improvements could occur in phases over several years. (See section on “Suggested Phases for Garden Improvements,” page 178).

4.4.3.1 Zoning

Under the New Jersey Right to Farm Act, Meadowburn does not need to apply for a zoning variance to allow for an onsite shop, or to open for educational tours or activities for the public, provided such activity relates to agriculture (or horticulture). The emphasis on supporting agritourism and heritage tourism in the region (Wiengart 2008a, Caldwell 2010) suggests that changes in the use of Meadowburn’s residential core to accommodate agritourism and heritage tourism programming will be supported by the Township.
However, if the primary commercial activities at Meadowburn do not relate to agriculture, such as operating as a B&B, botanic garden, or non-agricultural commercial enterprise, zoning variances will be necessary. In this scenario, rezoning as a Vernon Township Historic Landmark is recommended by the Vernon Township Zoning officer. This designation allows for adaptive new use of the site, and provides further preservation of the site’s historic features.

4.4.3.2 Historic Gardens

Decreased maintenance, severe deer pressure, aging, and weather damage have had a significant impact on the integrity of the garden’s vegetative fabric. Improvements will be required in order to return the gardens to a state representative of the period of historic significance.

It is the author’s conclusion that the gardens should interpret the period between 1902 and 1917, the height of activity in Ely’s gardens and the period for which there is the most documentation. However, each garden area could interpret a different period within the garden’s history, depending on the objectives of interpretation, available documentation, intended use, and available resources. For example, restoring the Pool Garden to the period of 1916 after it was simplified would be significantly less costly than restoring to an earlier period when Ely had installed elaborate lily and iris beds.

Further investigation will be required to better understand the cultural history, existing conditions, and historic integrity of the garden prior to any garden improvements or changes. These further studies should then support the development of a thoughtful treatment plan for the gardens (Birnbaum 1994).
The standards for preservation developed by the Secretary of the Interior are widely used as guidelines for preservation practices in the United States (Presley Associates 2007). These standards recognize four treatments for historic landscapes: preservation, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction. Due to the condition of the garden, available documentation, available financial recourses, and intended future use, it is likely that a combination of restoration and rehabilitation are appropriate treatments for the gardens at Meadowburn. Restoration is defined as the “process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular time” (Birnbaum 1994). Rehabilitation is defined as the “process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values” (Birnbaum 1994). Rehabilitation allows for changes in the garden in response to evolving use, while preserving the historic character of the gardens.

A treatment plan should consider improvements to the garden in phases, prioritizing areas of primary historic significance, integral to the overall design of the garden, and significant for the planned use of the garden. The plan should consider improvements to infrastructure such as irrigation, power, lighting and security, as well as making areas of the garden ADA accessible. It is imperative that the property be assessed for safety hazards prior to opening for public visitation. It is recommended that a professional landscape architect with expertise in garden preservation be consulted in the development of a treatment plan for the gardens (Favretti, Favretti 1991).
**Deer Management System:** Installing a deer fence that is not an impediment to the historic landscape design is currently cost prohibitive. Employing a combination of alternative strategies to inhibit deer damage is most practical in the short term. Resident dogs and portable electric fencing systems, complemented by preventative deer repellent sprays, use of resistant plant material, and increased hunting on the property could be effective deer deterrent strategies.

Resident dogs require an invisible fence system, which should encompass the historic garden core. The dogs should inhabit the garden when closed to public visitation. Vulnerable plantings could be further protected with preventative deer sprays (Maslo, Wehman 2013). During the winter, selected garden areas could be protected by a portable electric fencing system (Grande, et al. 1998). Replacing the hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) and arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*) hedges with a plant that deer do not eat, such as Red Cedar (*Thuja plicata*), should be considered. Increased hunting on the property will also help reduce the presence of deer (Maslo, Wehman 2013). Garden staff will need to be diligent about employing these preventative strategies in order to be effective.

Installing high-tensile woven wire fencing should be considered to protect nursery areas. This may qualify for a NJDA Deer Fencing Program cost-share, provided the nursery production is considered an agricultural endeavor (Wiengart 2008b).

When funds are available, it may make financial sense to invest in a permanent deer fence that encompasses a much larger portion of the property, and does not visually interfere with the designed elements of the landscape.
4.4.3.3 Buildings and Facilities

Facilities for Garden Operations: Facilities needed include:

Offices: Garden staff need office space, which could be located in the storage room above the Carriage House in an interim or permanent capacity. Depending on future plans, other buildings that could house offices include the New Barn, or the Superintendents House.

Storage: The Garage could easily store garden equipment and supplies; it is large, accessible by large vehicles, and conveniently located to the garden.

Nursery: This is needed to support the garden and could be established behind the Garage in what was once the horse pen. This area is close to utilities and the center of activity yet removed from the formal core of the garden. If a commercial production nursery is established, a larger space might be required. The Greenhouse should continue to be used for propagation, however an upgraded, more efficient heating system should be considered. New winter storage area for dahlia tubers should be established, since current storage in the Main House basement is inconvenient.

Compost: The compost pits adjacent to the Garage are sufficient for the needs of the garden, but will need to be rebuilt.

Visitor Amenities: Visitor amenities should be shared with the dairy operation for efficiency, and to create a central hub of information and activity at Meadowburn Farm. It is important to assess the property for safety hazards, and make necessary improvements prior to opening for public visitation.

Circulation: Opening Meadowburn to public visitation will require a new, clear circulation path for visitors to and through the gardens. A well defined, easy to follow, and free flowing circulation route is important to insure visitor safety, quality of
experience, and minimized pedestrian impact on the site (Favretti, Favretti 1991). This circulation plan should consider the entire visitor experience from arrival to departure, including signage, accessibility, way-finding, resting places, safety, and amenities.

Signage: A simple and elegant road sign would identify Meadowburn to visitors upon arrival (Favretti, Favretti 1991) and a sign on Route 94 would also serve as an effective marketing tool (Schilling 2006). Way-finding signage to parking, the garden entrance, and important facilities should also be considered. Because the gardens themselves are relatively small, way-finding signage within the garden can be limited. Interpretive signage, as part of a well-designed interpretive plan, will be valuable for telling Meadowburn’s story and enhancing the educational experience.

Visitor Parking: This should be created and screened from the historic garden core (Favretti, Favretti 1991). Parking is limited at the Main House, which is currently reserved for residents only. Limited space is available adjacent to the Garage, which should be designated for garden operation use only due to the proximity to the garden facilities areas. Ideally, guest parking should be located at the farmstead (across the street) to reduce impact on the historic garden, with a clearly marked walking route from parking to the garden entrance. Overflow parking for special events could be directed to an adjacent field.

Information and Sales: A reception area and retail shop should be created and should be the main hub for information relating to the garden and dairy, as well as the point for retail and ticket sales.

Restrooms: ADA accessible visitor restrooms will be required. In the short term, there should be one restroom facility built at the farmstead for visitors to the farm and garden. Depending on the eventual use of buildings in the historic core,
additional restrooms could be made available in future phases. For large events, mobile restrooms can be rented to avoid any burden on Meadowburn facilities.

Program Space: Multipurpose space will be needed for educational programs and events either now or later. Suitable, existing buildings for this purpose include the new barn and the lower level of the Carriage House, which would need to be renovated with this intention in mind. Alternatively, a facility actively used for other purposes could be used for occasional events when necessary, much like the barn at Glynwood Farm uses its cattle barn.

Accessibility: ADA garden access must be considered whenever possible. Designating a drop off area close to the garden entrance would help accommodate elderly guests and wheelchairs (Favretti, Favretti 1991). Fortunately, the garden terrain is relatively level, and most of the pathways are wide enough for wheelchair use. The Evergreen Garden may be the only inaccessible garden location.

**Buildings and Future Uses Options:** Meadowburn Farm’s residential core and farmstead contain several buildings that lend themselves to new uses.

Main House: The Main House is currently used as a permanent residence of the property owners, however, in the future they are open to additional compatible uses. The Main House is the most costly structure on the property to maintain and would benefit from revenue generation. Renting select rooms on the first floor for small events, meetings, and conferences is an option that could be integrated with the family’s calendar of use. Upstairs bedrooms could be rented for overnight accommodations for multi-day conferences, as seen at Glynwood Farm. Another
option that is not mutually exclusive, is to rent rooms for overnight guests as apart of a farm-stay or B&B operation (Donaldson, Momsen 2011).

Carriage House: The top floor of the Carriage House, also affectionately referred to as the Roost or the Winter Palace, is optimal for garden and administrative offices as it is centrally located and equipped with the necessary infrastructure. A remodeled lower floor could serve as program space or retail shop. Alternatively, the lower level could be used for garden storage, and the top level for staff housing.

Superintendent House: Also referred to as the Furman House, this is currently the residence of Mrs. Ethel Furman. Keeping it as the residence of the head gardener or garden manager has the advantages of having staff on-site for security purposes (Hanna 2004), and could complement employee compensation. Other possible uses include overnight accommodations, offices, or educational programming space.

Tenant House: This is a small residential home adjacent to the Farm House. It could serve as additional staff housing, intern housing, rental accommodations, or office space. Alternatively, this building could be rented to a tenant to produce additional income.

New Barn: In the short term, it is likely to be occupied by farming operations. It is the only current interior space that can accommodate large events. Integrating event rentals with the farm operations, as seen at Glynwood Farm, could generate significant revenue for Meadowburn. Other possible uses include program space, offices, retail shop, or a café.
4.4.3.4 Security

Inviting the public requires new security measures to ensure the privacy of residents and protection of assets while the garden is closed (Favretti, Favretti 1991). Having a permanent resident onsite curtails damage, theft, and vandalism. A driveway gate entrance to the main residence along Meadowburn Road, and clear signage regarding open hours will reduce the incidence of people accessing the gardens during closed hours. It may also be necessary to increase security of the gardens to prevent theft and vandalism of the garden features and ornaments. In the past this has not been a problem, but increased public exposure of the gardens may increase the risk.
4.4.3.5 Suggested Phases for Garden Improvements

These recommendations for prioritizing garden rehabilitation over a five-year period have been developed following analysis of all data in this research. Prioritization of garden areas is based on historic significance, current condition, and potential to attract visitors.

**Phase 1: Highest Priority (Year 1)**
- **Garden Stabilization**
  - Mark and document all plant material of historic importance – propagate and distribute to preserve cultivars
  - Install deer prevention system
  - Assess garden for safety hazards, such as paving, steps, deep pools, and trees
- **Horticulture Facilities**
  - Designate office space for garden operations
  - Restore compost pits and cold frames
  - Establish nursery area to support garden rehabilitation

**Phase 2: High Priority (Year 1-2)**
- **Formal Gardens**
  - Rehabilitate pergola garden, perennial borders, pool garden, iris and dahlia beds, and surrounding hedges
- **Guest Amenities**
  - Designate visitor parking area
  - Create safe visitor circulation system
  - Designate visitor bathrooms
  - Establish visitor reception area and retail shop

**Phase 3: High Priority (Year 2-3)**
- **Evergreen Garden**
  - Restore terrace and pool, rehabilitate coniferous plantings
- **House Gardens**
  - Rehabilitate foundation plantings
- **Horticulture Facilities**
  - Expand nursery for production
- **Guest Amenities**
  - Create multi-purpose program space
Phase 4: Medium Priority (Year 3-4)
  • Auxiliary Gardens
    o Rehabilitate Vegetable Garden and Cedar Walk

Phase 5: Low Priority (Year 5+)
  • Missing Gardens
    o Recreate Orchard, Hidden Pathway (May Flowering Hillside), Rose Garden, and other missing garden areas if compatible with planned use of the garden
Figure 43: Recommended phases for garden restoration/rehabilitation.
Figure 44: Preliminary conceptual plan for horticulture and visitor facilities.
4.4.4 Management and Maintenance

**Family Leadership:** Creating a business to preserve and operate the gardens at Meadowburn hinges on the desire and commitment of the property owners.

**General / Garden Manager:** Preserving the gardens at Meadowburn will require the services of a passionate, dedicated, and competent leader and skilled horticulturist to maintain the gardens to professional standards. The Garden Manager position should be a full-time permanent position. Ideally this individual will manage rehabilitation projects, manage garden operations, serve as the primary gardener, develop programming, oversee public relations and marketing, and perform related administrative duties. As the business grows, additional support staff will be needed (Gagliardi 2009), and the responsibilities of the Garden Manager could be integrated into new support positions.

**Maintenance Staff:** It is recommended that separate staff persons be responsible for lawn care and facilities maintenance. Currently Walter DeVries and his son serve in this capacity, and are very familiar with the needs of the property. An alternative option is to contract lawn and facilities maintenance services with a local provider.

**Seasonal Staff:** Additional seasonal staff will be needed to assist with garden maintenance, nursery operations, shop and market sales, and leading tours. These responsibilities could also be integrated into a summer internship program.
**Professional and Contract Services:** A professional landscape architect with expertise in historic landscapes may be necessary to assist in the development of a treatment plan for the garden (Favretti, Favretti 1991). A professional in historic interpretative design and planning should be consulted to create the materials, signage, and experiences that tell the story of Helena Rutherford Ely and the gardens at Meadowburn.

Occasionally it will be necessary to contract a landscaping company or arborist for large demolition, installation, or maintenance projects. Other contract services might include irrigation specialists and skilled craftsmen.

### 4.4.5 Documentation

There is ample photographic and written documentation of the gardens during the Ely era, as well as documentation of the garden’s evolution during the Coster/Gerard era, which has been collected and compiled as a part of this study. Some garden areas are not documented as thoroughly as others or exist in here-say, and will require further inquiry into location, design, and plantings. This includes the Rose Garden, the Picking Garden, and the May Flowering Hillside.

Further documentation will be needed to support a carefully thought out preservation approach and treatment plan. An existing condition plan and inventory of garden features and plant material is recommended to create a baseline (Birnbaum 1994). Period plans of the gardens in their peak will be useful for preservation treatment planning and interpretive planning.
4.5 Further Research

**Existing Site Conditions and Historic Integrity:** This study touched briefly on the existing condition of the garden features at Meadowburn. Further research to fully assess the existing condition of the garden and the historic integrity of existing features is recommended to support preservation planning.

**Infrastructure:** It is recommended that further research involve analyzing the condition of current septic and water systems to determine their ability to support public visitation.

**Cultural History:** Further investigation into the cultural history of Meadowburn will be useful for preservation and interpretive planning.

A rich history exists in the story of the Furman family and the care of Ely’s gardens. Further studies on the Furman gardening legacy would contribute a valuable piece to the Meadowburn story.

**Funding:** Additional research is needed to determine the cost of restoration and rehabilitation and start-up and operating costs for a for-profit business.

**Planning:** Future planning for the preservation of Meadowburn should include the following planning processes:

- Strategic Plan
- Business Plan
- Master Plan
- Preservation Approach and Treatment Plan
• Maintenance and Management Plan
• Interpretive Plan
4.6 Recommendations

The following recommendations fundamentally consider these four salient factors, which lead to the conclusion that the preservation of the gardens at Meadowburn Farm is feasible:

- Helena Rutherfurd Ely’s gardens at Meadowburn Farm are significant in American horticultural history, and there is value in preserving them.

- The beneficiaries of the Meadowburn Trust would like to maintain ownership of the property, and have access to the house and gardens for family purposes.

- Available resources for the preservation of the gardens are presently limited and any future venture must be financially self-sustaining.

- Any venture at Meadowburn Farm related to horticulture, agritourism, or heritage tourism, will be well received in the Warwick Valley.

Justification: Preserving Ely’s Gardens will:

- Allow for continued study of the tangible aspects of the gardens Ely created while developing her gardening techniques and design vision.

- Enable future generations to learn from and appreciate the gardens as an embodiment of cultural values and attitudes expressed through the home garden at the turn of the century.

- Further the understanding of the inspiration for, and history of the Garden Club of America.

- Provide new sources of earned revenue and diversify income for Meadowburn Farm.
• Bolster Meadowburn’s agritourism and farming operations.

• Benefit other business ventures at Meadowburn Farm by offering the additional attraction of the gardens and Ely’s story.

*Community Receptiveness & Public Visitation: As long as Ely’s story is told, there will be interest.*

• The regional community is supportive, encouraging, and enthusiastic about the preservation of Ely’s gardens and the possibility of public visitation.

• Meadowburn Farm’s historic significance, agricultural enterprises, horticultural interest, and scenic open space are qualities that make it an ideal destination for local residents and tourists to visit and enjoy.

• The season of interest for the gardens runs from May through November provided they are rehabilitated with a plant palette that echoes Ely’s original successions of bloom.

*Goods and Services: Generate a critical mass of activity to keep the public engaged and diversify income.*

• Establish a small for-profit business to operate the gardens at Meadowburn, working in collaboration with the dairy farm and cheese business.

• Offer guided tours of the gardens and farm to educate the public, and market programs, goods, and services.

• Develop onsite educational programs and events to educate the public, foster an appreciation for the garden, engage with the community, and increase awareness about Meadowburn.

• Create a Meadowburn “brand” and develop products inspired by the heritage, horticulture, and agriculture at Meadowburn Farm.
• Establish a specialty retail nursery. Produce plants with a historic tie to Ely’s gardens, or her gardening practices and philosophies, to create a unique angle for the nursery business.

• Sell related gift items and value-added garden and farm products.

• Establish a café at Meadowburn Farm to complement the garden and dairy operations.

• Sell fresh cut flowers as part of a community supported agriculture (CSA) program, at farmers markets, or at an onsite farm shop.

• Rent facilities for weddings, conferences, meetings, and small gatherings.

• Offer overnight accommodations, such as farm-stays or a bed and breakfast.

• Incorporate activities that the owners are passionate about.

**Partnerships: Work with entities for mutual gain.**

• Develop partnerships for collaborative programming and services.

• Reach out to entities with connections to Ely, such as the GCOD and GCA.

• Partner with local businesses rather than compete with them.

• Enter partnerships with clear mutual priorities and expectations.

**Management and Maintenance: Leadership is key.**

• The success of this venture hinges on the commitment of the property owners.

• Hire or partner with a professional to manage garden preservation and operations.
• Hire seasonal staff to help run daily operations.

• Contract professional services for projects/services not possible to carry out in-house.

Site Improvements: Take it step by step.

• Document and preserve significant heirloom plant material present in the gardens.

• Establish a deer management system.

• Assess property for potential safety hazards, and make improvements prior to opening for public visitation.

• Conduct further studies on Meadowburn’s cultural history and existing conditions to support preservation planning.

• Consult a landscape architect with expertise in historic landscapes to help develop a preservation treatment plan.

• Prioritize areas based on historical importance, contribution to overall design composition, and planned future use.

• Repair and enhance horticultural support facilities.

• Consider the needs of visitors, including ADA accessibility, safety, circulation, and amenities.

• Upgrade security measures to reduce vandalism and theft.
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Appendix B

SELECTED PHOTOGRAPHS FROM 1902 TO 2012

Figure B.1: South side of Main House prior to 1903. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.
Figure B.2: Front terrace of Main House, circa 1903. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.

Figure B.3: Rustic gate, circa 1902, from A Woman’s Hardy Garden.
Figure B.4: Pool Garden, circa 1905, from *Another Hardy Garden Book*.

Figure B.5: Entrance to the Formal Garden, circa 1910, from *The Practical Flower Garden*. 
Figure B.6: The Formal Garden, circa 1910, from *The Practical Flower Garden*.

Figure B.7: Lumiere autochrome showing Pool Garden, circa 1910. Image courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.8: Lumiere autochrome showing section of perennial border, circa 1910. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.9: Driveway looking South, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.

Figure B.10: Pool Garden looking North, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.11: Formal Garden, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.

Figure B.12: Evergreen Garden looking South, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.13: Evergreen Garden looking North, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.

Figure B.14: Evergreen Garden looking West, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.15: North side of Main House, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.

Figure B.16: South side of Main House, circa 1915. Photograph courtesy of B. Danforth Ely.
Figure B.17: Rose Garden featuring sundial, circa 1930/40’s. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.
Figure B.18: The Evergreen Garden, circa 1930/40’s. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.

Figure B.19: Entry to the Main House featuring bay laurel and boxwood, circa 1970’s. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.
Figure B.20: Dahlia beds, circa 1970’s. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.

Figure B.21: Dahlia beds, 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.
Figure B.22: The Greenhouse Garden, 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.

Figure B.23: Furman, Jr. in Formal Garden looking North, 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.
Figure B.24: Formal Garden in spring, 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.

Figure B.25: Formal Garden in spring, 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.
Figure B.26: Formal Garden looking South, May, 2012

Figure B.27: Formal Garden looking North, June, 2012
Figure B.28: Pergola Garden, November, 2012

Figure B.29: Greenhouse Gardens, June, 2012
Figure B.30: Greenhouse Gardens, May 2012

Figure B.31: Pool Garden, December, 2011
Figure B.32: Southern brick terrace, December, 2011

Figure B.33: Evergreen Garden looking South, December, 2011
Figure B.34: Front entrance to Main House, March, 2012

Figure B.35: North side of Main House, May, 2012
Figure B.36: South side of Main House, May, 2012

Figure B.37: Original site of Orchard, looking toward Vegetable Garden (left), and Cedar Walk, May, 2012
Figure B.38: Areal photograph of the Main House and gardens, circa 1950’s (?). Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.
Figure B.39: Areal photograph of Meadowburn, circa 1980’s. Photograph courtesy of the Gerard Family.
Appendix C

PLANS OF GARDENS

Figure C.1: Early plan for a garden, circa 1902, published in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*
Figure C.2 Early plan for a garden, circa 1902, published in *A Woman's Hardy Garden.*
Figure C.3: Early plan for a border, circa 1902, published in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*.

Figure C.4: Early plan for a border, circa 1902, published in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden*. 
Figure C.5: Early plan for Formal Garden, circa 1902. Published in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden.*
Figure C.6: Existing site plan of historic core as of 2012. Drawing courtesy of Stephen Sullivan Designs.
Appendix D

INVENTORY OF GARDEN ORNAMENTS AS OF 2012

Formal Garden
Pergola Gate (Figure D.1)
Description: Elaborate wrought iron double gate with grape vine motifs, and a half circle decorative pediment.
Date: 16th century. Purchased by Ely’s in 1913 in Switzerland from a demolished Papal Palace.
Location: South end of pergola along Meadowburn Road
Condition: Good – small corrosion spots

Pergola (Figure D.2)
Description: Rustic cedar pergola, 70’ long by 8’ wide by 10’ high. Originally constructed with cedars cut from woods on the farm.
Date: Reproduced in 1997, based on original predating 1903.
Location: South West end of formal garden
Condition: Good - Some posts appear to be rotting at the base.

Fruit Baskets (Figure D.3)
Description: Carved stone fruit baskets.
Date: Placed in garden circa 1910’s
Location: Currently on top of the 6ft stone columns flanking the pergola gate. Originally placed on the terrace in the Evergreen Garden.
Condition: Excellent

Sundial (Figure D.4)
Description: Bronze sundial face a-top marble pedestal 4 ½” in height slightly tapering towards the top with beveled corners. Ely purchase the marble base at a second hand building supply shop in New York City. The face was custom made, inscribed with “Utere praesenti, memor ultimae”, (Use the present moment, mindful of the last).
Date: Prior to 1903
Location: Originally the sundial was placed in the axis of the grass paths in the formal garden, then moved to rose garden. It is currently disassembled and stored.
Condition: Excellent
Lawn Steps (Figure D.5)
Description: Lawn steps consisting of two treads 6” in length, terminated at each end with a short chamfered pier.
Date: Likely prior to 1903
Location: Between Formal Garden and Pool Garden.
Condition: Excellent.

Pool Garden
Pool and Fountain (Figure D.6)
Description: Round pool 12’ in diameter, featuring stone carved statue of cupid riding a fish spouting water from mouth. Statue repointed in late 20th century.
Date: Prior to 1905
Location: Centered in the Pool Garden.
Condition: Fair – statue previously broken and repaired, may need a cleaning

Lion Steps (Figure D.7)
Description: Lawn steps 6’ in length, consisting of two risers with carved stone lions at each end.
Date: Prior to 1903
Location: Pool Garden. As of 1910, lions were placed in formal garden.
Condition: Good – One step is cracked and lions are listing.

Lion Benches (Figure D.8)
Description: Two 6’ x 20” stone slab, supported by carved stone pedestals with winged lion motif.
Date: Prior to 1905
Location: The Pool Garden
Condition: Good /Fair – one appears to be listing and may need repair.

Classical Bench (Figure D.9)
Description: A 6’ by 20” stone slab supported by two pedestals with classical acanthus motif.
Date: Prior to 1905
Location: Pool Garden
Condition: Good

Rustic Gate (Figure D.10)
Description: Double gate made of cedar posts in a rustic design featuring diamond motif.
Date: Reproduced in the late 20th century, based on the original gate predating 1903.
Location: South-east side of the Formal Garden, at the end of the cross axis that separates the perennial borders and Pool Garden.
Condition: Excellent – but current design differs slightly from original.

**House Garden**

Eyebrow Gate (Figure D.11)
- Description: Reproduction of original wooden farm gate with arched top rail, incorporating in active leaf a decorative man-gate with arched top rail.
- Date: Original dates to Ely Era, reproduced in Coster era.
- Location: North East from Pool Garden, along Meadowburn Road.
- Condition: Excellent

Front Gate (Figure D.12)
- Description: Wrought iron double gate with motif of basket weave and simple filigree, supported on two stone piers.
- Date: 16th century - Purchased by Ely’s in 1913 during trip to Switzerland from demolished Papal Palace.
- Location: Front entrance to the house from Meadowburn Road
- Condition: Excellent

Fruit Baskets (Figure D.12)
- Description: Two carved stone fruit baskets, which differ in design from those at the Pergola Gate.
- Date: Placed in garden circa 1910’s
- Location: Atop stone piers flanking Front Gate. Originally placed on terrace in Evergreen Garden.
- Condition: Excellent

Well (not pictured)
- Description: Wrought iron wellhead with decorative finial and pulley above stone cistern.
- Date: The well dates to 1700’s, finial and pulley added early 1900’s.
- Location: Southwest corner of Main House
- Condition: Excellent

**The Evergreen Garden**

Millstone Table (Figure D.13)
- Description: A table made out of an old millstone set atop a large rock. Albert Furman, Sr. planted a fern in the center.
- Date: Placed in garden in 1910’s.
- Location: East end of stone terrace in Evergreen Garden
- Condition: Excellent

Madonna and Angels (Figure D.14)
Description: Carved stone Madonna and child with pair of flanking angels. 
Purchased by Ely in Italy. 
Date: Places in gardens in 1910’s. 
Location: Southwest end of Evergreen Garden 
Condition: Excellent

St Francis (not pictured) 
Description: Small carved sculpture of St Francis 
Date: unknown 
Location: Bushes west of Madonna and Angels 
Condition: Excellent

Frog Fountain (Figure D.15) 
Description: Bronze frog sculpture by artist Kurt Seligman purchased by Coster. The mouth spouts water into pool. 
Date: Coster Era 
Location: North end of pool in Evergreen Garden 
Condition: Excellent

Scroll Bench (Figure D.16) 
Description: Semi-circular bench with three classical geometric scroll pediments. 
Date: Placed in garden in 1910’s. 
Location: Evergreen Garden 
Condition: Poor– plank is damaged and crumbling.

Karyitid (Figure D.17) 
Description: Archaic carved stone karyitid figures, male and female, with rustic ionic capital motif. 
Date: Placed in garden in Coster Era 
Location: Set on either side of rock wall fountain at North end of Green Garden 
Condition: Excellent

Sphynx (Figure D.18) 
Description: Carved stone embedded in rock wall with sphinx character in deep relief. 
Date: Placed in garden in 1910’s. 
Location: Set into stone wall at North end of Evergreen Garden 
Condition: Excellent
Figure D.1: Pergola gate, May 2012.
Figure D.2: Pergola, December, 2011
Figure D.3: Fruit baskets, December 2011.

Figure D.4: Sundial face, circa 1999. Photograph courtesy of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County.
Figure D.5: Lawn steps, March, 2012

Figure D.6: Cupid and Fish fountain in pool, June 2012.
Figure D.7: Lion steps, May, 2012.

Figure D.8: One of two winged lion benches, May 2012.
Figure D.9: Classical bench, May 2012.

Figure D.10: Rustic gate, June 2012.
Figure D.11: Eyebrow gate, June 2012

Figure D.12: Front gate and fruit baskets, May 2012
Figure D.13: Millstone table, December, 2011

Figure D.14: Madonna and angels, December, 2011
Figure D.15: Bronze frog fountain, March 2012.

Figure D.16: Scroll bench, March 2012.
Figure D.17: One of a pair of carved stone karytid, December 2011.
Figure D.18: Carved stone Sphynx deep relief set in stonewall, December 2012.
Appendix E

PLANTS LISTED IN ELY’S THREE BOOKS

The following lists include the perennials, annuals, spring flowering bulbs, vines, trees, shrubs, and roses listed in Ely’s three books. Not included in these lists are the fruit trees and vegetables described in Another Hardy Garden Book (1905). In the case that the scientific names have dramatically changed since the publication of Ely’s books, the synonyms used by Ely are in parentheses. The common names are based on Ely’s writing when available, or those listed from other reliable source if not provided by Ely.

**Hardy Perennials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aconitum napellus</td>
<td>Monkshood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aconitum wilsonii</td>
<td>Monkshood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrostemma alba</td>
<td>White Agrostemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrostemma coronaria</td>
<td>Pink Mullein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrostemma flos jovis</td>
<td>Flower of Jove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcea rosea</td>
<td>Hollyhock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchusa italica 'dropmore'</td>
<td>Italian Alkanet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone japonica 'whirlwind'</td>
<td>Japanese Windflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone japonica alba</td>
<td>White Japanese Anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileja</td>
<td>Columbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arondo donax</td>
<td>Giant Cane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruncus sylvestre (Spiraea aruncus)</td>
<td>Aruncus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster amellus</td>
<td>Starwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster x salignus</td>
<td>Michaelmas Daisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo (hardy)</td>
<td>Hardy Bamboo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisia australis</td>
<td>False indigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosta coerulea (Funkia curulea)</td>
<td>Plantain Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosta subcordata (Funkia subcordata)</td>
<td>Plantain Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarvillea delavayi</td>
<td>Hardy Gloxinia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris anglica 'Mont Blanc'</td>
<td>English Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris florentina</td>
<td>Florentine Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris germanica</td>
<td>German Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris germanica 'Mme Cherau'</td>
<td>Madame Cherau's Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris hispanica</td>
<td>Spanish Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris kaempferi</td>
<td>Japanese Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris siberica</td>
<td>Siberian Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandula</td>
<td>Lavender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatris</td>
<td>Liatris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium auratum</td>
<td>Goldband Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium batemanii</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium brownii</td>
<td>Hong Kong Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium canadense</td>
<td>Meadow Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium candidum</td>
<td>Madonna Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium chalcedonicum</td>
<td>Turk's Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium excelsium</td>
<td>Excelsium Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium hansonii</td>
<td>Hanson’s Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium krameri</td>
<td>Japan Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium leichtlinii</td>
<td>Tiger Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium longiflorum</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium rubellum</td>
<td>Maiden Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium speciosum rubrum</td>
<td>Oriental Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium speciosum alba</td>
<td>Oriental Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium speciosum 'Melpomene'</td>
<td>Oriental Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium superbum</td>
<td>Turk's Cap Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium tigrinum</td>
<td>Tiger Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilium wallacei</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobelia cardinalis (syphilitica hybrid)</td>
<td>Cardinal Flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupinus</td>
<td>Lupine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lychnis chalcedonica</td>
<td>Campion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lychnis chalcedonica 'London Pride'
Lysmachia clethroides
Monarda didyma
Monarda rosea
Montbretia
Nelumbium nucifera (syn. N. speciosum)
Nymphaea odorata rosea
Nymphaea flava
Nymphaea odorata
Oenothera lamarchiana
Paeonia 'double herbaceous'
Paeonia 'Japanese single'
Paeonia
Paeonia (tree)
Papaver nudicaule
Papaver orientale
Penstemon barbatus torryei
Penstemon alba
Penstemon digitalis
Phlox 'Coquelicot'
Phlox paniculata
Phlox sabulata
Physostegia
Platycodon grandiflorum
Rudbeckia 'Golden Glow'
Salvia azurea var. grandiflora
Scabiosa caucasica
Scabiosa caucasica 'Alba'
Sedum spectabile
Spirea palustris elegans
Tanacetum (Pyrethrum)
Knifofia uvaria (Tritoma pfitzerii)
Trillium grandiflorum

London Pride
Loosestrife
Oswego Tea
Bee Balm
Montbretia
Egyptian Lotus
Cape Cod Water Lily
English Water Lily
Fragrant Water Lily
Evening Primrose
Double Herbaceous Peony
Japanese Single Peony
Herbaceous Peony
Tree Peony
Iceland Poppy
Oriental Poppy
Beard Tongue
Lion's Foot
Beard Tongue
Phlox
Garden Phlox
Moss or Mt Pink
False Dragonhead
Balloon Flower
Golden Glow Rudbeckia
Blue Sage
Pincushion Flower
White Pincushion Flower
Stonecrop
Spirea
Pyrethrum
Red-Hot-Poker
Wake Robin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valeriana coccinea alba</td>
<td>White Valerian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica grandiflora</td>
<td>Speedwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica longifolia subsessilis</td>
<td>Speedwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca minor</td>
<td>Periwinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola sororia</td>
<td>Native Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca filamentosa</td>
<td>Adam's Needle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acroclinium</td>
<td>Everlasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageratum</td>
<td>Floss Flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageratum 'Princess Pauline'</td>
<td>Ageratum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloysia citriodora</td>
<td>Lemon verbena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssum</td>
<td>Madwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antirrhinum</td>
<td>Snapdragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster american</td>
<td>Daybreak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster 'Giant Comet'</td>
<td>Giant Comet Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster 'Purity'</td>
<td>Purity Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster chrysanthanum 'flowered'</td>
<td>Chrysanthemum Flowered Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster ostrich feather</td>
<td>Ostrich Feather Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster peony flowered</td>
<td>Peony Flowered Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>Tuberous Begonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browallia speciosa major</td>
<td>Amethyst Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendula</td>
<td>Pot Marigold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna 'President Meyer'</td>
<td>President Meyer's Canna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna 'Tarrytown'</td>
<td>Tarrytown Canna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna 'Wyoming'</td>
<td>Wyoming Canna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celosia cristata plumosa</td>
<td>Coxcomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurea 'Emperor William'</td>
<td>Emperor Williams Centaurea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurea cyanus</td>
<td>Bachelor's Button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurea gymnocarpa</td>
<td>Velvet Centaurea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centaurea imperialis</td>
<td>Royal Sweet Sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleus</td>
<td>Flame Nettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coreopsis (Calliopsis)</em></td>
<td>Calliopsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cosmos 'Extra Early'</em></td>
<td>Extra Early Cosmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cosmos 'Lady Lenox'</em></td>
<td>Lady Lenox Cosmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cosmos 'Mammoth Perfection'</em></td>
<td>Mammoth Perfection Cosmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dahlia</em></td>
<td>Dahlia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dianthus chinensis</em></td>
<td>Annual Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Echinochloa</em></td>
<td>Evening Primrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Escholtzia</em></td>
<td>California Poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gladiolus</em></td>
<td>Gladiolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Godetia</em></td>
<td>Godetia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Helianthus</em></td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heliotropium</em></td>
<td>Heliotrope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hyacinthus candicans</em></td>
<td>Cape Hyacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iberis</em></td>
<td>Candytuft 'Empress'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impatiens balsamia (Balsam)</em></td>
<td>Lady's Slipper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impatiens sultani</em></td>
<td>Balsam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ismene calathina</em></td>
<td>Peruvian Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kochia</em></td>
<td>Standing Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lathyrus odoratus</em></td>
<td>Sweet Pea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lobelia fulgens 'Queen Victoria'</em></td>
<td>Lobelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lobularia maritima 'Carpet of Snow'</em></td>
<td>Sweet Allysum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Matthiola</em></td>
<td>Gilliflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myosotis</em></td>
<td>Forget Me Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tropeoleum</em></td>
<td>Nasturtium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nicotiana affinis</em></td>
<td>Jasmine Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nicotiana sanderae</em></td>
<td>Flowering Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nicotiana sylvestris</em></td>
<td>Flowering Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nigella</em></td>
<td>Love in the Mist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Papaver</em></td>
<td>Poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Papaver 'Lady Bird'</em></td>
<td>Lady Bird Poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Papaver 'Shirley'</em></td>
<td>Shirley Poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelargonium</em></td>
<td>Geranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Petunia</em></td>
<td>Petunia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petunia 'Rosy Morn'</td>
<td>Rosy Morn Petunia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petunia 'Snowstorm'</td>
<td>Snowstorm Petunia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlox drumundii</td>
<td>Annual Phlox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polianthes tuberosa</td>
<td>Tuberose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portulaca</td>
<td>Sunplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reseda</td>
<td>Mignonette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardia</td>
<td>Calla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricinus</td>
<td>Castor Oil Bean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salpiglossis</td>
<td>Painted Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia 'Bonfire'</td>
<td>Bonfire Salvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia patens</td>
<td>Gentian Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizanthus</td>
<td>Butterfly Flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagetes</td>
<td>Marigold - African and French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td>Verbena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena 'Defiance'</td>
<td>Defiance Verbena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>Pansy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xeranthemum</td>
<td>Everlasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinnia</td>
<td>Zinnia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Flowering Bulbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulb Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convallaria majali</td>
<td>Lily of the Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocus</td>
<td>Crocus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythronium</td>
<td>Dog Tooth Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritillaria imperialis</td>
<td>Crown Imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galanthus nivalis</td>
<td>Snowdrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyacinth candicans</td>
<td>Hyacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscari</td>
<td>Grape Hyacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus 'Emperor'</td>
<td>Emperor Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus 'Empress'</td>
<td>Empress Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus 'Golden Spur'</td>
<td>Golden Spur Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus 'Von Sion'</td>
<td>Van Sion Daffodil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissus poeticus</td>
<td>Poet's Narcissus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narcissus 'Jonquilla'  Jonquil
Narcissus 'Sulphur Pheonix'  Sulphur Pheonix Narcissus
Narcissus (old double white)  Double Poet's Narcissus
Narcissus (old double yellow)  Pheasants Eye
Narcissus alba plenus odoratus  Poet's Narcissus
Narcissus peoticus ornatus  Squill
Narcissus poeticus odoratus  American Beauty Tulip
Scilla  Boutron Tulip
Tulipa 'American Beauty'  American Beauty Tulip
Tulipa 'Bouton'  Bouton Tulip
Tulipa 'Cottage Maid'  Cottage Maid Tulip
Tulipa 'd'Or'  d'Or Tulip
Tulipa 'Gesneria'  Gesneria Tulip
Tulipa 'Golden Yellow'  Golden Yellow Tulip
Tulipa 'Isabella'  Isabella Tulip
Tulipa 'Murillo'  Murillo Tulip
Tulipa 'Picotee'  Picotee Tulip
Tulipa 'Pottebakker'  Pottebakker Tulip
Tulipa 'Yellow Rose'  Yellow Rose Tulip
Tulipa (parrot varieties)  Parrot tulips

**Hardy Vines**

Aristolochia sipho  Dutchman's Pipe
Campsis grandiflora (Bignonia grandiflora)  Trumpet Creeper
Celastrus scandens  Bittersweet
Clematis flammula  Fragrant Virgin's Bower
Clematis hendersonii  Henderson's Clematis
Clematis henryi  Clematis
Clematis jackmanii  Jackman's Clematis
Clematis paniculata  Sweet Autumn Clematis
Clematis virginiana  Virgins Bower
Dolichos japonicus  Kudzu Vine
Euonymus radicans
Hedera Helix
Humulus
Lonicera
Lonicera japonica 'Golden Japan'
Lonicera japonica 'Hall's Japan'
Parthenocissus quincefolia (Ampelopsis quinquefolia)
Parthenocissus tricuspidia 'Lowii'
(Ampelopsis lowii)
Parthenocissus vetchii (Ampelopsis veitchii)
Polygonum multiflorum
Vitis barusca
Vitis coignetiae
Vitis riparia
Wisteria sinensis

Winter Creeper
Ivy
Hop Vine
Honeysuckle
Honeysuckle
Honeysuckle
Virginia Creeper
Porcelain ampelopsis
Boston Ivy
Chinese Knotweed
Fox Grape
Japanese Ornamental Grape
River Bank Grape
Chinese Wisteria

Annual Vines
Cobea scandens
Convulvulus
Echinocystis
Ipomea grandiflora
Passiflora
Cucurbita

Cup and Saucer Vine
Morning Glory
Wild Cucumber
Moon Flower
Passion Flower
Ornamental Gourd

Trees and Shrubs
Abies alba
Abies balsamea
Abies canadensis
Abies excelsa

European Silver Fir
Balsam Fir
Hemlock Spruce
Norway Spruce
Golden Norway Spruce
aurea
Abies
Abies nordmanniana
Abies pungens glauca
Abies pungens glauca 'Kosteri'
Acer negundo
Acer palmatum
Acer sacharinum
Aesculus hippocastanum
Ailanthus altissima
Alnus
Berberis thunbergii
Betula papyrifera
Betula pendulata
Buxus sempervirens 'Dwarf'
Buxus sempervirens
Calycanthus floridus
Carya
Castanea
Catalpa bignoniodes var. nana (C. bungeii)
Cerasus japonica (Prunus japonica)
Chaenomeles japonica (Pyrus japonica alba)
Chamaecyparis filifera (Retinospora filifera)
Chamaecyparis plumosa 'aruea'
Chamaecyparis plumosa 'aurea'
Chamaecyparis squarrosa (Retinospora squarrosa veitchii)
Clethra alnifolia
Cornus florida
Cotinus obovatus (Rhus cotinus)
Crataegus
Deutzia crenata
Deutzia scabra 'Candidissima'
Fagus grandiflora

Normand Fir
Colorado Blue Spruce
Kosteri Spruce
Norway Maple
Japanese Maple
Cutleaf Maple
Horse Chestnut
Tree of Heaven
Alder
Barberry
White Birch
Weeping Birch
Dwarf Boxwood
Boxwood
Sweetshrub
Hickory
Chestnut
Umbrella Catalpa
Flowering Almond
Japanese Quince
Sawara Cypress
Golden Plumed Cypress
Blue Moss Cypress
Sweet Pepper Bush
Flowering Dogwood
Smoke Tree
Hawthorn
Deutzia
Deutzia
Beech
Forsythia fortunei
Forsythia suspensa
Hemamalis
Hibiscus grandiflorus
Hibiscus syriacus 'Alba Plena' (H. alba plena)
Hibiscus syriacus 'Jeanne D' Arc'
Hydrangea paniculata grandiflora
Hydrangea quercifolia
Juglens nigra
Juniperus communis 'Hibernica'
Juniperus virginiana
Kalmia latifolia
Laburnam anagyroides (Cytisus laburnum)
Larix laricina
Laurus nobilis
Ligustrum ovalifolium
Ligustrum vulgare
Liriodendron tulipafera
Magnolia conspicua
Magnolia soulangiana
Magnolia stellata (M. stella)
Mahonia
Philadelphus grandiflorus
Pinus strobus
Pinus sylvestris
Platanus occidentalis
Polulus nigra
Populus canadensis
Prunus americana
Prunus serisifera 'Pissardi' (P. pissardi)
Prunus serotina
Prunus virginiana
Golden Bell
Weeping Forsythia
Witch Hazel
Swamp Rosemallow
Rose of Sharon
Jeanne D'Arc Rose of Sharon
Panicle Hydrangea
Oakleaf Hydrangea
Black Walnut
Irish Juniper
Red Cedar
Mountain Laurel
Golden Chain
Larch
Bay Laurel
California Privet
Common Privet
Tulip Tree
Yulans Magnolia
Saucer Magnolia
Star Magnolia
Mahonia
Mock Orange
White Pine
Scotch Pine
Sycamore
Lombardy Poplar
Carolina Poplar
Wild Cherry
Purple Leaf Plum
Black Cherry
Chokecherry
Quercus palustris
Quercus alba
Rhododendron arborescens (Azalea arborescensi)
Rhododendron maximum
Rhododendron mollis (Azalea moliss)
Rhus
Robinia hispida
Robinia pseudoacacia
Rosa rugosa
Sambucus canadensis
Sciadopitys verticillata
Sorbus americana
Spiraea 'Anthony Waterer'
Spiraea prunifolia
Spiraea thumbergii
Spiraea vanhouttei
Symphoricarpos racemosus
Syringa josikaea
Syringa persica alba
Syringa vulgaris 'Madame Casimir-Perier'
Syringa vulgaris 'Madame Lemoine'
Syringa vulgaris 'Marie Legraye'
Taxus bacata
Thuja occidentalis
Thuja occidentalis 'elegantissima aurea'
Thuja occidentalis 'vervaeneana'
Tilia americana
Ulmus americana
Viburnum plicatum
Wiegelia 'Eva Rothke'
Wiegelia florida rosea
Wiegelia florida candida (W. candida)

Pin Oak
White Oak
Sweet Azalea
Rosebay Rhododendron
Mollis Azalea
Sumac
Rose Acacia
Locust
Ramanas Rose
Elder
Umbrella Pine
American Ash
Spirea
Bridal Wreath Spirea
Baby's Breath Spirea
Bridal Wreath Spirea
Snowberry
Hungarian Lilac
Persian Lilac
Lilac
Lilac
Lilac
Irish Yew
Arborvitae
Arborvitae
Arborvitae
Linden
American Elm
Japanese Snowball
Wigelia
Wigelia
Wigelia
Roses

Rosa 'American Beauty'
R. 'Anne de Diesbach'
R. 'Baltimore Belle'
R. 'Baron Bonstetten'
R. 'Baroness Rothchild'
R. 'Bride'
R. 'Bridesmaid'
R. 'Burbank'
R. 'Climbing Wooton'
R. 'Coquette de Alpes'
R. 'Cothilde Soupert'
R. 'Dorothy Perkins'
R. 'General Jacqueminto'
R. 'General Washington'
R. 'Hermosa'
R. 'John Hopper'
R. 'Jubilee'
R. 'Kaiserin Augusta Victoria'
R. 'La France'
R. 'Lady Gay'
R. 'Madame Alfred Cartier'
R. 'Madame de Watterville'
R. 'Madame Gabriel Luizet'
R. 'Madame Hoste'
R. 'Madame Plantier'
R. 'Madame Plantier'
R. 'Magna Charta'
R. 'Marchioness of Londonberry'
R. 'Margaret Dickenson'
R. 'Marion Dingee'
R. 'Mlle. Germaine Trochon'
R. 'Mrs. John Laing'
R. 'Mrs. Robert Garrett'
R. 'Paul Neyron'
R. 'Perles des Jardins'
R. 'Persian Yellow'
R. 'Prince Camille de Rohan'
R. 'Princess Alice de Monoco'
R. 'Soliel d'Or'
R. 'Souvenir de Wootton'
R. 'Sunset'
R. 'Ulrich Brunner'
R. 'Victor Verdier'
R. 'White Madam Cochet'
R. 'Clothilde Soupert'
R. multiflora 'Crimson Rambler'
R. rugosa
R. wichuriana
R. wichuriana 'Dorothy Perkins'
R. wichuriana 'Evergreen Gem'
R. wichuriana 'Jersey Beauty'
R. wichuriana 'Lady Gay'
Appendix F

FOUNDING MEMBERS OF THE GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA

As printed in *The Garden Club of America: History 1913-1938*, by the Garden Club of America (Goodman 1938).

1. Mrs. John Ridgely, Amateur Gardeners, Baltimore
2. Mrs. Henry Marquand, Bedford, New York
3. Mrs. Charles Ludington, Gardeners of Montgomery and Delaware Counties, Pennsylvania
4. Miss Elizabeth Williams
5. Mrs. Cyrus McCormick, Illinois
6. Mrs. Walter Brewster
7. Mrs. Francis King, Michigan
8. Mrs. Andrew Green
9. Mrs. M.J. Chittenden
10. Mrs. Alfred Ely, Orange and Duchess Counties, New York
11. Mrs. C. Stuart Patterson, Philadelphia
12. Mrs. J. Willis Martin
13. Mrs. Franklin Pepper
14. Mrs. Charles Biddle
15. Mrs. Henry Middleton Fisher
16. Miss Ernestine A Goodman
17. Mrs. Bayard Henry

18. Mrs. Allan Marquand, Princeton

19. Mrs. Archibald D Russell

20. Mrs. John A Stewart Jr., Short Hills, New Jersey

21. Mrs. Edward B. Renwick

22. Mrs. Samuel Appleton, Warrenton, Virginia

23. Miss Mary Evans, The Weeders, Pennsylvania
Appendix G

MEADOWBURN FARM TIMELINE

1724 - 1853: Colonel Thomas DeKay purchases 1,200 acres for 500 pounds of sterling, and builds the farmhouse at Meadowburn. The property is passed down through the DeKay family.

1853-1881: Louisa Rutherfurd and Mary Rutherfurd purchase Meadowburn with 248 acres from Major Thomas S. DeKay. Meadowburn is presumably inherited by John Rutherfurd after the death of Louisa and Mary.

1881 – 1903: Meadowburn is given to Helena Rutherfurd Ely as a wedding present. Ely builds her first gardens at Meadowburn and begins to develop a personal sense of design and her own horticultural practices, as documented in *A Woman’s Hardy Garden* (1903). Albert Furman is hired as Ely’s gardener in 1893 at the age of 17.

1903 - 1905: Ely is recognized as an authority on hardy gardening, and Meadowburn is known as one of the most beautiful gardens in the country. Ely continues to expand her plant palette and refine her horticultural skills, and new gardens are created at Meadowburn. Her second book, *Another Hardy Garden Book* (1905), includes extensive chapters on the vegetable and fruit garden, deciduous trees, and coniferous.

1905-1911: Ely’s personal design preferences and plant palette are refined. She simplifies her garden, removing plants she now despises, and creating more simple designs and planting schemes. She writes her third book, *The Practical Flower Garden* (1911), with greater confidence in her design philosophies and practical techniques.

1911- 1916: Ely continues to gather and share gardening knowledge. She helps develop a national network of avid gardeners as a founding member of the Garden Club of America, founder of the Garden Club of Orange and Duchess County, and Advisory Member of the International Garden Club. Ely builds her final garden at Meadowburn, the Evergreen Garden, where not a single flower grows and the plants stay green all winter long.

1920-1930: Alfred Ely, Jr. inherits Meadowburn, spending very little time there. Helena Meade and her family spend occasional summers at Meadowburn. Albert Furman Sr. continues to oversee gardens.

1930 – 1977: Charles Henry Coster and his wife, Vicenza Giuliani, purchase Meadowburn from Alfred Ely, Jr. Very few changes are made to the gardens. Albert Furman Sr. continues to tend the gardens as he always has until his death in 1948. Albert Furman, Jr. takes over as head gardener. Coster purchases additional congruous farms, expanding the acreage of Meadowburn to 525 acres.


Appendix H

SURVEY RESULTS FOR HISTORIC GARDENS OWNED BY NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

2. How is your garden best characterized?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic landscape or garden</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic house/building and garden</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The following statements are from the Garden Conservancy’s "Significance Criteria" for historic gardens. Which apply to your garden? (Check all that apply) Our garden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is associated with a prominent person in history</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is associated with an important historic event</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents a distinctive style of the period in which it was built</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a significant work of a well known designer, landscape architect, or person of extraordinary ability</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrates the development of a region or the particular relationship between the people and the land at a given point in history</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains additional significant collections (furnishings or art)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is part of a property with significant natural amenities or scenic open space</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains a plant collection of regional or historic importance</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains unique or diverse plant collections</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Is your garden on the State or National Historic Register for Historic Places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Register for Historic Places</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register for Historic Place</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process of application for State or National Register</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on any Historic Register</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Please identify the statement that best characterizes your garden. (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some or all of the historic garden is protected by a garden conservation easement</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all of the natural land affiliated with the garden is protected by a conservation easement</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all of the agricultural land affiliated with garden is protected by a conservation easement</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no conservation easements on garden or affiliated land</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Were the rights donated or sold to the holder of the easement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often is your garden open for public visitation? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly throughout the year</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonally</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a few days a week</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only on weekends</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only on certain days during the season</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By appointment only</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What is your annual visitation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 5,000 visitors</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 10,000 visitors</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 20,000 visitors</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20,000 visitors</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note sure</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What best describes the area in which your garden is located? (Criteria from the US 2012 Census "Urban and Rural Classification")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban (population greater than 50,000)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban or &quot;Urban Cluster&quot; (population between 2,500 to 50,000)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (population less than 2,500)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Which best describes the ownership of your garden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned privately (non University)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by a private not-for-profit organization, trust, or foundation</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by City Government (non University)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by County Government (non-university)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by State Government (non University)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by a University (private or public)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Does the entity that owns your garden own other gardens as well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which of the following best describes the operations of your garden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operated by the same not-for-profit organization or government department that owns the garden</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by different not-for-profit organization, trust, or foundation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by an incorporated Friends Group</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by City Government (not University)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by County Government (not University)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by State Government (not University)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operated by University (private or public)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Does the entity that operates your garden operate other gardens as well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Was the property donated to, or purchased by the current owner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated to current owner</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased by current owner</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. If donated, were funds for maintenance included in the gift?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How many of the following positions do you have at your garden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>More than 10</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time employees (not gardeners)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employees (not gardeners)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time gardeners</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time gardeners</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Who spearheaded the process of preservation? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original property owner</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of original property owner</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested individual (not family)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Group</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not-for-profit organization</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Club</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Were partnerships critical in the process of preservation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. If partnerships were critical in the process of preservation, with whom were you partnered? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Conservancy</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Club of America</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Garden Club</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Department</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Society</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Are the original individuals involved in the preservation still actively involved with your garden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Are the founding leaders still involved with garden operations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Is there a Friends Group associated with your garden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Is this Friends Group incorporated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. What are the responsibilities of the Friends Group? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden maintenance</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of garden</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major decision making</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. What is the annual operating budget for the garden? (If your garden is a component of a larger multi-faceted organization, please just account for the garden operating budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $200,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 - $500,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 - $1 million</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million - $5 million</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5 million</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. What was the annual budget for the garden in the first year of operation? (If your garden is a component of a larger multi-faceted organization, please just account for the garden operating budget).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $200,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 - $500,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 - $1 million</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 million</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 28. Does your garden have an endowment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process of creating an endowment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 29. What size is this endowment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1 million</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million - $3 million</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3 million - $5 million</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 million - $10 million</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $10 million</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30. When was the endowment established?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to transferring ownership to not-for-profit organization or government</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within three years of transferring ownership to not-for-profit organization or government</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three years after transferring ownership to not-for-profit organization or government</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 31. What is the origin of the endowment fund? (Check all that apply)

| Answer                                                          | %  |
|                                                                |----|
| Individual gift from original land owner                       | 38 |
| Individual gift (not from original land owner)                 | 35 |
| Endowment campaign                                            | 24 |
| Not sure                                                       | 0  |
| Other                                                          | 19 |
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32. Is it important that the property owner(s) contribute to an endowment before seeking support from others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Please identify the sources of revenue for your garden. (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual appeal / Private philanthropy</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden admissions and tours</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and Fundraisers</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility rentals</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight guest accommodations</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales (not nursery)</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail nursery sales</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions or food service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Foundation support</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, County, or State Government support</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Please identify the significance of the following revenue streams for your garden (1 being the very significant, and 5 being insignificant).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 (Major Revenue)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (Moderate Revenue)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Insignificant Revenue)</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events / Fundraisers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility rentals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Appeal / Private philanthropy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden admission and tours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight guest accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sales (not nursery)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Has your garden ever embarked on a capital campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. When was this capital campaign started?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 years of transfer of garden to not-for-profit organization or government</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years after transfer of garden to not-for-profit or government</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What was the goal of your most recent or current capital campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden preservation project(s) (including restoration, rehabilitation, or reconstruction)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New facilities</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded facilities</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. For what reasons was the local community supportive of your garden opening to public visitation? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pride in local history</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social opportunities</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to open space</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to garden</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced economic impact</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. What were the obstacles, if any, that hindered community support for your garden opening to public visitation? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased vehicle traffic</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian impact</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased competition for public resources</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased crime or related activity</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased noise</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Please indicate the level of importance of each of the following contributions from the local community during the process of preservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of the community members in</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of community members in</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteer Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other volunteer help</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind donations of good and services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. With whom does your garden have a partnership? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other not-not-profit organization</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit entity</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Government</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Government</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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42. Who initiated the partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your institution</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner institution</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. How long has this partnership been in effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. What are the advantages of this partnership for your garden? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared labor</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared services</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared grounds or facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative programs</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. What are the disadvantages, if any, of the partnership(s)? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting priorities</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing leadership</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent funding</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Currently, what are the greatest challenges for your garden? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue / Funding</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled labor</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance within community</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong and active leadership</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>