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Introduction

Purpose

Garden design is often considered an ephemeral art. When current design trends change or fall out of fashion, the historical development of a landscape can be altered to a state that voids the landscape of any historical reference. Because landscapes are susceptible to change by humans and damage by natural elements, the greatest threat to cultural landscapes is destruction, by intent or ignorance. A major impediment to preserving important landscapes is the lack of knowledge of the Nation’s historic landscapes especially those created for private residences during the mid-twentieth century. “Landscapes provide considerable evidence as to how humans have used nature over time. They assist us in understanding, appreciating and valuing an even broader range of landscapes and landscape types, especially those we call ‘home’.”¹

A fast-paced society with ever-increasing demands on the land and swiftness of development has placed, and still is placing, many modern residential designed landscapes in imminent danger of being altered or demolished. Fletcher Steele’s works are representative examples of a period of landscape architecture that was materially and stylistically experimental. Steele’s importance to the landscape architecture profession has been established through Robin Karson’s complete biography Fletcher Steele, Landscape Architect: An Account of the Gardenmaker’s Life 1885-1971, and articles and essays published in contemporary journals. The problem facing Steele’s designed landscapes in the Rochester area are that his garden designs are not well known and are being altered or destroyed without proper documentation before demolition.
This study of Steele’s designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area is intended to provide property owners, preservation advocates, and planners, with a history of Steele’s garden designs, character defining features, a comparison of the historic landscape and existing landscape and recommendations for future planning decisions. The goal of this study is to supply a master list of Steele’s work, and provide informational and management tools to convey the quality and importance of these gardens as a significant component of Rochester’s residential landscape history.

**Methodology**

Three different methodologies were used in this study. Extensive archival research of photographic, graphic and written resources was conducted to compile the master list of Steele’s clients in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area; a field survey was completed to document the existing conditions of each of the properties; and a comparison study of Steele’s original design intent and the existing conditions was conducted to record the current condition of the property.

Before the field survey of existing conditions began, a master list of Steele’s Rochester area clients was compiled. Primary source materials located in seven repositories were used to compile the client list. The Fletcher Steele Archives in F. Franklin Moon Library at State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry was the main repository for Steele’s primary source materials such as drawings, photographs and client order books. Other repositories investigated for primary source materials included the Landmark Society of Western New York in Rochester, New York, Rush Rhees Library at University of Rochester, Rochester Historical Society, Carl A. Kroch Library at Cornell University, George Eastman House and The Strong Museum. Secondary source materials reviewed included theses, Fletcher Steele’s biography, and Historic Architecture Building Surveys.

Utilizing the client master list that was created, properties were located for a field survey to document existing landscape features. *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process and Techniques* was used to guide the landscape survey process. As defined in the guide a historic designed landscape is:

---

...a landscape significant as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturalist to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur according to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture.²

The field survey process consisted of three components, a survey form, photographs and an existing condition plan. The following list of character-defining features was used as an organizational tool in the survey form to document the existing landscape features:³

- **Spatial Organization** – is the three-dimensional organization of physical forms and visual associations in a landscape, including the articulation of ground, vertical, and overhead planes that define and create spaces.

- **Circulation** – includes the spaces, features, and applied material finishes that constitute the systems of movement in the landscape.

- **Topography** – is the three-dimensional configuration of a landscape surface characterized by features (such as slope and articulation) and orientation (such as elevation and solar aspect).

- **Vegetative Features** – includes the deciduous and evergreen trees, shrubs, vines, ground covers and herbaceous plants, and plant communities, whether indigenous or introduced in a landscape.

- **Constructed Water Features** – are the built features and elements that use water for aesthetic or utilitarian functions in the landscape.

- **Small-Scale Features** – are the elements providing detail and diversity for both functional needs and aesthetic concerns in a landscape.

Photographic documentation of each property was performed to provide a concise record of the designed landscape features at a specific moment in time. These photos are "...useful for depicting site features and character that may be difficult to describe in the survey."⁴ In addition to the written survey and digital photographs, an existing condition plan was created for each of the properties to graphically represent the landscape as it presently exists. The sketch plans were constructed on site and/or from historic period plans to accurately portray the conditions and character of the property. The schematic drawings illustrate large-scale landscape patterns and the location of landscape features, but do not include precise dimensions.

³ Ibid, 53.
⁴ Ibid, 67.
Landscape features were assessed regarding their physical condition based on a visual inspection. The level of condition was assessed according to four categories:

**Good Condition** – indicates the cultural landscape shows no clear evidence of major negative disturbances and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The cultural landscape’s historical and natural values are as well preserved as can be expected under the given environmental conditions. No immediate corrective action is required to maintain its current condition.

**Fair Condition** – indicates the cultural landscape shows clear evidence of minor disturbances and deterioration by natural and/or human forces, and some degree of corrective action is needed within three to five years to prevent further harm to its historical and/or natural values. The cumulative effect of the deterioration of many of the significant characteristics and features of the cultural landscape, if left to continue without the appropriate corrective action, will cause the landscape to degrade to a poor condition.

**Poor Condition** – indicates the cultural landscape shows clear evidence of major disturbances and rapid deterioration by natural and/or human forces. Immediate corrective action is required to protect and preserve the remaining historical and natural areas.

**Unknown** – indicates that not enough information is available to make an evaluation.

In addition to these four standardized categories, three additional categories were necessary for this study:

**Demolished** – indicates that the designed landscape was severely altered or completely removed from the property.

**Consultation** – indicates that either professional advice was provided or a proposed designed landscape was never implemented.

**Properties not Visited** – indicates that the proposed/ designed landscapes were unable to be documented due to time constraints, lack of information or non-cooperation from property owners.

**Organization of the Study**

The study consists of three chapters. Chapter 1 summarizes Steele’s background, education and professional career in Boston and Rochester. Chapter 2 presents the designed landscapes judged good, fair, poor and demolished condition and includes detailed descriptions of historic and existing conditions. Chapter 3 consists of treatment recommendations for three properties utilizing the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. This chapter of the study serves as an example of a management and preservation tools for property owners and preservation advocates making future planning decisions.

---

5 Ibid.
Figure 1.1: Portrait of Fletcher Steele after graduating from Williams College, c.1907 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
Chapter 1

Fletcher Steele: Landscape Architect

Historic Overview

A hundred years ago there were no vitamins nor deficiency diseases in The Valley. There was a food necessity, grain; and food luxury, fruit. It called for bravery in a pioneer farmer to turn from a sure thing to a gamble. The nursery business had already been started. Ellwanger was the first to carry it on as a gigantic scientific experiment. On a financial shoestring he and his wise young partner, Patrick Barry, combed Europe for hundreds of varieties of fruits to try out. Many kinds failed or were not commercially useful. Some succeeded. Today much of Western New York thrives because of the work of these two men. Miles of steep hillsides over the Finger Lakes are patterned with lines of grapes. Thousands upon thousands of acres of apples, peaches, pears, plums, and cherries fill pockets with money and eyes with pleasure. The region is one vast garden. What wonder that Rochester is “The Flower City.”

Located along the lower Genesee River in upstate New York, Rochester was known as the “Flour City” from 1834 to 1854 “...having emerged for a time as the world’s leading producer of flour,” the city was renamed in 1855 as the “Flower City” due to “...a series of disasters that crippled grain growers up the valley in the mid-fifties and idled millers at Rochester to such an extent that wheat farming and flour milling drifted farther west. Fortunately, Rochester’s nurserymen, lead by Ellwanger and Barry, were ready to supply young trees for new fruit orchards and seed for truck gardens...” 2 Rochester after the Civil War had “...twenty three nursery men, three dealers and five seed firms within the city...” the largest of these nurseries were the “Frost and Company’s three hundred acres on South Plymouth Avenue and Ellwanger and Barry’s six hundred and

---

fifty acres across the river...3 In addition to having one of the largest collections of nursery suppliers in the country, in the late 1890s the City of Rochester engaged Frederick Law Olmsted's landscape architecture firm to design public parks such as Genesee Valley Park, Highland Park, Seneca Park and Maplewood Park. His firm also designed a parkway system for the city and smaller areas including Plymouth Circle, Schiller Park and Washington Square.4 The entire city now boasts 3500 acres of nationally recognized parkland.

In addition to the large system of public parks, Rochester was also home to nationally renowned residential landscape architect Fletcher Steele (1885-1971). Fletcher Steele was a devoted practitioner of landscape architecture. Schooled in the traditional Beaux Arts fashion at Harvard University and trained by Warren H. Manning in the picturesque style, Steele's own innovative design approach would eventually bridge the gap between classical design principles and modernist functionalism. His idea of modernism and the emerging eclectic application of past styles in garden design would have a profound impact on the landscape architecture profession for years to come. Impressed by the great sights during his travels in Europe, especially Italy, Steele utilized his copious sketches and notations of landscape elements to aid his design development. His inventive garden design talent, understanding of proportion and geometry and use of balustrades, urns, stone, statuary, hedges and water features are unmistakable. After opening his own private firm in Boston, Steele would embark on a sixty-year career of private landscape garden design. Creating more than 500 garden designs, Steele left behind a legacy of garden design concentrated in his home town of Rochester, New York.

Since the 1930s, Rochester has had a strong history of preservation. With advocacy groups such as the Landmark Society of Western New York and preservation ordinances and district guidelines, the city has had much success in preserving its cultural and horticultural history. The urban residential fabric in the city's seven preservation districts boasts some of the most exquisite examples of architecture and garden design in the Upstate New York region. Together the East Avenue, Mt. Hope/Highland and Grove Place Preservation Districts initially encompassed twenty-seven of Steele's seventy-five designed landscapes/cemetery lots. However, due to development pressure and the increasing need to accommodate the automobile, eight of the twenty-seven landscapes/cemetery lots have been demolished and one severely altered. Demolition of the

---

eight properties occurred prior to the city’s designation of the East Avenue (1969) and Mt. Hope/Highland (1974) Preservation Districts. The severely altered property, located in the Mt. Hope/Highland Preservation District was altered after designation in the early 1980s. The property located in the Grove Place Preservation District was unable to be visited.

Early Years

Steele was the eldest child born to John and Mary Steele in Rochester, New York in 1885. His father was a lawyer and mother a pianist. The Steele family “…spent their winters in a middle-class house on Rochester’s Park Avenue, and summers in nearby Pittsford in a farmhouse owned by the family since 1850.” After the family permanently moved to the farmhouse in Pittsford in 1895, Steele was home-schooled for a short while by his mother then at the age of 12 began attending the Bradstreet School for Boys in downtown Rochester. After graduating from the Bradstreet School for Boys in 1903, Steele enrolled at Williams College where he would spend the next four years of his life. In the autumn of 1907 Steele entered into Harvard University’s young graduate program of landscape architecture. In its second year of existence, the graduate program had a roster of instructors and administrators that included Fredrick Law Olmsted Jr., Arthur Shurtleff and James Sturgis Pray, and courses in “Landscape Architecture, History of the Fine Arts, Elements of Architectural Design, Plants and Planting Design, Surveying, Road Building, Water Works, Masonry and Foundations, Contracts and Specifications, Geology, Meteorology, Physiography, Botany, Mathematics, and Languages.” Rooted in the Beaux Arts design philosophy and based on those of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Steele’s training at the Harvard Design School would have a profound impact on his approach to design for the remainder of his career.

While only mildly successful in the academic realm, Steele’s design talents were recognized by Boston landscape architect and city planner, Warren H. Manning. In September of 1908, Manning persuaded Steele to leave Harvard and work for him in Boston. A year later, Steele was officially hired as Warren H. Manning’s personal traveling secretary and was given his first opportunity to travel throughout the US, design

———

6 Initially started as an under-graduate program in 1900, the Harvard landscape architecture program was moved to the Graduate School of Applied Science in 1906. Anthony Alofsin, The Struggle for Modernism: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning at HARVARD (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002), 40.
and write about landscape architecture related issues. Over the next couple of years, Steele met with clients, dictated reports to Manning and revisited Harvard. In the spring of 1913, Warren Manning gave Steele time off from work and one hundred dollars to travel Europe and write a report of his travels upon his return. During his travels, he kept a detailed sketchbook and notebook documenting colors, shapes, forms, materials, and the relationship of proportion to the overall spatial organization of the site. Among the many seaports and estates Steele visited, his experiences in the Italian cities such as Rome, Florence and Naples and tours of gardens at Villa Aldobrandini at Franscati and Ville Lante at Bagnaia would have the greatest impact and provide inspiration for future garden designs.

Professional Practice

In the fall of 1913, Steele returned from the four-month tour of Western Europe and England. Shortly thereafter he left the Manning office and helped found the Boston Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects.8 In 1914, Steele landed his first client, good friend Grahame Wood of Philadelphia. As Steele’s career began to gather speed after another successful design for a wealthy New Yorker, Ethan Allen in North Andover, Massachusetts, he began submitting articles to popular magazines concerning the proper construction and design of a residential landscape. His first long article entitled ‘The Landscaping of Peridot’ illustrates a fictional residential landscape project pointing out “…the importance of privacy, then building cost, good versus bad views, existing resources (trees, stone wall, etc.), maintenance issues (initial versus long-term costs), and efficiency in use of space.”9 Over the course of his career, Steele would write approximately eighty-four articles for popular journals such as Landscape Architecture, House Beautiful, Country Life in America and Garden Magazine. In addition to the journal publications Steele wrote two full-length books, Design in the Little Garden (1924) and Gardens and People (1962) and would often lecture for universities and garden clubs.

As the primary principal of his firm in Boston for over fifty years, Steele designed and created residential gardens throughout the New England and Mid-Atlantic states, with seventy-five of his 500 designs concentrated in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area. Known as “George Eastman’s town”, Rochester’s

9 Ibid, 22.
East Avenue during the 1910s became the city’s center for civic, social and cultural events and a gathering of Rochester’s aristocracy. In 1941 Steele described East Avenue:

Much of the Victorian atmosphere of all our cities is going, here as elsewhere. Rochester still has its principle [sic] residence avenue. In their good days such streets had a real influence on the manners and progress of whole cities. Each town had one, like Delaware Avenue in Buffalo, Euclid Avenue in Cleveland, Jefferson Avenue in Detroit. Broad, tree-covered highways, lined with the residences of prosperous citizens, they were the centers of all social and cultural activities. There people promenaded after church, watched their beaux and husbands race fast horses, delivered calling cards on proper afternoons, thought up good works and gathered to sew for the new affairs to be called hospitals and orphan asylums. Of all these city foci, East Avenue is more nearly as it was than any.  

Steele’s initial work in the Rochester area began by capitalizing on the concentration of wealth along East Avenue. In 1914, Steele’s first client was Mr. and Mrs. Kingman Knott Robins at 935 East Avenue (After Mr. Robins death in 1923, Elizabeth Sibley Robins remarried Edwin Allen Stebbins, soon to be president of Rochester Savings Bank). The tea and rose garden Steele designed for Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen Stebbins in the 1930s combined geometric and curvilinear forms creating intricate patterns both on the ground and as vertical planes. Just around the corner from the Stebbins, in 1915 Steele was commissioned to design a small walled garden for Mr. and Mrs. Atkinson Allen. As Steele’s clientele grew, he continued to design full and partial gardens within the East Avenue neighborhood, while expanding his geographic area to neighborhoods such as Ambassador Drive and Lake Road. Steele’s clientele eventually consisted of the city’s contemporary industrialists such as Edward G. Miner, Arthur L. Sterns and Dr. James Sibley Watson, as well as the emerging leaders of the city such as Harper Sibley and Frank E. Gannett. Earning the respect of his colleagues, Steele was elected a Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architecture in 1918. With many of his Rochester clients, Steele built lifelong relationships and often continued designing and ordering plant materials well past the initial installation of his design.

Steele’s sister Esther began having health problems in 1962. Having a strong clientele in the area, Steele moved back into his family home on Monroe Avenue in Rochester. During his time in Rochester, Steele continued to work with old and new clients beginning twenty additional landscape projects. Many of his later projects were never built, but designs such as the linden allee for the University of Rochester Memorial Art Gallery and the Richard and Nancy R. Turner garden were.

---

11 *Landscape Architecture*, October 1949, 34.
Rochester Client Projects

In 1924 Steele published Design in the Little Garden, a book proposing a functional approach to design of an ordinary residential plot and the need for privacy in gardens. Reversing the usual arrangement of the functions and amenities surrounding a single family home Steele wrote:

We must have an attractive house entrance on the street. But our living rooms should open on the old despised backyards now turned into gardens and terraces no matter how small. The garage should be directly on the street, as is most practical and economical. Kitchen and service rooms should be on the front, not the back of the house. Laundry yards should go next to the garage, toward the front. If possible a high wall on the sidewalk should hide them...with such a scheme we may be content that not a foot of room has been wasted; that everything is where use and common sense would have it; and that finally we have cleared the old backyard to make ready for a proper setting for our out-of-door life.\textsuperscript{12}

His strong rejection of the American front lawn, proposal for compatible functional areas and use of the “outdoor living room” as a private refuge from the automobile was the basic functional approach he used in creating his garden designs. Steele felt “The work of the landscape architect is a living changing thing. Left alone, it will more often than not deteriorate until what might have been beauty is shapeless and distorted. It cannot be trusted to care for itself. It will inevitably be spoiled by the wrong hand, even when well meaning. If the landscape architect is needed to create beauty, he cannot be spared when his work is only begun.”\textsuperscript{13} Steele was extremely successful in practice and personally popular with his clients. Working for wealthy clients such as bankers, industrials, inventors and philanthropists, he met them on equal footing through his dress, demeanor and awareness for the finer things in life.

Steele began designing for Rochester area clients in 1914 and created his last garden in 1971. Beginning in the downtown Rochester neighborhoods such as East Avenue and Mt. Hope Avenue, through networking, Steele began adding clients in the suburban villages of Pittsford, Webster, Bushnell’s Basin and Avon. Designing for a wide variety of clients, Steele primarily focused on private residential garden design. In all, Steele had sixty-five private residential clients, eight memorial/ cemetery lots and two public landscape designs in the Rochester area. He had three types of clients. Depending on the client and the nature of the work, Steele created designs for entire properties, components of properties and provided professional consultation services. Regardless if his proposed designs were built, he gave each job a client number.

\textsuperscript{12} Fletcher Steele, Design in the Little Garden (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1924), 18.
The Charlotte Whitney Atkinson Allen garden is the only example of Steele designing an entire property from ground breaking to final installation in the Rochester area. As the primary landscape architect for the Allens from 1915 to 1965, the full garden design included grading and drainage plans, planting plans, and sketches and details for iron and stone work unique to the garden. The majority of Steele’s design work was a component of an entire property. These component designs were generally located to the side or rear of the residential structure in keeping with his functional approach to garden design. Component designs generally consisted of rose gardens, turf and stone terraces, designed planting beds and water features. Steele created component garden designs for Edwin Allen Stebbins (President of Rochester Savings Bank), Helen Ellwanger (Niece of horticulturalist, George Ellwanger), Homer and Margaret Woodbury Strong (Founders of Strong Museum), Richard and Nancy Turner (President of Schlegel Corporation) and Joseph and Hilda Taylor (President of Bausch and Lomb). As a master in his field, Steele was often consulted for advice concerning tree removal, materials and plants and design suggestions. Many potential clients seeking Steele design expertise may have declined his suggested design due to lack of finances or general disagreement concerning the appropriateness of the proposed design. Clients that Steele consulted with include Mr. John Steele, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Robbins and Mrs. Andrew Wolfe.

In addition to his clientele, Steele began developing a working relationship with local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn. Born in Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada in 1915, Rahn graduated from the Graduate School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture at Smith College in 1940 and moved to Rochester in 1942. Also specializing in private residential design, Rahn and Steele often competed for clients in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Katherine Wilson Rahn is best known for her design work during the early 1970s complimenting Steele’s already completed design at the Richard and Nancy Turner estate.

As a member of the Garden Club of America, board member of the Landmark Society of Western New York and Fellow of American Society of Landscape Architects, Steele was an influential member of the Rochester community. As a designer, he also influenced young minds in the landscape architecture field through his exploration and experimentation with new spatial ideas from modernist landscape design. While attending the graduate school of design at Harvard University from 1936 to 1938, Dan Kiley, Garrett Eckbo and James Rose became aware of Steele’s artistic and innovative garden designs. Although it is difficult to assess the impact Steele’s writings and designs had on these three key innovators of the modern landscape
movement, in a letter to Professor Marlene Salon at the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Dan Kiley wrote:

I am delighted that you are planning an exhibit on Fletcher Steele as he was, in my opinion, the most interesting designer (the only one) in that period, before 1930.

I first met Mr. Steele in 1934 through Arthur Sylvester who worked for him after returning from his Charles Eliot Fellowship. At the time, I was working for Warren H. Manning in Harvard Square, for whom Fletcher Steele worked in the 1920’s, or earlier.

I was very excited, stimulated and inspired by Mr. Steele’s work. He had a rich sense of design influenced somewhat by Chinese work. Naumkeag in the Berkshires (Woodstock?) had this character. It was Mabel Choates [Sic] place. She invited me to lunch and by luck Steele appeared.

He had a dashing, debonair manner of great confidence. It is told (I’m not sure if it true) that he arrived for dinner at a rich and fancy clients house in his old Rolls Royce. As the chauffeur opened the door, it fell on the ground while Fletcher stepped haughtily on it and entered the house.

His standard of drawing was high- he demanded excellent drafting and beautiful detailing.

He seemed to be the only one in the profession interested in the Modern Los Angeles movement then (but he himself did not subscribe to it) as indicated by his excellent article on the French in ASLA Quarterly.

Although his writing and design influenced many people including myself, I do not think his work was in a line of transformation for I believe he rejected the modern approach. His was more romantic and out of the stream.

Your question “Did he play a role in the transformation in approach to Los Angeles design which spread through the profession in the 1930’s – needs correction. The “transformation” did not spread through the profession in the 1930’s. The whole profession, including the schools, especially Harvard, rejected it completely and scornfully.

Eckbo, Rose and I were the only ones in the United States in the 1930’s [Sic] interested and dedicated to this approach. In England, Christopher Tunnard was working in a parallel way. Tommy Church has one foot in, but his work was still conservative.

I hope this is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact me further as I am very interested. 14

As a prolific writer and master in his field Steele was important to the development of American landscape architecture and specifically private residential garden design. Steele’s legacy of gardens in the Rochester metropolitan area represents his life’s work and his ability to experiment with previously unexplored materials and spatial organization of garden designs. The next chapter will introduce the extent of Steele’s garden design in the Rochester area and their existing condition in relation to his original design intent.

Chapter 2

Rochester Gardens

Introduction

This chapter presents the history of Fletcher Steele’s Rochester metropolitan area designed landscapes and the existing conditions of the properties in 2003. A comparison of the existing conditions and the historic condition of the landscape during the period of significance (which is when Steele was involved with the property) will be used to evaluate the condition of the property.

After initial property visits, a comparison of character-defining landscape features from the period of significance and the character-defining features of 2003, both historic and contemporary, was completed. A determination was then made regarding existing features and their contribution to the property. A contributing feature is one “...present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at the time or is capable of yielding important information about the period.”¹ A non-contributing feature is “...not present during the significant period, or due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at the time or is incapable of yielding important information about the period.”² Finally, an analysis of the condition, use and existing feature’s relationship to the historic character of the property was made.

¹ U.S. Department of the Interior. National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning. The bulletin was completed by the Interagency Resources Division of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, 1977. Revised by Patricia L. Parker, 1985, 45. A contemporary reconstruction of a feature, based on accurate documentation of the original, potentially contributes to the significance of a property if it reflects the historic character of the time.
² Ibid.
There are three components to the property analysis; (1) a brief description of the property history and Steele’s involvement, (2) an assessment of historic and existing conditions containing spatial organization, circulation, topography, vegetation, constructed water features and small-scale features, and (3) an analysis of the condition of the property. As the landscape features were assessed based on their physical condition, the property’s level of condition was assessed according to the following categories: Unable to Visit, Unknown, Consultation, Good, Fair, Poor, and Demolished.

Of the seventy-five clients in the Rochester metropolitan area, fifty-eight properties were visited from May 2003 to November 2003. Seventeen properties were unable to be visited (due to financial and time constraints). Seventeen properties had an unknown condition and ten properties where Steele provided only consultation services to the client. These forty-four clients/properties will be discussed in greater detail in Appendix A. Of the remaining thirty-one properties, representative examples from each of the four categories—good, fair, poor and demolished conditions—will be discussed in a comprehensive manner to gain a sense of the time span of the gardens and to provide a detailed analysis of Steele’s landscape design work. A complete list of these thirty-one properties is located in Appendix B.

Although Steele indirectly influenced the design of the flower and vegetable gardens at his home on Monroe Avenue, a full property analysis has been included. Following the discussion of Steele’s family property, six of the thirteen properties in good condition, three of the six properties in fair condition, three of the four properties in poor condition, and seven out of eight properties demolished will be presented.
Current Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Stuart and Nancy Bolger
Client #: 114 Mr. John Steele Esq.
20 Monroe Avenue
Pittsford, New York 14534

Site History

The Potter-Steele-Bolger residence is one of the finest and oldest examples of architecture in the Village of Pittsford. The rear two-story Federal style portion of the residence was built c.1810 by the Potter family with a c.1830 one-story late Federal style wing addition many decades later. "The Steele family was comfortable but not well-to-do, especially by standards in the unusually prosperous upstate city. They spent their winters in a middle-class house on Rochester's Park Avenue, and summers in nearby Pittsford in a farmhouse owned by the family since 1850."3 The modified Greek revival house was owned by the Steele family until Steele's death in 1971. The property was then purchased by Stuart and Nancy Bolger who are the current owners of the property. The Federal/Greek Revival farmhouse is situated on the northern side of Monroe Avenue with a single family residence to the west and a parking lot to the east.

The current site is 1.6 acres and is a contributing property to the Pittsford Village Historic District.

Client #114 represents the work that Steele did for his parents, Mary and John Steele from 1922 to 1945, and then his sister Esther from 1946 to 1959. The large flower garden in the backyard was well tended by Mary and Esther Steele (Figure 2.1). Although it is unknown if Steele designed portions or the entire family garden, he did order plant materials and supervise the maintenance and care of the property. In March 1922, Steele ordered packets of Himalayan desert candle (Eremurus himalaicus) and foxtail lily (Eremurus robustus) from England for Esther. For his father in October 1926, Steele placed plant orders for four varieties of cotoneaster (Cotoneaster nitens, Cotoneaster divaricata, Cotoneaster horizontalis and Cotoneaster microphylla) and for ninety rock speedwell (Veronica rupestris).

The late 1920s and early 1930s layout of the flower garden included wood trellises framing a grass path through the center of the garden (Figure 2.2), a shady spot near the house for lawn furniture and gazing into the garden (Figure 2.3) and a large turf panel surrounded by geometric flower beds (Figure 2.4). Steele's order forms from April 1931 to 1939 include new flooring and rubber-lined cotton hosing for the necessary repairs to the damaged house during a winter storm in 1931 (Figure 2.5). In April 1940, Steele

---

placed orders for pink, orange, white and yellow Hybrid Tea roses including Betty Uprichard, Countess Vandel, Dame Edith Helen, Duquesa De Peneranda, Etoile de Hollande, Rex Anderson, Dainty Bess, Radiance, Red Radiance and Reverend F. Page-Roberts (Rosa x hybrida) for Esther. He also ordered red and pink floribunda roses Donald Prior, World’s Fair and Gruss an Aachen (Rosa x hybrida).\(^4\) Shortly after Mary Steele died in 1943, Esther placed a large order with Steele for a variety of day lilies including Apricot, Dr. Regal, Gold Dust, Hyperion, J. A. Crawford, May Queen, Orange Man, Gypsy Harvest, Lemon hybrid and Mrs. W. H. Wyman hybrid (Hemerocallis fulva var.). Also in 1945 Esther ordered 18 different types of hibiscus including Lucy, Ardens, Jeanne d’ Arc and Rubra plena (Hibiscus syriacus var.) and white, pink and red oriental poppies including Barr’s White, Helen Elizabeth, Beauty of Livermore and Indian Chief (Papaver orientale). From December 1947 to April 1948, Esther continued to order purple and red variegated hibiscus (Hibiscus syriacus variegates) from Steele. To care for his family property and many of his other Rochester clients, in a letter to Paul N. Crandall of Crandell Tree Surgeons, Inc., Steele writes:

> I have your letter of March 26, 1953. When the time comes, please cut down the cucumber tree between the house and the street on the west side of the sidewalk into the front porch. And also will you please spray the other tree close to the sidewalk. Please contact Miss Esther Steele before the work is done so that she can tell you about the wood of the tree that is cut down.

> I understand that you will cut the tree close to the ground for $55. That will be satisfactory as I am interested in seeing just how long it takes the stump to rot.\(^5\)

After Mary’s death, Esther had slowly been turning her interests away from flower gardens and towards vegetable gardening. From May 1956 to March 1958, Esther placed orders through Steele for a variety of herbs including French tarragon (Artemisia dracunculus sative), sorrel (Rumex cetosa), bush basil (Ocimum minimum), chervil (Anthriscus cerefolium) and seed packets for corn, parsley and shallots.\(^6\) Steele returned to the family property in 1962 to be close to Esther who died in 1964. Steele continued to live at 20 Monroe Avenue until his death in 1971.

\(^4\) Fletcher Steele to Jackson and Perkins Company, 19 April 1940, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
\(^5\) Fletcher Steele to Paul N. Crandall, 28 March 1953, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
\(^6\) Fletcher Steele to Village Hill Nursery, 14 May, 1958 and Fletcher Steele to Andres R. Kennedy, Inc., 14 March 1958, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
Condition of the Landscape

The landscape that Mary and Esther Steele tended has been severely altered by Stuart and Nancy Bolger. The Bolgers have created a large pond on the property behind the barn and used the fill to raise the grade along the back of the house with three foot retaining walls dividing the upper and lower spaces of the backyard. The flower and vegetable gardens have been reduced to a small rectangular plot in the northwest corner of the backyard. The wood trellises depicted in Mary and Esther’s garden were kept and remain as a focal point in the backyard. Although Steele ordered plants for his mother and sister and provided advice concerning the maintenance of the property, the spatial organization and design of the vegetable and flower gardens did not reflect Steele’s design style. Even though the gardens have been altered and that Steele did not create designs for his family property, the property as a whole is significant because of its association with Fletcher Steele.
Client #: 114 Mr. John Steele Esq.

Fletcher Steele Archives  
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library  
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry  
Syracuse, New York  
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719  

This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

FSMC: Photograph Book, L-5, pages 24 and 49.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-15: Photograph Album: Client 114, Garden and Exterior of Residence.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 2, Folder 9-114, Six Trace Drawings of Architectural Floor Plans of Steele Residence.

Photograph Collection:

L4929 to 4992: 35 mm Contact Prints: Views of Garden and Exterior of Residence.

L5173: 35mm Contact Prints: Interior Views of Residence.

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 2 (5 plates): Views of Garden and Mary

Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.1: Mary Steele in the Flower Garden, June 1920 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.2: View of the flower garden, wood trellises and lawn furniture, July 1928 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.3: Looking northward through the Flower Garden, August 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.4: View of the Lawn Panel and Flower Garden, August 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.5: Fixing the Roof of the Steele Residence after winter storm damage, January 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).
GOOD CONDITION

Successful space composition has an entity of its own quite independent of the things around and in it. It is felt rather than seen. It houses the spirit and charm of a place. It is intangible yet continually felt...Whatever the size, the human being feels a relation to the space in which he is, - an almost mystical sense of being part of himself.

- Fletcher Steele
Current Owner: Mr. Geoffrey T. Yancey Jr.
Client #40: Ms. Charlotte Whitney Atkinson Allen
32 Oliver Street
Rochester, New York 14607

Site History

The property was previously part of the William Little Nurseries, Oliver Culver Estate and Alice E. Buell Tract. The two story L-shaped English style residence was a wedding present from the bride's parents in 1915 for newlyweds Charlotte Whitney and Atkinson Allen (Vice-President of Allen Woolen Mills). The property eventually became a popular point of entertainment for prominent Rochester families. In 1938, Charlotte Allen divorced her husband and remained at the residence until her death in 1978. She had bequeathed twenty five works of art including drawings, paintings, sculptures by Lachaise and Calder, as well as a cash gift to the University of Rochester Memorial Art Gallery. Elizabeth Brayer writes, “She had earlier deeded the home to the University, but retained lifetime possession of the collection and use of the property. No written stipulation was made as to the disposition of the house, although a tacit understanding existed that it would be used as the director’s residence.” After several months the Board of Managers at the Memorial Art Gallery decided to sell the home with restrictive covenants on the garden. Mr. and Mrs. Bunney purchased the property in 1978. The Bunnys took excellent care of the property and were able to retrieve original items such as the metal flower arrangements, squirrel and iron furniture at auction. In 1998, Mr. Geoffrey Yancey purchased the property and is the current owner.

Fletcher Steele was hired in 1915 and continued to work on the small lot (90 by 200 feet) for the next half-century. The original 1916 plan was almost entirely implemented except for the tea house and the red cedars in the terrace walk (Figure 2.6). Although red cedars may have been planted without success, European beeches proved to be a more durable specie. The Medina stone walkways, brick walls and tile coping and terrace walkway were in place by 1916. A 1922 sketch planting for the Atkinson Allen garden suggests over story trees, geometric planting beds, stairs and retaining walls leading to the terrace walkway. At some point between 1922 and 1926 the Gaston Lachaise sculpture, a wall fountain and octagonal pool

---

7 Architectural and Historical Buildings Data for 32 Oliver Street, East Avenue Area, binder 11 Oliver Street to Oxford Street, Landmark Society of Western New York, 1984.
9 Ibid.
were installed between the turf panel and the terrace walkway. To augment the importance of the Lachaise sculpture, a Sussex arch was added over the sculpture c.1934. In place of the tea house at the end of the terrace walkway, an Alexander Calder sculpture was purchased and placed there in 1935. As early at 1932 Steele was exploring the design of the swimming pool shelter. By February of 1937, Steele had developed a tent-like structure with metal mesh curtain backdrops and a shell-backed bench. The swimming pool shelter took its final form as a tent-like structure with less of a backdrop based on medieval campaign tents.\(^{11}\) The unconventional chain mail tent material gathered in the center and drooped over the edges of the iron frame. The Saracen tent, as it is now called, was installed in 1940. Up through the 1960s, Steele was still designing for Ms. Allen. He ordered plant materials, noted where trimming was needed and in 1966 designed a wrought iron gate at the entrance to the driveway.

**Historic/ Existing Conditions**

Historically, and currently, the site is approximately .4 acres situated on the east side of Oliver Street. The property is a contributing property to the East Avenue Preservation District. Across the street to the north, south, east and west of the property are single family residences. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the second visit to the property by the author in June 2003 (Figure 2.7).

**Spatial Organization**

In the 1916 plan, the property had two primary spaces the front yard and the back yard with the driveway located along the northern side of the property and the spring garden along the southern side of the residence. The front yard was primarily lawn with low lying evergreen beds along the foundation and sidewalk. A single large pin oak (*Quercus palustris*) in the northeastern corner of the yard was pruned to allow open views of the property from Oliver Street. The brick garage and brick tread driveway along the northern edge were added during the late 1930s. Enclosed by a seven to eight foot red brick wall, the backyard encompassed four distinct spaces, the turf panel, fountain area, drinking pit and terrace walkway (Figure 2.8). The turf panel space was surrounded by a Medina stone walkway with evergreen beds to the

\(^{11}\) Ibid, 216.
left and right allowing views open to the fountain area and sky. The fountain area was the focal point of
the garden. Situated above the pool and at eye level from the back porch, the fountain area was often
viewed from the drinking pit. Primarily used for entertainment, the drinking pit was located adjacent to the
pool, defined by plantings and a wooden fence. The temporary poolside furniture and terrace was
redesigned and replaced in 1940 by the Saracen tent. Behind the fountain area was the terrace walkway. In
this shady space, an allee of European beech directed views towards the northern end and Alexander
Calder’s sculpture. Sandwiched between the house, front yard and back yard and enclosed by gates was the
spring garden. In the 1960s, a small water feature and flowering plants were added to the spring garden.

The spatial organization of the current property is relatively similar to its historical layout. The
plantings have matured and in places have been replaced as needed. Encroachment by a euonymus hedge
added in the 1960s along the sidewalk and evergreen plantings along the foundation have slightly
diminished the size of the front lawn. The large pin oak has been removed but a shadblow serviceberry in
front of the bay window and a red Japanese maple has slightly obscured the view of the façade from Oliver
Street. The red brick garage and tread drive are intact. The layout of the back yard and 1960s alterations to
the Spring Garden are exactly the same with only minor changes to the plant materials (Figure 2.9). The
Lachaise sculpture and the Calder sculpture have been moved to the University of Rochester Memorial Art
Gallery for public display.

Circulation

The circulation system in the 1916 plan included a driveway, parking area and pedestrian
walkways in the front yard and back yard. The linear driveway along the northern edge, material unknown,
rann the entire length of the property from Oliver Street to the brick garage in the northeast corner of the lot.
Behind the house the driveway widened for extra parking and maneuvering of vehicles. The linear red brick
front walkway connected the front porch to the sidewalk. The backyard had two entrances; the primary
entrance was off the enclosed patio while a wooden gate along the edge of the driveway leading to a
stepping stone pathway between the house and the Saracen tent was the second. From the enclosed patio,
the Medina stone walkway wrapped around the central turf panel from 1916 to c.1930. During the early
1930s, the eastern side of the walkway was removed and placed along the northern side of the pool to
connect the walkway to the Lachaise fountain. From the fountain area into the terrace walkway, a crushed stone path led northward towards the Calder sculpture.

Compared to the 1916 plan, the current circulation system has undergone minute changes. The driveway material was changed to red brick treads and grass at an unknown point before the 1960s. The remainder of the circulation system is extant.

Topography

Historically and currently the topography of the site is relatively flat in the front yard, sloping slightly towards Oliver Street, with the back yard having a four to five feet retaining wall along the eastern edge creating the fountain area and terrace walkway spaces.

Vegetation Features

Throughout the property, the 1916 plan depicted densely planted beds lining the front yard and spaces in the back yard. The front yard had an open lawn area on either side of the red brick walkway with dense low-lying planting beds surrounding the yard. A 1947 photograph shows the front yard planted with evergreen hedges along the concrete sidewalk and pachysandra (Pachysandra terminalis) beds with a flowering dogwood (Cornus sp.), arborvitaes (Thuja sp.) and possibly bracken ferns (Pteridium aquilinum) along the foundation. Within the northwest corner of the front lawn stands a single pin oak (Quercus palustris) (Figure 2.10). In the back yard, the turf panel space originally had a young sycamore maple (Acer pseudoplatanus), and an oak (Quercus sp.). In June of 1922, the north side bed along the Medina stone walkway had a boxwood hedge (Buxus sp.) with Japanese andromeda (Pieris japonica), junipers (Juniperus sp.) and Japanese wisteria (Wisteria floribunda). By 1947 the turf panel’s evergreen beds included alumroot (Heuchera micrantha), fire thorn (Pyracantha sp.), mahonia (Mahonia sp.), U-shaped yew hedges (Taxus sp.) and English holly (Ilex aquifolium). The south side bed was primarily planted with English ivy (Hedera helix) and a few deciduous trees. In 1927, the drinking pit a small patch of lawn was enclosed by a low evergreen hedge, upright junipers (Juniperus sp.) and a backdrop hedge of burning bush (Euonymus alatus). When the Saracen tent was built in 1940, the planting beds became a forest of hawthorn trees (Crataegus sp.). During the 1930s, the pool retaining wall was covered with Virginia
creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*) and in the corners of the pool were planted Japanese wisteria (*Wisteria floribunda*), lilacs (*Syringa* sp.) and an evergreen shrub. The terrace walkway originally had four red cedars (*Juniperus virginiana*) that were changed in the 1930s to a European beech alle (*Fagus sylvatica*). In the 1960s a water feature was added to the spring garden that was surrounded by ferns, four arborvitae (Thuja sp.) in wooden corner planter boxes and Dutchman’s pipe (*Aristolochia durior*).

Although the front yard has been altered, the current conditions of the back yard and vegetation features have been preserved due to the covenant on the garden. In the front yard, the pin oak and flowering dogwood have been removed and replaced with a large shadblow serviceberry (*Amelanchier canadensis*) in front of the bay window, a red Japanese maple (*Acer palmatum*), yews (*Taxus* sp.) and an apple tree (*Malus sylvestris*) on the southern side of the red brick walkway. Euonymus hedges continue to line the concrete sidewalk (Figure 2.11). The driveway space has turf panels between and along side the red brick treads with a small perennial planting bed alongside the residence filled with Hostas (*Hosta* sp.), lily-of-the-valley (*Convallaria majalis*) and English ivy (*Hedera helix*). Replacing the oak in the turf panel are three fleshy hawthorns (*Crataegus succulenta*) spaced evenly along the southern wall in a bed of English ivy (*Hedera helix*). The northern bed remains an evergreen bed with a common boxwood hedge (*Buxus sempervirens*) and similar mixture of yews, holly, firethorn, heuchera and mahonia. The hawthorn forest surrounding the Saracen tent in the drinking pit and the Japanese wisteria in the northwestern corner of the pool are extant. The Virginia creeper covering the pool side retaining wall was removed in the 1940s. European beaches continue to line the crushed stone terrace walkway.

**Constructed Water Features**

The 1916 plan depicts the swimming pool and the Fountain Area as important elements along the central axis. Beginning with the layout of the topography the flat space for the pool and Fountain Area was constructed in 1916, with the completion of the retaining walls, steps, balustrade and shell shaped wall fountain in June 1922. By fall of 1927, the swimming pool, water runnel and upper fountain were implemented. In 1963, a small but intricate fountain was constructed in the Spring Garden just off the enclosed patio (Figure 2.12). Centered in a basin formed by a series of intersecting arches, atop a porcelain
stand the water poured from the wrought iron sphere into the basin. The stone fountain, swimming pool and sphere fountain are extant.

*Small Scale Features*

Since it’s inception in 1916, the Allen property has had a wonderful collection of detailed features from designed lawn furniture to hand crafted wrought iron flower arrangements. Although the front yard was relatively simple and unadorned compared to the back yard, in 1967 Steele designed a decorative wrought iron gate for the entrance of the driveway. In the backyard, the turf panel space had a long rectangular wooden bench that was intended to sit poolside in the 1916 plan, but was moved below the raised enclosed porch. A set of white painted wrought iron lawn furniture overlooking the swimming pool are pictured in a 1933 photo of the drinking pit. In 1940 the wrought iron and chain mail Saracen tent was completed. The bell shaped wrought iron frame supported the chain mail gathered at the top and draping to the ground. A pair of wrought iron decorative poles and detailed iron edging flanked the entrance to the tent and defined the planting bed edges in the drinking pit. For furniture, Steele designed a set of iron chairs, a bench and table (Figure 2.13). Adorning the fountain area were a stone balustrade, stone stairs, red brick retaining walls, shell shaped wall fountain and a water runnel from the upper fountain. The focal point of the entire garden was the Gaston Lachaise sculpture. The seven foot marble nude female with flowing drapery was framed by a pair of stone obelisks and later a red brick Sussex arch (Figure 2.14). A foliage covered rustic wooden trellis served as the backdrop to the sculpture. To keep the eye moving along the upper edge of the pool retaining wall, Steele commissioned Gustav L. Koralewsky to create four colored wrought iron flower arrangements in February 1937. The flower arrangements sat atop the four pillars surrounding the pool. In 1934, Alexander Calder wrote Steele discussing his sculpture he was building for Mrs. Allen.¹² The sculpture would be placed at the terminus of the terrace walkway as to not

---

¹² In 1934, Steele received a note and three snapshots of current work from “Sandy” (Alexander) Calder, whom he had befriended in Paris: “Am bringing the mountain to Mohammad,” the note read, “but stay still a moment till I catch up with you! I’ll be in Boston by Dec. 15 (I think) with the object or objects.” On his way back from Chicago in 1935 Calder stopped off in Rochester to meet Charlotte...Mrs. Allen wanted a mobile for her garden which Fletcher Steele had designed—this was the first object I made for out of doors. As I remember, it consisted of some quite heavy iron discs that I found in a blacksmith’s shop in Rochester and had them welded to rods progressively getting heavier and heavier. Robin Karson, *Fletcher Steele, Landscape Architect: An Account of the Gardenmaker’s Life 1885 – 1971* (New York: Sagapress, Inc., 1989), 190.
detract from Lachaise’s nude sculpture (Figure 2.15). Lining the walkway were hostas and marble urns and eventually small plaques marking the resting places of family pets. Surrounding the metal sphere fountain adjacent to the porch was decorative red brick in a basket-weave pattern, wrought iron fencing, four wooden corner planting boxes and a strip of crushed stone.

Since the death of Ms. Allen, the Calder sculpture and the Lachaise sculpture have been moved to the Memorial Art Gallery where they are on display. The remainders of the small-scale garden features including the Saracen tent and wrought iron colored flower arrangements are extant. (Figure 2.16 and 2.17).

Condition of the Landscape

The Charlotte Whitney Atkinson Allen garden was a culmination of half a century of design work. It represents Steele’s changing design styles throughout his career and exquisite use of metals, hardscape materials and understanding of proportion. The Allen property is the only example of a landscape designed entirely by Fletcher Steele. In relation to Steele’s entire body of work, the Allen garden is a significantly designed landscape with integrity. The covenant placed on the garden and good stewardship of past owners has maintained this small but magnificent garden to survive as Steele and Ms. Allen intended. Despite the removal of the Lachaise sculpture, the garden is in excellent physical condition.
Client #40: Ms. Charlotte Whitney Atkinson Allen

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

FSMC: Photograph Book L-5, pgs 24-25, 53.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-14: Photograph Album: Client 40 Stairs and lawn, pool, residence and Lachaise sculpture.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 8, Folder 40- Six drawings of elevations of garage and residence, walls.

Flat File: Drawer 8, Folder 40-14 Study for Formal Garden February 1916.

Photograph Collection:

L4929: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views of Garden.

L5142: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views of Garden.

L5427: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views of Garden.

Photostatic Print Collection:

FSPP: Folder 1: Study for Formal Garden d-14 February 1916, Planting for Atkinson Allen d-64 1922, Shelter at the swimming pool d-97 June 20, 1932, Table in the Drinking Pit d-100 February 1934, Garden Table d-102 March 1934, Sketch for Garden.


Study Print Collection:


Client Order Book Collection:

Rochester Historical Society Steele Collection Plans and Drawings have three original plans for the Allen garden dating from 1932 to 1937.
Figure 2.6: Study for the formal garden at Mr. Atkinson Allen residence, February 1916 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.7: Existing site plan for the Yancey residence, June 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.8: Looking eastward across the turf panel towards the fountain area, May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.9: Current conditions of the panel and fountain areas, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.10: View of the front yard and front facade, May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.11: Current condition of the front yard and front facade, April 2004 (Photograph by author).
Figure 2.12: Metal sphere fountain in the spring garden area, 1963 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.13: View of the Saracen tent from the panel area, August 1968 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).
Figure 2.14: View of the Gaston Lachaise nude female sculpture atop the fountain, (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.15: Alexander Calder mobile for Charlotte Allen on display at U of R Memorial Art Gallery, (from Elizabeth Brayer, *Magnus Opus* (Rochester, New York: Monroe Reprographics, 1988), 173).
Figure 2.16: View of the Saracen tent from the fountain area, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.17: Wrought iron flower arrangement by the swimming pool, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owners: Mr. and Mrs. Gary and Connie Mauro  
Client #387 Mr. and Mrs. Adrian G. and Charlotte W. Devine  
3550 Elmwood Avenue  
Rochester New York 14610  

Site History

Mr. and Mrs. Devine built the Colonial Revival home c. 1930 and in 1943 purchased an additional strip of land along the east side of the property. 13 In the early 1960s, the Devine’s sold the property to Mr. and Mrs. Ogden R. Adams in the early 1960s. The Adams employed Arnold and Stern architecture firm to make alterations to the spatial organization of the interior of the house. The Adams shortly there after sold the property to Mr. and Mrs. Noble in the late 1960s. In 1969, the Nobles employed Faragher & Macomber and Associates to redesign the exterior of the home adding a two story bay to the right side of the façade and a garage. The Nobles in turn sold the property in the early 1970s to Mr. and Mrs. Vanden Brul. Mr. Vanden Brul was co-founder of RF Communications Inc., now as division of Harris Corporation. The Vanden Bruls lived at the property until the early 1990s when Mr. and Mrs. Paul and Susan Yesawich purchased the property in 1992. The Yesawichs lived at 3550 Elmwood for the next 8 years when the current owners Mr. and Mrs. Mauro purchased the property in 2000.

Steele was hired by the Devines in 1931 to create a backyard garden at their newly build suburban home in the small village of Brighton, just south of Rochester. 14 Created in December 1931, the general plan for the backyard called for a rectangular lawn panel with six black gum trees (Nyssa sylvatica) terminating in a semi-circular cascade of layered stone and plants (Figure 2.18). Along the house a raised turf terrace was proposed “…shaded by a living “awning” of locusts (Robinia sp.). The terrace fence—wide enough to function as a seat—reflects the Art Deco influence so prevalent in Steele’s work of the thirties.” 15 In the fall of 1933 work had started on the semi-circular terminus of the turf panel. By the summer of 1936, the red brick house terrace retaining wall and pillars, Medina stone stairs, locusts and field stone retaining wall in the semi-circular space were completed. 16 A wrought iron and wooden seat was designed in September of 1936 to fit between the red brick terrace wall pillars. Three summers later, the wrought iron and wood benches

16 Photographs, August 1936, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
were installed creating the appearance of a fence. In 1939, the Medina stone walkways and arborvitae hedges bordering the turf panel were added for privacy and six sweet gums spaced evenly, with three to each side of the panel, were planted to provide a framed view of the garden terminus. When an additional strip of land was added to the east side of the property in 1943, Steele suggested planting a gray hedge with rosemary willow (Salix elaeagnos), silverberry (Elaeagnus argentea) and autumn-olive (Elaeagnus umbellata).\textsuperscript{17} It is unknown if this hedge was ever planted.

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

Historically, and currently, the site is approximately one acre situated on the northern side of Elmwood Avenue. The property is surrounded to the north, east and west by single family residential properties. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the property by the author in August 2003 (Figure 2.19).

**Spatial Organization**

The 1931 general plan illustrates that the property was composed of two primary spaces, the front yard and back yard including the house-terrace, garden and service yard. The house-terrace and garden proper were built as specified, but it is unknown to what extent the proposed designs for the front yard and service yard were implemented since they are not depicted in historical photographs of the property. The 1931 plan shows a square-shaped front yard enclosed by a deciduous hedge with an opening for the driveway along the southwestern edge of the yard. A mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees was proposed throughout the front lawn. A conservatory was proposed east of the residence to physically and visually separate the house-terrace from the front lawn. It is unknown if the conservatory was built. The garden proper consisted of a long rectilinear space with the house-terrace used primarily for entertaining and viewing the garden. The L-shaped lawn on the house terrace defined by a red brick retaining wall was shaded by an “awning” of fifteen locusts also planted in an L-shape (Figure 2.20).\textsuperscript{18} The locusts were pruned high to allow uninterrupted views of the garden.


\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 180.
The current spatial organization of the property is very similar to Steele’s 1931 general plan. The front yard remains enclosed by a hedge to the east and densely planted deciduous shrubs along the northern side with open views of the residence from Elmwood Avenue. In place of the proposed conservatory is a white-washed brick wall separating the front yard from the house-terrace. The house-terrace locusts have been removed and replaced with a temporary canopy awning and the lawn replaced with flagstone (Figure 2.21). In the garden proper, five of the six black gums have been removed altering the framed view of the semi-circular terminus. Replacing the proposed badminton court, vegetable garden, and clothes yard and compost spaces in the service yard is a small stretch of lawn, flower garden, pergola and stone patio. Where the badminton court was proposed is an open rectangular mulched space.

Circulation

The circulation system in Steele’s 1931 general plan consisted of a curved driveway and pedestrian pathways in both the front yard and backyard garden. The driveway (material unknown) curved along the western side of the property connecting the proposed garage, which was never built, in the service yard to a turn around immediately behind the residence to Elmwood Avenue. Pedestrian walkways in the front yard consisted of a curved walkway (material unknown) connecting the driveway to the front porch and proposed L-shaped terrace, which was never built. In the backyard, a set of four medina stone stairs on the central axis lead from the house-terrace down to the garden. In the semicircular terminus, two sets of stairs were proposed to connect the turf panel to the grape arbors. Just north of the evergreen hedge, a pleached allee was proposed connecting the house-terrace to the badminton court. It is assumed the two sets of stairs, grape arbors and pleached allee were never constructed since they are not depicted in any historic photographs. The 1936 photographs do show a medina stone walkway approximately four to six feet wide encompassing the turf panel with steel edging coming to an end at the semicircular terminus (Figure 2.22).

The pedestrian pathways in the backyard are extant, but the vehicular and front yard pedestrian pathways have been altered since Steele’s 1931 general plan for the property. When the existing garage was added in 2000, the asphalt driveway was widened and a drop-off loop was created adding a second vehicular entrance to the property in the southeastern corner. A large square patch of asphalt was also added to the north side of the garage in the service space for an unknown use. In addition to the driveway changes, the
current owners added a flagstone pathway connecting the new drop-off loop to the house-terrace and steps to the strip of land acquired in 1943. In the backyard the house-terrace has been altered with the lawn removed for a flagstone patio (Figure 2.23). The medina stone pathways and stairs are extant.

**Topography**

Historically, and currently, in the front yard the property slopes at a one to three percent slope towards Elmwood Avenue, and three to five percent towards the southeastern property hedge. In the backyard, the house-terrace is approximately two feet above the relatively flat grade of the turf panel and garden. Towards the northeastern end of the property and in the semicircular terminus, stone retaining walls have created a three foot tall raised planting bed that extends northward to the edge of the property line.

**Vegetation**

A comprehensive plant list and plant order forms do not exist for this property. The overall arrangements of plant materials on the 1931 general plan do depict a less formal approach to the front yard with a formal symmetrical planting in the backyard. The plan proposed a U-shaped deciduous hedge that enclosed the front yard, with deciduous and evergreen trees dispersed throughout. The formal garden in the backyard was enclosed by evergreen hedges with three evenly-spaced black gums (*Nyssa sylvatica*) paralleling the hedges and framing the view of the semicircular terminus. Repeating the semicircular form, evergreens were used as a backdrop to the vista with other plant material continuing to the property edges. In the service yard, a large vegetable garden was proposed (it is unknown if the garden was ever used). Before construction of Steele's design in 1931, Mrs. Devine had formal rose beds (*Rosa* sp.) flanking a turf walkway lined with perennial/annual beds including iris (*Iris* sp.), petunias (*Petunia* sp.), columbines (*Aquilegia* sp.) and other flowering plants stretching from the house northeast ward.¹⁹ By August of 1936, the house-terrace locusts (*Robinia* sp.) were planted in an L-shaped pattern with American arborvitaes (*Thuja occidentalis*) and a variety of yews (*Taxus* sp.) or junipers (*Juniperus* sp.) planted at the base of the house. The semicircular dry laid stone retaining wall was completed in August and planted with “...sedum (*Sedum* sp.), saxifrage (*Saxifraga* sp.), thyme (*Thymus* sp.), and other foolproof rock-loving varieties.”²⁰ A row of

¹⁹ Photograph, September/October 1933, (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
arborvitaes (Thuja sp.) and yews (Taxus sp.) were planted lining the upper edge of the semi-circular rock wall. Three summers later in 1939, six black gums (Nyssa sylvatica) and the evergreen hedges consisted of yews (Taxus sp.) and American arborvitaes (Thuja occidentalis) bordered by a hedge of boxwoods (Buxus sp.) were planted.

The vegetation features in the existing front yard include three mature deciduous trees, a large oak (Quercus sp.), European beech (Fagus sylvatica) and tulip tree (Liriodendron tulipifera) shading a majority of the yard. The European beech is situated in a bed of pachysandra (Pachysandra terminalis) separated by flagstone steps from the northern rhododendron bed (Rhododendron sp.). A deciduous hedge and dense plantings of rhododendrons (Rhododendron sp.) define the eastern and western edges of the front yard. Foundation plantings include a boxwood hedge (Buxus sp.) along the median stone walkway and woody shrubs consisting of azaleas and rhododendrons (Rhododendron sp.) and Japanese andromeda (Pieris japonica). At some point after the house-terrace was altered and the locusts removed, date unknown, a small garden entrance was created on the southwest side of the house. The small garden in the house-terrace includes false cypress (Chamaecyparis obtusa), azaleas (Rhododendron sp.), Chinese junipers (Juniperus chinensis), Chinese witch hazel (Hamamelis mollis) and crabapple (Malus sp.). The evergreen planting beds along the house in the terrace have been removed and replaced with potted evergreens and annuals. Lining the base of the red brick retaining wall is a hedge row of boxwoods (Buxus sp.). Except the removal of the boxwood hedge, the evergreen hedges and planting beds lining the medina stone walkway and turf panel are extant. Of the six black gum trees planted, the last remaining tree is the middle tree on the east side of the turf panel. The semicircular terminus has been slightly altered. The rock loving plants have been removed and a row of hydrangea paralleling the semicircular stone wall has been added. The ring of American arborvitaes (Thuja occidentalis) and yews (Taxus sp.) lining the upper course of the wall remain. The former service yard has a large display of flowering plants compared to Steele's formal garden. A perennial garden including hostas (Hosta sp.), sedums (Sedum sp.) and black-eye susan (Rudbeckia hirta) lines the eastern edge of the space. Rhododendrons (Rhododendron sp.) and holly (Ilex sp.) line the western edge of the service yard and continue to the wooden pergola in the northeast corner of the property. The proposed badminton court site is an open space surrounded by pines (Pinus sp.), a mugo pine (Pinus mugo), and Chinese junipers (Juniperus chinensis) with a bird feeder in a bed of pine needles and mulch.
**Constructed Water Features**

Neither Steele's general plan for the Devine property, nor photographs taken from 1933 to 1939 indicate any water feature. The current owners have added a simple water feature with a urn that cascades water into a basin in the semicircular terminus.

**Small-Scale Landscape Features**

The 1931 general plan indicates a L-shaped walkway off the front porch leading to a rectangular terrace enclosed by a balustrade, which would never be built. In the back yard, the two feet tall house-terrace red brick retaining wall and pillars with medina stone stairs were implemented in 1936. The dry laid three feet tall rock retaining wall in the semicircular terminus was also completed at this time. The proposed set of stairs and grape arbors to either side of the rock retaining wall would never be built. In September 1936, Steele began to design a wrought iron and wood bench to fit between the red brick pillars along the edge of the house-terrace. By August of 1939, the benches, broad Medina stone walkways and stone edging were in place.

At an unknown date a geometric patterned white washed brick wall defining the eastern and southern edges of the small garden in the house-terrace was added to the garden. All of the brick work in the house-terrace space has been painted white, but the wrought iron and wood benches are extant. In the formal garden the dry laid stone retaining wall is extant. The current owners have added the garage and wooden pergola in the service yard.

**Condition of the Landscape**

The Devine garden is a good example of Steele’s work as an eclectic designer beginning to combine forms from the Beaux Arts and Modernist design idioms. For example the rectilinear back yard terminating in a semi-circular space, wrought iron and wood house-terrace benches and screened views of neighboring yards are characteristic of Steele’s design work during the 1930s. Although the Devine garden has been well maintained, the house-terrace has been altered from Steele’s original design intent. Even though a flagstone terrace was added and the locusts removed, the garden retains much of Steele’s initial design and is physically in good to fair condition.
Client #387 Mr. and Mrs. Adrian G. and Charlotte W. Devine

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-24: Photograph Album: Client 387 Wrought iron and wooden benches and house terrace.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 5, File 30- Folder 387 Seat Study and plan.

Photostatic Print Collection:


Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 9 (10 plates): plan, flower beds, terrace and retaining walls.
Figure 2.18: General Plan for estate of Adrian G. Devine Esq., December 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.19: Current site plan for the Mauro property, August 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.20: View of the house terrace, red brick retaining wall, medina stone stairs and 'awning' of locusts from the turf panel, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.21: View of the house terrace, painted red brick retaining wall, medina stone stairs and walkways and benches from the turf panel, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.22: Looking across the turf panel toward the semicircular terminus from the house terrace, August 1939 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.23: Looking northward across the house terrace towards the service garden, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owners: Mr. and Mrs. Allen and Susie Spencer
Client #390: Mrs. Raymond Bentley
125 Old Mill Road
Rochester, New York 14618

Site History

The Colonial revival residence was built in 1932 for Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Bentley. At the time
the Bentley family owned the majority of property along Old Mill Road. Mrs. Bentley lived at the family
estate until her death in 1975, when the property was subdivided and sold for single family residential
development. An adopted Bentley daughter purchased the residence in 1975 and lived at the property until
1985. In September of 1985, Mr. and Mrs. Allen and Susie Spencer purchased the property and are the
current homeowners.

Steele was hired in 1932 to create a terrace design for the Bentleys. A comprehensive design for
the property does not exist. The initial January 1934 proposal for a series of turf terraces on the lower south
terrace was never implemented. However, later that year in July of 1934, Steele began devising a plan for a
terrace spanning the length of the west side of the house including a series of stairways and retaining walls.
The west terrace plan was finalized in November of 1934 (Figure 2.24). By July of 1935, the turf and brick
terraces, balustrades and stone retaining walls were built. Between 1934 and 1936, plant orders were placed
for rock loving plants, seed packets, and various deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs. Also in 1936,
Steele began designing a fence for the forecourt (Figure 2.25). Although the proposed fence for the
forecourt was never implemented, in September and October of 1946, Steele ordered 600 “Type S Ogee
Headers” from the New England Brick Company.\footnote{21} The bricks may have been used for the current
forecourt fence or the stairway in the west terrace. Over the next twenty years, Steele continued to
correspond and order plant materials for Mrs. Bentley.

Historic/Existing Conditions

The current property is still approximately four and a half acres bordered to the west by Allens
Creek, and to the east by Old Mill Road. To the north and south of the property are single family
residences. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the second visit to the property
by the author in June 2003 (Figure 2.26).

\footnote{21} Fletcher Steele to New England Brick Company, 4 September 1946 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele
Archives).
Spatial Organization

Historically the landscape was composed of three primary spaces, the front yard and forecourt, side yard and south terrace and back yard including the west terrace and stream bank. In April 1934, the landscape was primarily lawn with a few newly planted evergreens in the front yard and mature elms in the back yard. Views of the residence from Old Mill Road and the surrounding agricultural landscape were uninterrupted. Steele’s 1934 plan for the west terrace introduced hardscape and planting elements giving spatial definition to the backyard by creating two long rectangular spaces, the west and south terraces. The west terrace was broken into two smaller rectangles, a red brick patio and a turf panel stretching towards the garage (Figure 2.27 and 2.28). A wooden balustrade enclosed the west terrace along the western and southern edges. Further defining the western property edge, Steele planted a massing of maples, birches, willows and evergreens along the stream bank. For privacy in the front yard he ordered fifteen firethorn (Pyracantha coccinea ‘Lalandei’) and in the backyard corner by the garage he ordered junipers, spruces, and viburnums. A tennis court was added in the north east corner of the front yard and a vegetable garden in the center of the front yard, dates unknown. The tennis court was then screened by beeches planted along Old Mill Road and the vegetable garden surrounded by thorn trees.\(^2\) In 1959 Mrs. Bentley wrote Steele “The neighbors’ swimming pool proved a far greater eye-sore this winter then I expected and I shall need one, probably two trees on the terrace in order to hide it.”\(^3\) A little leaf linden (Tilia cordata) was ordered to remedy the unsightly view, but was planted at the base of the balustrade and not in the terrace as Mrs. Bentley intended. By the 1960s, the property was enclosed by a dense massing of trees along the western and southern edges. The row of beeches along Old Mill Road and plantings associated with the vegetable garden filtered the views of the residence from Old Mill Road. Little is known of the spatial organization of the side yard and south terrace.

The spatial organization of the current property is very similar to the historic conditions. The vegetable garden and tennis court in the front yard are extant. A wide T-shaped asphalt driveway and parking area was added at an unknown date. An American arborvitae hedge to the north and mature evergreen and deciduous trees to the south enclose the front yard and block views of neighboring properties. A forecourt fence divides the front yard from the side yard and south terrace. The side yard is

\(^2\) Fletcher Steele to Mr. Painter, 24 August 1959 (Courtesy Mrs. Spencer).
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primarily lawn with a sloped planting bed to the south dividing the side yard from the south terrace. A long, thin rectangular span of lawn, the south terrace stretches the entire length of the southern side of the property. The retaining walls, balustrades, stairways and patios in the west terrace are extant (Figures 2.29). The stream bank plantings have matured and are encroaching on the terrace balustrade, but continue to block the views of the neighbor’s pool.

Circulation

The circulation system included a vehicular driveway and pedestrian circulation included stairs, terraces and walkways in the west terrace. The circulation patterns in the front yard and south terrace are unknown. An April 1934 photograph depicts a vehicular driveway loop in the side yard, material unknown. The 1934 west terrace plan illustrates a pedestrian walkway along the south side of the residence opening up to a rectangular red brick and medina stone patio. The rectangular red brick terrace was lined with medina stone in a running bond pattern in the walkway and entrance and a basket weave pattern in the central portion of the terrace. Medina stones turned on end form two treads leading down to the turf terrace. The turf terrace spanned the entire length of the residence connecting the existing walls and colonnade south of the garage to the red brick stairway leading down to the south terrace. A turf ramp at the north end of the terrace led to the stream bed and behind the retaining wall.

The current circulation pattern consists of a vehicular driveway and pedestrian pathways in the side yard, south terrace and west terrace. The wide T-shaped asphalt driveway enters the property west of the tennis court running parallel with the residence across the front yard from the garage to the forecourt. A red brick pedestrian pathway curves from the forecourt to the enclosed porch and the main entrance. Just south of a espalier crabapple, is a medina stone patio for viewing the south terrace. Dividing the sloping planting bed in the south terrace is a set of earth treads connecting the side yard to the south terrace. The red brick walkway, terrace and stairs in the west terrace are extant.

Topography

23 Mrs. Janet Bentley to Fletcher Steele, 8 April 1959 (Courtesy Mrs. Spencer).
Photographs taken in April of 1934 indicate the side and front yard was relatively flat, sloping at three to five percent and gradually increasing to ten to fifteen percent south of the residence. The back yard gradually sloped away from the residence for thirty feet at three to five percent and then steeply down hill towards Allens Creek. After the terraces were installed along the west side of the residence in 1935, the backyard became relatively flat for thirty feet due to the construction of a five foot stone retaining wall. The stream banks still sloped steeply away from the bottom of the terrace. Little information is known concerning the topography of the front and side yard after Steele’s involvement.

The topography of the current landscape in the backyard is extant. The front yard slopes from Old Mill Road towards the residence at a one to three percent slope. The northeastern portion of the front yard is relatively flat for the tennis court. The side yard is relatively flat sloping slightly away from the house and at a three to five percent slope at the south terrace planting beds.

**Vegetation**

Before Steele finalized his 1934 plan, he had ordered a purple beech (*Fagus sylvatica* ‘Purpurea’) and two Sargent cherries (*Prunus sargentii*) for the landscape in 1933. Once the west terrace was installed in 1935, his primary focus was planting the south end rock wall. In October of 1934, Steele placed plant orders for upright, drooping and crevice rock loving plants. Upright plants included rock aster (*Aster alpinus*), Carpathian bellflower (*Campanula carpatica*), harebell (*Campanula garganica*), sand pink (*Dianthus arenarius*), coralbells (*Heuchera sanguinea* ‘Pluie du Fue’) and Tibet poppy (*Papaver thibetica*). Perennials with drooping habits included goldentuft (*Aurinia saxatilis* originally *Alyssum saxatile* ‘Compactum’), creeping baby’s-breath (*Gypsophila repens*), evergreen candytuft (*Iberis sempervirens*), and two varieties of wallcress (*Arabia* sp.), three varieties of thyme (*Thymus* sp.), three varieties of phlox (*Phlox* sp.) and three varieties of sedum (*Sedum* sp.). Tufts or crevice plants included pale goldentuft (*Aurinia saxatilis* originally *Alyssum saxatile* ‘Citrinum’), moss sandwort (* Arenaria verna caespitosa*) and trailing cup flower (*Nierembergia rivularia*). Between the south rock wall and the terrace balustrade is a thin rectangular planting bed. Over the years this small space became a constant subject of conversation.

---

24 Fletcher Steele to Amawalk Nurseries, Inc. 6 October 1933 and Fletcher Steele to Bay State Nurseries, 10 May 1933 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
and change. Originally, in April 1935, thirteen rock cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*) were planted with clematis added in April 1936 along the south end terrace balustrade (*Clematis montana undulata*).\(^{26}\) In 1946 the space became affectionately known as the fragrant corner and was planted with Jupiter’s beard (*Centranthus ruber*), northern bedstraw (*Galium boreale*), daylilies (*Hemerocalis flava*), musk-mallow (*Malva moschata*), sweet-briar (*Rosa rubiginosa*) and primrose (*Oenothera speciosa*).\(^{27}\) In May 1958, the fragrant corner underwent a replanting with seven broom shrubs (*Cytisus nigricans*) ordered, one extra in case something happened to one of them.\(^{28}\) Finally in 1962 after a conference with Mrs. Bentley, two peonies, one white, one pink were to be planted in the south end over the planted wall.\(^{29}\) In addition to the south end terrace bed, Steele focused on three other specific planting spaces, the stream bank, hedge along street and corner by garage. The stream bank located below the west terrace was heavily planted with red maple (*Acer rubrum*), yellow birch (*Betula lutea*), red pine (*Pinus resinosa*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), Thurlow weeping willow (*Salix elegantissima*), golden willow (*Salix alba ‘vitellina’*) and Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*).\(^{30}\) For the hedge along Old Mill Road in the front yard, Steele ordered fifteen firethorn (*Pyracantha coccinea ‘Lalandei’*). Plants ordered for the corner by the garage included deutzia (*Deutzia lemoinei ‘avalanche’*), fragrant viburnum (*Viburnum carlesii*), Tamarix savia juniper (*Juniperus rubina ‘tamariscifolia’*), Engelmann spruce (*Picea engelmanni*), mugo pine (*Pinus mugo*) and dwarf winged euonymus (*Euonymus alatus ‘compacta’*). Through out the late 1940s and early 1950s Steele continued to order a variety of plant materials for the Bentley property including cotoneaster, roses, crabapples and a magnolia tree. After Mrs. Bentley complained of a neighbor’s swimming pool, a ten to twelve feet tall little leaf linden (*Tilia cordata*) was planted and a Sargent crabapple (*Malus sargentii*) was added outside the kitchen window to be trained against the wall as espalier.\(^{31}\) Throughout the 1960s, Steele continued to order plants and seed packets for the property. In an office memorandum, Steele points out some of the last changes made to the property:

---

\(^{25}\) Fletcher Steele to N. A. Hallauer, 31 October 1934 and Fletcher Steele to The Wayside Gardens Co., 31 October 1934 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).

\(^{26}\) Fletcher Steele to Henry Kohankie & Son, 30 April 1935 and Fletcher Steele to James I. George & Son, 8 April 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).

\(^{27}\) Fletcher Steele to Henry Kohankie & Son, 3 June 1946 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).

\(^{28}\) Fletcher Steele to Mrs. Raymond Bentley, 26 May 1958 (Courtesy Mrs. Spencer).

\(^{29}\) Office memorandum, 27 March 1962 (Rochester Historical Society).

\(^{30}\) Fletcher Steele to Henry Kohankie & Son, 24 April 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).

\(^{31}\) Fletcher Steele to Edward H. Scanlon & Associates, 21 April 1959 (Courtesy Mrs. Spencer).
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Suggested forty-eight primroses - Ellen Carder - for ground cover under Amur maple (Acer ginnala). Get these. Plant vinca on north side. No red or magenta. Get two white Daphne mezere on alba for bed north of door (front). Next to the tennis court plant a few low bushes. See about Corliss’ bushy Euonymus. 32

Although many new plant materials have been added to the property, some of the original plantings are extant. In the west terrace, white and pink peonies continue to bloom in the south end planting bed. A flowering dogwood (Cornus florida) has been added in the southwest corner adjacent to the red brick stairway. The rock-loving plants have been removed from the rock wall and the stream bed plantings have been allowed to spread and dominate the stone wall and balustrade along the western edge of the turf terrace (Figure 4.88). A large black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia) dominates the planting bed adjacent to the rock wall with under story plantings including daylilies (Hemerocallis sp.), ferns and azaleas and rhododendrons (Rhododendron sp.) (Figure 2.30). The Amur maple (Acer ginnala) is extant, but the primroses have been replace with a variety of azaleas and rhododendrons (Rhododendron sp.), dwarf spruces (Picea sp.), mugo pines (Pinus mugo) and peonies (Paeonia sp.) in the planting bed north of the south terrace. Against a backdrop of densely planted woods, two specimen trees an Oyama magnolia (Magnolia sieboldii) and a cherry tree (Prunus sp.) stand out in the south terrace space. The espalier Sargent crabapple outside the kitchen window is the only known extant feature in the side yard. A holly (Ilex sp.), azalea (Rhododendron sp.) and witch-hazel (Hamamelis sp.) are planted along the foundation with the rest of the yard primarily grass except for a single pine tree (Pinus sp.) in a kidney-bean-shaped bed of mulch. The side yard is edged by a dense planting of pines and rhododendrons stretching to the tennis court in the front yard. In the forecourt, perennial beds have been added along either side of the forecourt fence with a raised planter including a pine tree and cotoneaster anchoring the northeast corner of the residence. The row of beech trees pruned in the 1950s remains while two rows of Austrian pines (Pinus nigra) flanking the driveway entrance have been added to the front yard. Cherry and apple trees and a rose hedge surround the fenced in square vegetable garden. A rose of American arborvitaes (Thuja occidentalis) line the western boundary of the front yard.

*Constructed Water Features*

In fall of 1966, Steele billed Mrs. Bentley for visits to the property, out of pocket expenses and in office work including “Listing and ordering plants, Lead edging for fountain, Iron plant for fountain, etc.”. 33 In January of 1966, Steele again billed Mrs. Bentley for visits to the property and in office expenses including “Fountain details, plant details and orders for $118.75.” 34 Although Mrs. Bentley was billed for drawings concerning a fountain with lead edging and iron plants, there is no reference to the fountain ever being built. Currently, there is no constructed water feature on the property.

**Small-Scale Features**

The 1934 west terrace plan illustrates a wood balustrade running along the edge of the terrace enclosing the space. The wood balustrade was between two and three feet tall and tied into two existing stone walls and the colonnade south of the garage. In the side yard Steele proposed a forecourt fence and formal entry to the side yard. It is unknown if the fence was ever implemented.

All of the small scale features that were built in 1935 for the west terrace are extant. A wood forecourt fence continues to divide the driveway from the side yard, but is unknown when the fence was constructed.

**Condition of the Landscape**

Fletcher Steele continued to work with the Bentleys for over thirty years creating an intricate terrace system taking advantage of the views to Allens Creek. It is during the mid-1930s that Steele began utilizing curvilinear walls and other landscape features/materials that he had not used previously in his garden designs. The curvilinear/serpentine wall system would eventually become a reoccurring component in his later landscape designs. The overall integrity of the west terrace has been preserved although the wood balustrade and stone/brick terrace are in need of repair. Even though the stream bank plantings have encroached on the west terrace and many of the original plantings have been replaced, the site is physically in good to fair condition.

33 Fletcher Steele to Mrs. Raymond Bentley, 28 September 1966 (Rochester Historical Society).
34 Fletcher Steele to Mrs. Raymond Bentley, 6 January 1967 (Rochester Historical Society).
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This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-24: Photograph Album: Client 390 Photos of garden and residence

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 3, File 27- Folder 390 Topography plan, sketches, horseshoe latch and elevations.

Photostatic Print Collection:


Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.24: Plan for the West Terrace, November 1934 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.25: Study of Forecourt, September 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.26: Existing site plan for Spencer property, June 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.27: Paved rectangular terrace and planting bed at south end of west terrace, July 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photographic Collection).

Figure 2.28: View of the turf terrace and wooden fence towards the garage, July 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photographic Collection).
Figure 2.29: View of the current turf panel and wood fencing, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.30: View of the rock wall and sloped planting bed from the south terrace, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
 CURRENT OWNER: MR. AND MRS. DAVID SWINFORD
ORIGINAl CLIENT #468 MR. AND MRS. HOMER AND MARGARET WOODBURY STRONG
700 ALLENS CREEK ROAD
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14618

SITE HISTORY

Alvah Griffith Strong (grandson of Col. Henry Alvah Strong, cofounder of Kodak) built the fourteen bedroom, 14,000 square feet Norman French styled mansion in 1925. Located on sixty-five acres, Alvah Strong initially named the property “Twin Beeches”, but after Homer and Margaret Strong purchased the property in February 1937, Homer renamed it “Tuckaway Farm”.34 Homer Strong was Chairman/President of the Movette Camera Company, organized in Rochester in 1916.35 His wife Margaret Woodbury Strong was a descendent of the Mosley-Motley flour-milling family and acquired part of her wealth from that inheritance.36 Homer and Margaret Strong lived at the property until her death in 1969 at age 72. After her death, Margaret Woodbury Strong willed her mansion to remain a museum and left $60 million for its care and expansion. In the late 1970s, the Strong estate trustees decided to build the Strong museum downtown rather than keeping the museum in a residential setting and placed the mansion and its current forty-eight acres for sale in 1981. In 1983, Theodore A. Miller purchased the property and later sold off forty-five acres to two local developers who subdivided the land for condominiums.37 In October 1990, a subsidiary of Chase Lincoln First Bank purchased the mansion in a foreclosure sale and in turn sold the property to Dr. and Mrs. Salatino in December 1990. After putting several hundred thousand dollars into restoration and renovation of the mansion, the Salatinos placed the mansion back on the market in 1993. For the next six years, the property was owned by David Hanel and Joseph Sirianni. In November 1999, The Pittsford Zoning Board of Appeals approved splitting the mansion into four condos, however due to economic hardship the property was sold in 2001 to current owners Mr. and Mrs. David Swinford.

Steele was engaged c.1940 to design the east and west gardens. A comprehensive site plan for the property does not exist, but a perspective sketch (Figure 2.31) and a sketch elevation (Figure 2.32) display

34 Carol Sandler, email correspondence, 4 November 2003.
36 Margaret Woodbury Strong, the only daughter of wealthy parents who traveled extensively, acquired the family's taste for collecting at an early age. She was planning to build a history museum to hold her unique collection of at least 300,000 items when she died in 1969 at age 72. The Strong Museum opened in 1982 in downtown Rochester. Ben Dobbin, "Checkers and alphabet blocks join Toy Hall of Fame", The JournalNews.com, 16 November 2003.
37 Judith Evans, "Old Strong estate is a mansion of debt; auction today", Democrat and Chronicle, 11 October 1990.
Steele's design intent. The perspective sketch illustrates how the proposed paths and hedges would all meet at the base of the house terrace. The sketch elevation shows the proposed design for the west wing wall including two openings in the wall for access to the garden from the north. A photograph taken in April of 1941 illustrates the east wing wall under construction. For the Garden Club of America's annual meeting Steele describes the work underway at the Strong estate:

The house of Norman French design is situated well up on a hill on the edge of a beechwood forest. From the upper house terrace the view spreads out across rolling lawns and is bordered on the west and north by a winding creek. Care has been taken to preserve the natural beauties of the woods, and acres of trillium, violets, ginger root, and other wild flora make a succession of woodland splendor for many weeks. Work is now in progress on walled terraced gardens on either side of the house. The garden on the east lies all on one level. Here the serpentine walls with their raised flower beds are a joy to the flower gatherer. The west gardens are still in the process of development. The plant material used on the grounds is largely grown in the nurseries on the estate. 36

It is unknown if Steele continued to work with the Strongs after the completion of the east and west gardens.

Historic/Existing Conditions

The initial property was sixty-five acres stretching between Allens Creek to the north and west and forested woods to the east. The current property is approximately three acres situated on a hill side with condominiums to the north, south and east of the property. A small portion of the original beech woods forest remains at the eastern edge of the property. At some point after 1950 a structure was built in the west garden to house Margaret Strong's collections replacing Steele's west garden design. An existing conditions plan was created during the initial visit to the property by the author in September 2003 (Figure 2.33).

Spatial Organization

There are four primary spaces to the property, the north, east and west gardens and south entrance space and yard. The north garden was designed for Alvah Strong in September 1927 by the Brown Bros Company and the south entrance space and yard are not associated with a particular designer. Of these four spaces, the east and west gardens will be discussed in further detail. Originally built with the mansion, the raised house terrace on the north side of the mansion with double staircases encloses the indoor swimming pool and separates the east and west gardens (Figure 2.34). From the raised house terrace views were

oriented northward towards the low lying agricultural and meadowlands surrounded by woodlands and the large rectangular formal garden. In addition to the northern views, from the house terrace there were birds eye views of the east and west gardens. From the east and west gardens, views of the northern agricultural landscape were screened by a tall dense hedge of Norway spruces (Picea abies) and a seven to eight foot tall cinder block wing walls extending from the base of the raised house terrace. The east garden was further enclosed by a forested area to the east, the raised house terrace to the west and serpentine retaining walls to the south. The west garden was further defined by the raised house terrace to the east, but little is known concerning the treatment of the western and southern edges.

Since the subdivision of the property and subsequent development in the 1980s and 1990s, the remaining three acres immediately surrounding the mansion has been unaltered. The once picturesque views from the raised house terrace now look out over a sea of condominiums and a small remaining portion of the rectangular formal garden. Views from the east and west gardens of the northern agriculture landscape continue to be blocked by the Norway spruce hedge and cinder block walls. The spatial organization of the east garden is extant (Figure 2.35). The structure in the west garden has since been removed with views of the garden open to the access road to the west. The space continues to be defined by the raised house terrace to the east, cinder block walls to the north and a stone retaining wall further upslope along the southern edge.

*Circulation*

Although Steele’s proposed perspective sketch and sketch elevation suggested a hardscape platform with pedestrian paths, it is unknown if these were ever built. However, photographs of the east garden taken in c.1942 depict a meandering red brick walkway following the form of the serpentine cinder block retaining wall. Originating at the eastern end of the garden, the red brick walkway continued from a four feet wide red brick staircase into the curvilinear alcove for the fountain. Following the serpentine wall, the walkway then connected to a five step red brick staircase along the serpentine wall. The walkway then expanded into a small curvilinear terrace space adjacent to the raised house terrace and terminated at the two foot wide staircase leading northward through a small arched opening in the stucco faced cinder block wing wall. The circulation system in the west garden is unknown.
The circulation system in the east garden in extant. In the west garden, there is no organized circulation system except for an opening in the stucco faced cinder block wing wall leading to a grass pathway running along the north side of the west and east wing walls.

**Topography**

Historically and currently the highest point of the property is the raised house terrace. In the west garden, the topography gradually slopes downward from the southern stone retaining wall and mansion at a ten percent slope to the base of the stucco faced cinder block wing wall. Retaining walls and sets of stairways create level landings and open spaces in the east garden. North of the east and west gardens the property gradually slopes towards the condominiums at three percent.

**Vegetation**

A historic planting plan for the property has not been located; however c.1942 photographs depict the plantings used in the east garden (Figure 2.36). A hedge row of boxwood (*Buxus* sp.) lined the edge of the turf panel while a variety of annuals were planted in the serpentine wall raised planting bed. In addition Steele describes the property and plant materials in the Garden Club of America’s annual meeting bulletin in May 1941. Plant materials including the Norway spruce hedge (*Picea abies*) and other evergreens may have been planted by Steele because of their location, current size and maturity.

Other than a few large deciduous trees along the southern stone retaining wall in the west garden, the remainder of the garden is planted with grass. Paralleling the northern side of the west and east garden’s stucco faced cinder block wing walls is a mature dense hedge of Norway spruces (*Picea abies*). At the base of the raised house terrace north of the double staircases are two small patches of pachysandra (*Pachysandra terminalis*) extending into the grass. The central turf panel in the east garden is extant, but the boxwood hedge has been removed. The turf panel is edged to the north by a green barberry hedge (*Berberis* sp.) with junipers (*Juniperus* sp.) and Japanese yews (*Taxus cuspidata*) planted at the base of the wing wall statuary. In the raised planting bed along the serpentine retaining wall are impatiens (*Impatiens wallerana*) and small ornamental evergreens dispersed throughout the bed. A small mass of hemlocks (*Tsuga* sp.) are located along the southern side of the serpentine wall.
**Constructed Water Features**

Although the current property has three constructed water features, the only water feature designed by Steele is located in the east garden. The east garden water feature consisted of a turquoise glazed terra cotta wall mounted fish and basin. The water spouting from the fish’s mouth drops into the basin and finally pours into a semicircular stone basin on the ground (see Figure 2.36). The water feature was extant, but not operating during the initial visit to the property.

**Small-Scale Landscape Features**

Illustrated in Steele’s 1941 photograph of the east wing wall, the northern edges of the east and west gardens were defined by a seven to eight feet tall cinder block wall with raised sections for decorative statuary or urns (see Figures 2.31, 2.32 and 2.37). In the east garden wing wall, a small two to three foot arched opening near the raised house terrace allowed access to the garden with a second staircase at the far eastern end terminated the wall section. Also in the east garden were two stone benches, one at either end and a table with decorative legs mounted to the southern retaining wall. A pair of bronze geese was centrally located in the turf panel, off setting the pair of decorative urns adjacent to the water feature. Flanking the southern stairs were a pair of cast stone urns with flower arrangements (see Figure 2.36). The western wing wall was also built with an opening in the wall for access to the space. The west wing wall was not built exactly as Steele had proposed in his sketch elevation of the west wing wall. The proposed gateway entrance, staircase and hardscape platform at the base of the raised house terrace were never implemented.

The current property includes extant retaining walls, statuary, benches and other small scale features. The west and east garden stucco faced cinder block wing walls are extant (Figure 2.38 and 2.39). Atop each wall are four to five white washed stone statues of females.

**Condition of the Property**

The work Steele created for the Strongs during the 1940s is an excellent example of his use of serpentine forms, hedges and small scale features such as urns. Although the east garden is a small component of the overall landscape, the property as a whole is significant to Rochester’s heritage. Physically, many of the property’s landscape and hardscape features are in need of maintenance and repair, but in general the east garden is in good to fair condition.
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 2.31: Perspective sketch of the platform at the foot of the raised house terrace looking toward the west garden, c.1938 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.32: Sketch elevation of west wing wall detail for the west garden, c. 1938 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.33: Current site plan for the Swinford property, September 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.34: Looking southward toward the raised house terrace with double staircases and entrance to the indoor swimming pool. There is no direct access from the house terrace to either the east or west gardens, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.35: Looking westward across the turf panel in the east garden toward the raised house terrace, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.36: View of the East Garden, serpentine walls and fish fountain from the house terrace, c.1942 (Margaret Woodbury Strong Museum Library, Personal Papers of Margaret Woodbury Strong).

Figure 2.37: Construction of the east wing wall at the Strong residence, April 1941 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.38: Looking northward across the west garden towards the west wing wall, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.39: Looking down at the east garden from the raised house terrace, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Site History

The current owner believes that, “Lot #35 in the Houston Barnard subdivision was incorporated in March 1923 and purchased by Mrs. Bettes Colfax Townsend in May 1945.”39 The two story colonial style residence was built in 1951 by Mr. and Mrs. Harold C. and Bettes Townsend. Mrs. Townsend died in March 1970 and Mr. Townsend died in July 1971. In November 1971 the Townsend’s son, Schuyler, sold the property to Mr. and Mrs. Jack D. Harby who sold the property to Mr. and Mrs. Robert A. Hawkins in October 1977. Mr. and Mrs. John Parke purchased the property in August 1979 and are the current property owners.

Steele was hired in 1955 to design a small walled-in backyard garden for the Townsens. Initial design work began in October 1955, the plan for the grounds was adjusted in February 1956. The February 1956 plan documented existing vegetation and small-scale landscape features that were to remain or be removed for new garden construction (Figure 2.40). In April of 1956, materials such as three-inch treated pine posts were ordered. Additional orders through November 1956 include a ton of #2 rose coral, 110 large and small sweet box plants (Sarcococca hookeriana var. humilis) and twenty feet of a lead pattern. The March 1957 planting plan shows the proposed garden layout with curvilinear retaining walls, stairs and fountain area (Figure 2.41). Although the planting plan does not include existing vegetation features, it does show the proposed plantings for the garden. There are no available historic photographs of the garden.

Historic/Existing Conditions

Historically and currently the property is approximately .35 acres situated on the south side of Ambassador Drive. Located to the east, south and across the street to the north of the property are single family residences. The lot west of the property is vacant. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the property in July 2003 (Figure 2.42).

39 John Parke to Author, email correspondence, 15 March 2004.
Spatial Organization

The landscape was composed of two primary spaces, the front yard and backyard. Steele’s involvement with the property was limited to the western half of the backyard. The layout of the small rectangular suburban garden was initially created by screening the neighboring houses through the use of a stucco-faced cinder block wall along the eastern and southern edges. Along the inside base of the walls were planting beds and red brick retaining walls. In the center of the garden was a turf panel. Views form the rose coral gravel terrace, square terrace and fountain terrace were directed towards the large white pine (Pinus strobus) and small wall mounted water fountain.

The current spatial organization of the garden has been slightly altered from Steele’s initial design. The large white pine has been removed and replaced with a weeping Japanese maple (Acer palmatum). The stucco-faced cinder block walls remain and contain the views within the garden proper. Views from the three garden terraces are uninterrupted and open to the sky.

Circulation Systems

The circulation system in the March 1957 planting plan includes multiple terraces and two sets of stairs. In the northeast corner of the garden is the rose coral gravel terrace. The triangular shaped terrace arcs northward from the circular Katsura tree planting bed to the low red brick wall surrounding the northwest terrace. The northwest terrace was a semi-square shaped space enclosed by a low red brick wall to the south and east and a stucco faced cinder block privacy wall to the west and north. The original material of the northwest terrace is unknown. A seven foot wide opening in the low red brick wall allows for a step leading from the terrace down to the turf panel. There is no defined path connecting the rose coral gravel terrace and northwestern terrace to the southeast corner fountain terrace. The triangular shaped fountain terrace, material unknown, arcs southward from the circular Katsura tree planting bed to the western side of the fountain terminating at the terraced planters filled with saxifrage, astible and Hungarian speedwell plants. A second set of stairs between the proposed terraced planters and the red brick circular white pine planting bed lead up to a small rectangular terrace.

The property’s circulation system is intact. During the period 1980 to 1983, the Parkes replaced many of the terrace surface materials. The rose coral gravel terrace was replaced with red brick (Figure
The property's circulation system is intact. During the period 1980 to 1983, the Parkes replaced many of the terrace surface materials. The rose coral gravel terrace was replaced with red brick (Figure 2.43). The northwest terrace was resurfaced with bluestone and a bluestone capped step and landing leading towards the turf panel (Figure 2.44). The fountain terrace and stairs were also replaced with red brick (Figure 2.45). The proposed terraced planters were never implemented. Instead, the red brick stairs continue along the base of the water fountain and turn at 90 degrees to terminate at the circular planted bed with the Japanese maple (Figure 2.46).  

Topography

Historically, and currently, the topography of the garden slopes away from the residence towards a circular drain inlet in the southwest corner of the turf panel. The northeast and northwest terraces are relatively level and approximately six inches above the turf panel. The turf panel slopes at a three to five percent slope from the terraces down to the southwest corner. This is the lowest point in the garden. The level fountain terrace is situated two and a half feet above the grade of the drain inlet.

Vegetation Features

The February 1956 adjustment plan for the grounds shows existing vegetation and the March 1957 planting plan includes the proposed plant materials for the small garden. Existing vegetation that remained in the proposed garden development included a large Katsura tree (Cercidiphyllum japonicum) in the eastern planting bed between the rose coral gravel and fountain terrace. "A large, existing white pine (Pinus strobus) opposite the Katsura tree was used as a structural focal point in a four-season scheme that reached its height of bloom in spring with pink dogwood (Cornus sp.) and rhododendron (Rhododendron sp.) blossoms." Other existing plant materials included a yew hedge (Taxus sp.) in the northwestern corner of the garden and viburnums (Viburnum sp.), birch (Betula sp.) and crabapple (Malus sp.). Plant materials proposed in the March 1957 planting plan included a variety of woody shrubs and herbaceous ornamental plants. The proposed woody shrubs included six Japanese andromeda (Pieris japonica),

---

40 Ibid.
fourteen Oregon grapeholly (*Mahonia aquifolium*), three leucothoe (*Leucothoe catesbaei*) and fifteen roses (*Rosa foliosa*). English ivy (*Hedera helix* 'Green Ripples') was used as a groundcover throughout the western planting bed. Over a dozen coral bells (*Heuchera* var. Plui de feu) and a dozen hosta (*Hosta fortunei viridis marginata*) were planted to either side of the southeast entrance to the garden. West of the fountain in the terraced planters were twenty proposed saxifrage (*Saxifraga deaipiens*), twenty astilbe (*Astilbe “Deyade”*) and twenty Hungarian speedwell plants (*Veronica austriaca* var. *trehane*). Bordering the western red brick retaining wall were a row of alternating herbaceous plants including lavender cotton (*Santolina chamaecyparissus*), and two varieties of false rock cress (*Aubrieta deltoidea* var. *whitewell gem* and *lavandar*). Annual fountain grass (*Pennisetum setacecum*) was planted as a backdrop to the lavender cotton and false rock cress. The planting beds along the gravel terrace were planted with candytuft (*Iberis sempervirans* var.* Christmas Snow*), common lavender (*Lavandula vera Dutch*) and a variety of other herbaceous plants. Proposed plant materials are unknown for the square terrace.

Between 1980 and 1983, the Parkes replaced most of the original plantings in the walled garden because the garden had become overgrown. The large Katsuratree in the eastern planting bed is extant, but the white pine was removed at an unknown date and replaced with a weeping Japanese maple (*Acer palmatum* 'pendula'). A large mature maple (*Acer sp.*) in the bluestone terrace dominates the space.

Woody shrubs consist of Japanese andromeda (*Pieris japonica*), boxwood (*Buxus sp.*), rhododendrons and azaleas (*Rhododendron sp.*), horizontal junipers (*Juniperus horizontalis*), lilac (*Syringa sp.*) and holly (*Ilex sp.*). English ivy stills covers much of the western planting bed with yew hedge (*Taxus sp.*) spanning the full length of the bed. Herbaceous plants materials include hosta (*Hosta sp.*), astilbe (*Astilbe sp.*), lily of the valley (*Convallaria majalis*), lamb’s ear (*Stachys byzantium*) and a variety of annuals including begonias and impatiens.

**Constructed Water Features**

Along the south wall in the February 1956 adjustment plan, Steele proposed an eight foot wide by three to four foot long, seventeen- inch deep rectangular stone basin for the small relief water fountain. The fountain basin was edged with an intricate lead vine and grape pattern.

---

42 John Parke to Author, email correspondence, 15 March 2004.
The original fountain configuration and materials used are extant. The current fountain is a three-tiered copper shell shaped basin system. Mounted to the stucco covered cinder block wall, the water begins to fall from the seahorses into the two shell shaped basins and eventually spilling into the rectangular basin.

Small-Scale Features

Defining the perimeter of the rectangular garden is a six foot tall stucco covered cinder block wall capped with stone. Defining the interior turf panel are red brick retaining walls ranging from two to four feet tall.

The interior and perimeter walls are extant. Lawn furniture, clay pots and hanging baskets adorn the garden terraces. A decorative wrought iron gate was added at an unknown date to the western entrance to the garden.

Condition of the Garden

The Townson garden was typical of many of Steele’s post-World War II designs when there was a desire for low maintenance and an increasing casual atmosphere. The visually creative and interesting garden including the aquatic theme and shell-basin-tiered fountain, red brick retaining walls, terraces and central turf panel are consistent with many of Steele’s other Rochester area gardens. Although many of the original plant materials and rose coral gravel terrace were removed and replaced with alternative materials the garden’s integrity remains. The overall physical condition of the garden is in good to fair.
Client # 632 Mr. and Mrs. Harold C. Townson
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Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Drawing Collection:

   Flat File: Drawer 3: File 38- Folder 632 Three drawings for the garden, two plans.

   Loose Drawing: 632-7: Planting plan March 26, 1957.

Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.40: Adjustment plan for the grounds, February 1956 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.41: Planting Plan for the Townsend garden, March 26, 1957 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.42: Current Site Plan for the Parke garden, July 16 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.43: View of the triangular rose coral gravel terrace replaced with red brick in early 1980s, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.44: View of the square bluestone terrace and red brick seating walls, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.45: View of the triangular fountain terrace and small relief tiered fountain, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.46: View of the small rectangular terrace between the southern planting bed and circular red brick planter, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Mr. and Mrs. David and Mary Khalil  
Client #657: Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Calihan  
780 Allens Creek Road  
Rochester, New York 14618

Site History

The Colonial style residence was built in 1934. Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Calihan moved into the residence some time before 1960. Shortly before 1970, Mr. and Mrs. Calihan divorced and sold the property to Dr. and Mrs. Donald and Marjorie Grinols. During the next 33 years, the Grinols made no significant changes to the residence other than replacing plant materials as needed. In the winter of 2003, the current owners, Mr. and Mrs. David and Mary Khalil purchased the property.

Before Fletcher Steele was hired, the Calihans hired landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn c.1962 to design a driveway, components of the front yard, and create a conceptual design for the back yard.43 For one reason or another, the Calihans decided to hire Steele to create a landscape design for the property. By August 1964, Steele had created a number of drawings for the property including planting plans for the herb garden, terrace and garden gate spaces (Figure 2.47). In October of 1964 Steele placed orders for 12 tons of Hyper-Humus topsoil and in November had begun preparation for planting beds, roto-tilling and grading. From August to October of 1965 spring planting had been completed with, planning and construction of the Herb Garden, Children’s Circle and Garden Gate were commencing and plant orders for autumn of 1965 and spring 1966 were placed.44 A revised layout plan dated October 1968, shows the completion of the back yard with the design of the driveway still to be finalized (Figure 2.48). Through January of 1969, Steele had made many visits for conferences, finalizing the selection of herbs and perennials, Japanese pagoda trees (Sophora japonica) and his revisions to the driveway.45

Historic/ Existing Conditions

Historically and currently the site is approximately .6 acres situated on the northern side of Allens Creek Road. The property is surrounded to the north and west by the Country Club of Rochester. To the east the property is bordered by a single family residential property. Along the southern side of Allens Creek Road

43 R. B. Nelson Co. to Katherine W. Rahn, 21 June 1962 (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University).
44 Fletcher Steele to Dr. Robert C. Calihan, 13 October 1965 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
45 Fletcher Steele to Dr. Robert C. Calihan, 11 January 1969 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
are single family residential properties. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the second visit to the property by the author in August 2003 (Figure 2.49).

Spatial Organization

The 1968 revised plan illustrates that the property was composed of two primary spaces, the front yard and the back yard including the children’s circle, herb garden, symmetrical garden, terrace and garden gate. The front yard was primarily planted with grass and views open to the sky and Allens Creek Road. Vertical elements are suggested, dividing the lawn from the pedestrian circulation system and foundation plantings. From the triangular shaped back yard there were clear westerly views of the Country Club of Rochester. Northern views of the golf course were screened due to a pine grove along the northern edge of the back yard. A six to seven foot red brick wall extending from the garden gate space along the eastern edge provided a sense of privacy and directed views towards the herb garden and symmetrical garden. The children’s circle consisted of red brick on the ground plane and six Japanese pagoda trees (*Sophora japonica*) surrounding the space (Figure 2.50). The trees filtered the sunlight and the views towards the golf course. The herb garden had a stone pebble base with low lying terra cotta planting beds. The symmetrical garden had a rectangular turf panel, two linear planting beds and two red brick seating walls defining the space. The red brick terrace with sunken planting beds was surrounded by a red brick seating wall to the north, west and a six to seven feet privacy wall to the east. The garden gate space was enclosed by a wooden colonnade to the north, red brick and wood walls to the east and south and the house to the west. The ground plane was primarily red brick with a planting bed in a fleur-de-lis pattern. This was the formal entrance to the back yard from the front yard.

The current spatial organization of the property is very similar to Steele’s 1968 layout plan with all of the primary and sub spaces extant except for minor changes to the front yard and plant materials. The front yard is enclosed by a three feet tall white picketed fence along the edge of Allens Creek Road. The asphalt driveway splits the space in half with a large lawn to the west of the drive and foundation plantings framing the porch entrance to the east. A large deciduous wooded area to the west and east screen the views from the golf course and neighboring property. Framing the views to the porch from the road are two crabapples (*Malus sp.*) and a wooden post and chain link rope system extending towards the drive and to the east. The triangular shaped back yard has retained much of its original character and spatial organization. The views towards the
Country Club of Rochester are more obscured as new evergreen plant materials have been added and matured. The vertical elements of the pine grove and red brick wall covered with climbing hydrangea (*Hydrangea anomala* sp.) continue to direct views toward the planting areas. In the children’s circle, four of the six Japanese pagoda trees remain, but many of the terra cotta planters have been removed from the herb garden (Figure 2.51). A few planters remain along the eastern red brick seating wall in their original geometric configuration. Even though many of the original plant materials have been replaced, the original spatial organization of the symmetrical garden has been maintained. The mature plant materials in the terrace have obstructed the once clear views of the golf course. Although the garden gate entrance has been sealed off, and the entrance to the back yard is through the garage or through the children’s circle, the fleur-de-lis pattern and red brick remain intact.

*Circulation Systems*

The circulation system in the 1968 layout plan included a front walkway and porch landing, walkways along the eastern and northern sides of the residence, terrace and a vehicular driveway. The red brick front walkway and porch landing in a basket-weave pattern ran parallel with the residence and connected the driveway to the front porch. Although the walkway was proposed to continue eastward and turn the eastern corner of the residence to connect to the garden gate, historic photographs do not depict a walkway only lawn. The red brick walkway along the northern side of the residence ran adjacent to the house and connected the children’s circle to the garden gate space. The exact placement and organization of the driveway was not finalized on the layout plan. The original layout shows the driveway having a central median with the garage off to the right of the drive. A sketch over the plan shows that another possible organization was for the driveway to be a double lane drive curving to the right to pull directly into the garage.

The property’s circulation system is relatively intact. The red brick front walkway and porch landing are extant with a lawn pathway rounding the eastern side of the residence to connect with the garden gate. The red brick walkway and terrace along the northern side of the residence is extant. The current vehicular driveway is a simple linear driveway widening from Allens Creek Road to allow for a double bay garage and third parking row along the western edge.
Topography

From historic photographs, the topography of the site sloped away from the residence towards Allens Creek Road and the Country Club of Rochester. The back yard was relatively flat with grading for the brick walkway and terrace. Existing topography of the site still slopes away from the residence at a one to three percent slope towards Allens Creek Road.

Vegetation Features

The 1968 layout plan depicts shrubs or small trees lining the front walkway, however there are no historic photographs or notations made concerning the plantings in the front yard. There are historic photographs and planting plans for the herb garden and terrace/garden gate spaces in the back yard. Lining the northern edge of the property was a line of Eastern white pines (Pinus strobus). In the children's circle were six Japanese pagoda trees (Sophora japonica). In the herb garden there was a wide variety of herbs planted including lambs ear (Stachys byzantina), red yarrow (Achillea millefolium), mugwort (Artemisia vulgaris), spearmint (Mentha spicata), apple mint (Mentha rotundifolia), summer savery (Satureja hortensis) and tarragon (Artemisia dracunculus). The symmetrical garden consisted of four Bradford pear trees (Pyrus calleryana), boxwood (Buxus microphylla compacta), Japanese pieris (Pieris japonica), box-leaved holly (Ilex crenata) and other small woody shrubs (Figure 2.52). The terrace and garden gate planting plan illustrates the terrace having either a serviceberry (Amelanchier sp.) or a Korean stewartia (Stewartia koreana) surrounded by Christmas rose (Helleborus niger) and primrose (Primula sp.) in the central square bed. In the perimeter beds Steele suggested Japanese snowbell (Styrax japonica) surrounded by four creeping mahonia (Mahonia repens) and primrose (Primula sp.). Also in the perimeter beds were Japanese pieris (Pieris japonica) and Leucotho species. Along the inside edges were Korean boxwood (Buxus var. Koreana) and boxwood (Buxus microphylla compacta). However, August 1965 photographs show the terrace having only one deciduous tree and not the Japanese snowbells as suggested in the August 1964 planting plan. Along the house a long, thin rectangular planting bed had a single firethorn (Pyrocantha sp.) surrounded by a ground cover. In the garden gate space, the fleur-de-lis planting bed contained a variety of hybrid tea roses such as "Mrs. Sam McGredy", "Mme. Henry Guillot", "Christopher Stone" and "Crimson Glory" (Figure 2.53). Along the eastern wall two hydrangeas (Hydrangea sp.) were suggested in the corners of the garden gate and climbing roses "Gold Rush" and "Wt. Dawn" along
the base of the wall. Along the back of the tall red brick wall, Anglojap yews (*Taxus x media* var. ‘Hicksii’) were planted.

The vegetation features of the current property have matured and many replaced. The front yard to the eastern side of the driveway, has a centrally located magnolia (*Magnolia sp.*), two flowering crabapples (*Malus sp.*), Jackman clematis (*Clematis x jackmanii*), hosta (*Hosta sp.*), creeping juniper (*Juniperus horizontalis*), Canadian yew (*Taxus canadensis*) and Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*). The western half of the front yard is primarily grass with a hosta planting bed (*Hosta sp.*), apple tree (*Malus sylvestris*), American arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*), English oak (*Quercus robur*) and Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*). In the back yard the Eastern white pine stand is extant and in the children’s circle, four of the six Japanese pagoda trees (*Sophora japonica*) are extant. Hosta (*Hosta sp.*) and spreading euonymus (*Euonymus fortunei*) surround the Circle and have been supplemented in place of the missing pagoda trees. A double hedge of American arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*) just north of the children's circle was added at an unknown date. Although many of the terra cotta herb planters have been removed, of the remaining ones, chives (*Allium schoenoprasum L.*) and other herb varieties remain. In the symmetrical garden, the Bradford pear trees have been replaced with flowering crabapples (*Malus sp.*), but the boxwoods and Japanese pieris are extant (Figure 2.54). In the terrace, the stewartia or serviceberry was replaced with a flowering crabapple (*Malus sp.*). The eastern tall red brick wall is barely visible under a massive climbing hydrangea (*Hydrangea anomala sp.*). The terrace planting beds now consist of four hollies (*Ilex sp.*), catawba rhododendron (*Rhododendron catawbiense*) and spreading euonymus (*Euonymus fortuneii*). A recent addition to the terrace space are the planting beds to the north which include a variety of hosta, Japanese pieris and other small woody plants. The firethorn in the thin rectangular bed adjacent to the residence has been replaced with English ivy (*Hedera helix*). The garden gate area has a variety of woody shrubs and roses (Figure 2.55). There are no plantings in the fleur-de-lis pattern.

**Constructed Water Features**

Historically, there was a proposal for a circular water feature just north of the symmetrical planting area. The red brick and concrete feature is currently covered with black plastic and is unknown what the features was used for.
Small-Scale Features

Without written notations or historic photographs for the front yard it is unknown if the proposed vertical element was a wooden post and rope system. At the eastern and western end of the front yard terminating the brick walkway Steele proposed two structural alcoves or trellises. It is unknown if these two structures were ever constructed. In the back yard Steele’s elaborately designed red brick seating wall system lined either side of the symmetrical garden and continued to the north creating an L-shaped pattern. Directly to the north, a separate free standing red brick wall system perpendicular to the L-shaped walls frames the views from the patio to the proposed water feature. The red brick seating wall continues along the northern and eastern sides of the terrace. Upon reaching the wooden colonnade, the red brick wall expands to approximately ten feet and surrounds the eastern and southern sides of the garden gate area. Within the wall and walkway system in the back yard are geometric patterns and unusual details, common to Steele’s work with red brick. In addition to brick, the rectangular one foot square terra-cotta planters in the herb garden continued the geometric motif on the ground plane (Figure 2.56).

Today, all of Steele’s original brick walkways and details are extant. Approximately fifteen of the original thirty-five terra cotta herb planters remain in the herb garden (Figure 2.57).

Condition of the Landscape

The overall design intent and character of Steele’s 1968 layout plan remains largely intact. The Calihan garden is a good representation of Steele’s use of brick detailing and diverse plant palette. Utilizing the fleur-de-lis pattern as an organizational tool for the rose garden, Steele makes use of this pattern in many of his earlier works. The Calihan garden is significant because it characterizes Steele’s later design and style preferences moving from his curvilinear and serpentine forms back to a more traditional/ geometric approach to residential design. Although some of the plant materials have been removed and replaced with alternative plant varieties the property retains much of its original design intent and thus its integrity. Physically, the property is in good condition.
Client #657: Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Calihan
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This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 3: File 41- Folder 657 Supper Terrace, Herb Garden, Terrace, Door elevations

Flat File: Drawer 6: Folder 657 Garden Wall


Photograph Collection:

L: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views of Back yard

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 11 (3 plates): Garden Gate, Herb Garden and Terrace
Figure 2.47: Planting plan for terrace and garden gate entrance, August 1964 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.48: Layout plan with garage at angle with house axis, October 1968 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.49: Existing site plan for Khalil residence, August 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.50: Construction of the children’s circle and view of the Country Club of Rochester, c.1965 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.51: Current condition of the children’s circle, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.52: Looking westward toward the symmetrical garden, August 1965 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photograph Collection).

Figure 2.53: View of the garden gate area and terrace, c.1965 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.54: Looking westward toward the symmetrical garden from the terrace, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.55: View of the garden gate area with fleur-de-lis planting bed, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.56: Terra cotta herb planters in the herb garden, c.1965 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photograph Collection).

Figure 2.57: View of the remaining terra cotta herb planters, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Site History

This fine 1840 Greek revival residence was being threatened by commercial encroachment in the mid 1950s. Mr. and Mrs. Turner purchased the property and subsequently had it moved three and one half miles to a new site approved by landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn. The driveway grading and trees along the entrance drive and entrance court were prepared to facilitate the arrival of the residence by Katherine Wilson Rahn. After the residence was reconstructed on site in 1956, Mr. and Mrs. Turners lived at the property until c. 2000 when Mrs. Turner sold it to Mr. Stern and Mrs. McGrain.

Although Katherine Wilson Rahn sited the residence and designed the entrance driveway, from 1963 to 1971, Fletcher Steele was the principal landscape architect for further developing the property. His initial design for the property in 1963 illustrates an orchard, terrace, garden, barn yard and paddock (Figure 2.58). Although not labeled as such on the 1963 plan, Steele also proposed an entrance court, dense woodland, green room, upper terrace, grotto, rose terrace and lower terrace with reflecting pool. Northwest of the entrance court, Steele laid out an orchard that quickly grew to form a windbreak. An antique lattice well house also relocated from another site provided a terminus axis through the orchard’s center. East of the forecourt in the barn yard, Steele planted a dense woodland with a rich mixture of deciduous and evergreen plantings. On the north side of the residence, Steele created a series of turf terraces enclosed by a wall of vegetation. After Steele’s death in 1971 the Turners continued to develop the garden. In a letter to Katherine Wilson Rahn, the Turners asked if she would be willing to help them continue developing their garden. Richard Turner stated “In the last two years, with help from Paul Malo from Syracuse, we have installed a [swimming] pool and bathhouse (which are modeled on an 1820 well house). This year, and hopefully this spring, we need to get back to landscaping, including a long hedge to surround the pool area, and the planting of the most important trees and shrubs.” From 1974 to 1979, Rahn designed the west garden, the pool steps, and plantings surrounding the swimming pool. She also designed a kitchen garden with gate, tool shed and tennis court that were built c. 1978. In the

---

48 Richard L. Turner to Katherine Wilson Rahn, 18, March 1974 (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University).
early 1980s, Rahn created a birch allee leading from the swimming pool to sunset point. Also during this time the rose garden and turf terraces leading down to the reflecting pool were redesigned to accommodate additional plantings and gravel paths (See Figure 2.57).

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

Originally located at 3100 East Henrietta Road at the corner of Lehigh Station Road, the 1840 Greek revival residence was moved in 1956 to its current location at 22 Stoney Clover Lane. The residence is situated on a six-acre hilltop property facing southwest towards Stoney Clover Lane. Located to the north, south and east of the property are single family residences. A contemporary site plan of the property has been included courtesy of Deirdre Cunningham (Figure 2.59). 49

**Spatial Organization**

The development of the Turner estate occurred over a twenty-five year period. Katherine Wilson Rahn sited the residence and designed the straight line entrance drive through a sugar maple allee (*Acer saccharum*). After this initial work on the estate, Rahn moved her practice to Buffalo and the Turners approached (semi-retired) Fletcher Steele to continue the development of the grounds. Although Steele had intended to design the entire property, the forecourt, orchard, green room, woodland, upper terrace, grotto, rose garden and lower terrace with circular reflecting pool were the only components designed and implemented prior to his death in 1971. The large gravel forecourt located west of the residence, approximately 7,500 square feet, was enclosed by a four foot tall white picketed fence on the northern and southern edges. The orchard, located just northwest of the forecourt, spanned the north side of the property from the western property line to the well house and sunset point along the northern property edge. Serving as a wind break, the .75 acre orchard with turf ground plane had an axial path creating clear views of the well house from the entrance court. The cross axis in the southwest edge of the orchard was terminated by the green room. A small octagonal shaped turf room, the green room was enclosed by tall yew (*Taxus* sp.) hedges. Southeast of the entrance court was a richly planted woodland with a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees. On the north side of the residence, Steele designed a series of terraces, an upper, rose and lower terrace with a vista of the circular

---

49 Deirdre Cunningham was the landscape curator at the George Eastman House. Over the course of this thesis she was a valuable resource for information concerning many of Steele’s designed properties. Deirdre has since left her position at the George Eastman House.
reflecting pool. The upper terrace was a rectangular turf panel with semi-circular alcoves to the north and south enclosed by arborvitae and evergreen hedge. The northeast side of the upper terrace was defined by a wrought-iron and swag chain balustrade. A stone retaining wall with double flight of stairs led from the upper terrace past the grotto set in the wall down to the rose terrace. Planting beds consisting primarily of roses surrounded a circular turf space. From the rose terrace there were a series of rolling turf terraces leading downward toward the circular reflecting pool. Enclosed by two walls of screen plantings the arborvitae and white firs enclosed around the circular reflecting pool.

The spatial organization of the entrance court, orchard, green room woodland, upper terrace, grotto, rose terrace and lower terrace are extant.

_Circulation_

The November 1963 plan for the Turner property illustrates Rahn’s axial driveway and straight approach to Steele’s entrance court. The plan also shows the pedestrian pathways throughout the orchard, barnyard and upper terrace. From the large gravel entrance court Steele proposed a wide pathway, material unknown, on axis with the relocated well house. Running perpendicular to the pathway in the orchard, Steele also proposed a wide linear pathway, materials unknown, to connect the green room to the upper terrace. In the upper terrace, reddish Medina stone was used to create the soldier coarse along the balustrade edge, double staircases and rectangular landing platform.

Steele’s original circulation patterns for the property are extant, but some additions have been made to his initial proposed terrace space on the northwest side of the residence and the lower terrace. In 1975 the space labeled ‘Terrace’ on Steele’s 1963 plan, was redesigned by Rahn creating an octagonal shaped west garden providing turf pathway connections to the upper terrace, the swimming pool and the orchard. During the early 1980s, Rahn added a centralized stone staircase leading down from the rose terrace to the turf terraces in the lower terrace and two side gravel paths to the circular reflecting pool.

_Topography_

Historically and currently the entrance drive and entrance court is relatively level and situated at the highest point on the property. Northeast and southwest of the forecourt, the orchard and barnyard gently slope down hill at a one to three percent. The stone retaining wall defining the upper terrace creates eight feet of
grade change from the relatively flat upper terrace and the stone platform in the rose terrace. From the rose
garden to the circular reflecting pool there is a grade change of five to seven feet.

Vegetation Features

Steele kept the entrance court planting to a minimum by only including two maples (*Acer* sp.) placed
at the corners of the residence and beds of ivy to either side of the entrance porch. In order to augment the
verticality of the forecourt fencing, Steele back planted the fence with columnar glossy buckthorn (*Rhamnus
frangula* 'Columnaris'). The orchard was planted with flowering crabapples along the central axis and edible
varieties towards the outside. A 1967 partial plant list for the property lists some of the flowering crabapples
used in the orchard; *Malus x Arnoldiana*, *Malus* 'Dorothea', *Malus floribunda*, *Malus* 'Hops', *Malus
‘Van Eseltine’. Edible apple varieties included Golden Delicious, Spy, Cortlands and Jonathans, Russets and
RI Greening.50 In all, there were seventy-three trees planted in the orchard. The cross axial path within the
orchard which led to the green room was defined by sassafras (*Sassafras albidum*), clethra (*Clethra* sp.),
Washington hawthorn (*Crataegus phaenopyrum*), three varieties of ornamental cherry (*Prunus* sp.), yellowroot
(*Xanthorrhiza simplicissima*), and Bradford pear trees (*Pyrus calleryana* ‘Bradford’). Beds on either side of the
cross axial path were planted with tree peonies (*Paeonia suffruticosa*), *Cytisus* sp., and Japanese anemone
(*Anemone japonica*).51 In the rich textured woodland, east of the entrance court Steele planted, Lombardy
poplars (*Populus nigra* ‘Italica’), native sugar maples (*Acer saccharum*), hemlocks (*Tsuga* sp.), Katsura trees
(*Cercidiphyllum japonicum*) and silverbell (*Halesia monticola*) trees. Japanese angelica trees (*Aralia elata*),
Japanese tree lilacs (*Syringa japonica*), firs (*Abies* sp.), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), American holly
(*Ilex opaca*) and Colorado spruce (*Picea pungens*) were also among the wide-range of species he included.52

The vegetation in the upper terrace included four western arborvitae (*Thuja plicata*) and two Alaskan false
cypress (*Chamaecyparis nootkatensis* ‘Pendula’). A partial plant list for the lower terrace included; white fir
(*Abies concolor*), amur maple (*Acer ginnala*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), serviceberry (*Amelanchier x
grandiflora*), flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*), Kousa dogwood (*Cornus kousa*), English hawthorn

---

50 Plant list index cards (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
51 Robin Karson, *Fletcher Steele, Landscape Architect: An Account of the Gardenmaker’s Life 1885-1971*
(Crataegus laevigata (oxyantha) 'Pauli'), Mountain silverbell (Halesia monticola), Carolina silverbell (Halesia tetrapetra), little leaf linden (Tilia cordata ‘Greenspire’), doublefile viburnum (Viburnum plicatum var. tomentosum ‘Mariesii’) and butterfly-bush (Buddleia davidii).\footnote{Plant list index cards (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).} Behind the reflecting pool there were arborvitae and white firs.

There have been many alterations to Steele's initial planting design for the Turner property. The ivy planting beds in the entrance court have been removed, but the two maples are extant (Figure 2.60). In 1987, the glossy buckthorn planted behind the entrance court fence were removed and replaced with eighty European hornbeam (Carpinus betulus) (Figure 2.61). At the entrance to the orchard there is a pair of Serbian spruces (Picea omorika). Although many of the apple trees in the orchard are diseased, only one tree has been replaced (Figure 2.62). The green room is overgrown with yew hedges (Taxus sp.) blocking the entrance to the space (Figure 2.63). The upper terrace plantings are extant. In the rose terrace the roses have been removed and replaced with weeping hemlock (Tsuga sp.), weeping spruce (Picea sp.), swiss stone pine (Pinus cembra) and stewartia (Stewartia sp.) (Figure 2.64). Boston ivy (Parthenocissus tricuspidata) has grown to cover much of the stone retaining wall and grotto (See figure 2.65). Lining the central gravel path in the lower terrace are large mounds of mugo pines (Pinus mugo). The arborvitae and white firs surrounding the circular reflecting pool are extant.

**Constructed Water Features**

Steele designed two water features for the garden, a small grotto and the circular reflecting pool. Between the double flight of Medina stone stairs a grotto is set into the stone retaining wall. “Steele used six tiny supply pipes hidden in the stonework cave to keep the surface dripping.”\footnote{Robin Karson, *Fletcher Steele, Landscape Architect: An Account of the Gardenmaker’s Life 1885-1971* (New York: Sagapress, Inc., 1989), 297.} From the protruding semi-circular basin is a stone aggregate runnel (Figure 2.65). The runnel was situated on the garden axis and carried overflow water into a secondary clay pipe channels lining the perimeter of the circular turf terrace. The cast stone circular reflecting pool in the lower terrace was meant to capture and reflect the image of the mansion.

The constructed water features are extant.
Small-Scale Landscape Features

In the entrance court and upper terrace small scale features included wood fencing, a wrought iron baluster and stands, and clay pots. The entrance court on the northwest and southeast sides are enclosed by a four foot tall white picketed fence. The proportions of the fence were taken from pilasters on the rear house façade and the tops were derived from the architectural detail at the top of the pilasters.55 In the upper terrace, Steele used oil jars the Turners had collected from a trip to Spain to create “…wrought-iron stands to sit at the entries to the house terrace.”56 Along the northern edge of the upper terrace Steele designed a three foot tall wrought iron balustrade with swag chains (Figure 2.66). “The post finials were cast iron; the delicate wrought-iron loops were based on a motif adapted from the handsome house grills.”57 In front of the baluster on the upper terrace on the Medina stone edging were eight clay pots planted with whatever Nancy Turner wished. A pair of gargoyles statues was added at the top of the double staircase, date unknown.

Steele’s initial small scale features for the entrance court and upper terrace are extant. In the orchard, a contemporary copper sculpture of a tree has replaced a crabapple along the compacted soil path. Adjacent to the circular reflecting pool, Mr. Stern and Mrs. McGrain have added a contemporary abstract metal sculpture.

Condition of the Landscape

At the time Steele was commissioned by the Turners, he prepared a complete design for the property. At the time of his death in 1971, completed landscape components included the entrance court, orchard, green room, woodland, upper terrace, grotto and lower terrace with circular reflecting pool. To complete the remaining portions of the property, the Turners hired Paul Malo and re-engaged Katherine Wilson Rahn. The additions to the Turner landscape did not negatively impact any portion of Steele’s already completed design. The Turner property is significant for a number of reasons. This property was the last large scale residential design Steele completed before his death and is another great example of his design fitting into a larger context. Although the current owners have made minor changes to the property through the replacement of plant materials and addition of metal sculptural elements, the alteration to the landscape has been minimal and thus has retained its integrity (Figure 2.67). The gardens are in good physical condition.

55 Ibid, 293.
56 Ibid, 295.
57 Ibid, 295-296.
Client #674 Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Nancy Turner

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-25: Scrapbook Albums: Client 674: Photos of property

Drawing Collection:


Loose Drawing: 674 Topographic plan September 15, 1966.

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 11 (2 plates): Photos of residence and evergreen plantings

Plant List Collection:

FSclbl Box 1: Index cards of plant list for property
Figure 2.58: Plan for the Turner Residence, November 20, 1963 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.59: Current site plan for the Stern and McGraw property, nd or source (Courtesy Dierdre Cunningham).
Figure 2.60: View of the gravel entrance court and maples planted at the corner of the mansion, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.61: Looking northeast towards the orchard and well house from the entrance court, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.62: Looking northeast through the apple orchard, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.63: In the orchard looking eastward towards the green room, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.66: Wrought iron swag chain balustrade and double stairs in the upper terrace, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.67: Looking eastward from the lower terrace and circular reflecting pool, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
The landscape architect never sees his own perfected work. He dies before it is finished. The garden is not done when the earth is flattened, walls built and trees planted; it is far from ready to be judged. The evidence is not all in and will not be until the trees grow big.

- Fletcher Steele
Site History

The Italianate Harris-Watson-Spencer House at 1005 East Avenue was built in 1865 for Edward Harris, lawyer and counsel of Rochester Savings Bank. Mr. Harris was an active member of the East Avenue Shade Tree Association and contributed by planting a copper beech (*Fagus sylvatica* ‘Atropunicea’) in his front yard during the 1870s. “Next door at 987 East Avenue, Granger A. Hollister of Hollister Lumber Company, built his stone mansion in 1888 at the time of his marriage to Miss Isabelle Watson.” In 1892, Mrs. Don Alonzo Watson and her daughter Elizabeth C. Watson purchased 1005 East Avenue from Edward Harris to live next door to Mrs. Hollister. The Watson’s employed famous Rochester architect J. Foster Warner to remodel the dining room, staircase and rear hall and add bays to the east and west facades in 1892. After Elizabeth Watson married Granger A. Hollister in 1925, she sold the property to daughter and son-in-law, Thomas and Harriet Hollister Spencer, treasurer of Hollister Lumber Company. “The interior was again extensively remodeled in 1925 by Mr. and Mrs. Spencer with James Arnold of Arnold and Stern the architect. In the drawing room the dark velvet wall coverings were removed and the walls and cherry woodwork painted ivory. The mantel, over-the-mantel paneling and shell cupboards that were added follow the design of a room in a pre-Revolutionary house in Fairmont Park, Philadelphia.” Mrs. Spencer died in 1962, and in December 1976 Thomas Spencer gave the architecturally significant property to the Landmark Society of Western New York for preservation. The Landmark Society sold 1005 East Avenue to Jeffery and Beth Wilkens in August 1979. With protective covenants in the deed protecting the house and grounds, the Wilkens began restoring the house. In 2002, the Wilkens sold the property to Mark and Kathryn Cleary who are the current owners.

Steele was initially hired in 1929 by the Spencers to design a terrace for the southern entrance to the house. The south entrance paneled door set in a pilastered frame topped by a molded, stepped Colonial Revival entablature set the mood for the Classical style terrace. By June of 1930 the stepped flagstone terrace

---

59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.
and patio, wood balustrade and wood paling lattice were installed. The Spencers continued to order plant
materials from Steele in 1937 and 1944.

**Historic/ Existing Conditions**

Originally part of David Bates farm, the Harris-Watson-Spencer property consisted of two to three
acres eventually reduced to its current size of 1.25 acres. The house faces north, toward East Avenue and is a
contributing resource to the East Avenue Preservation District. Situated on the southwest corner of East
Avenue and Berkeley Street, to the west of the property are single family and multifamily residences and to the
south Rose Court Townhouses. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit
to the property by the author in August 2003 (Figure 2.68).

**Spatial Organization**

Historically the landscape was composed of three primary spaces, the front yard and back yard
divided into the upper and lower gardens. Steele’s involvement with the property consisted of primarily
working in the backyard. The upper gardens in the back yard consisted of an L-shaped stepped flagstone
terrace and wood balustrade, shed-roofed patio and lawn panel with deciduous tree and shrub plantings, some
tree specimens were originally planted by Edward Harris. The lower gardens consisted of Harriett Hollister
Spencer’s Elizabethan Tudor knot garden. Mrs. Spencer’s garden was designated a city landmark in 1976.

The spatial organization of the current property consists of the front yard and backyard with upper
gardens. The upper gardens in the back yard consist of Steele’s stepped flagstone terrace and wood balustrade,
shed-roofed porch and boxwood hedged perennial garden. In 1981, Porter Perham bought a one acre parcel
from heirs of the Spencers and moved into the refurbished gardener’s cottage. With plans to construct nine
townhouses, a row of pines (*Pinus* sp.) were planted at the southern edge of the property screening the new
construction completing the vegetative enclosure of the backyard.

**Circulation**

The circulation in the 1930s consisted of pedestrian paths in the back yard and a vehicular driveway
along the eastern edge of the property. The single lane vehicular driveway along the eastern edge of the
property, material unknown, widened as it ran along the side of the house. In the back yard, a stepped
limestone terrace south of the dining room connected the rear entrance to a linear three to four foot stone pebble pathway (Figure 2.69). The straight pathway ran past the flagstone patio southward towards the lower gardens.

The vehicular driveway has been paved with asphalt and extents slightly past the rear patio. The stone pebbled pathway in the backyard has been removed or planted over with grass (Figure 2.70).

Topography

On a gently sloping ground, the grade of the property slopes downhill slightly from East Avenue to Park Avenue at a one to three percent slope.

Vegetation

During the 1870s, Edward Harris planted a copper beech sapling (Fagus sylvatica 'Atropunicea') in the front yard and other trees in the back yard garden.\(^{63}\) In the backyard along the balustrade and northern portion of the stone pebble pathway, a variety of ferns and phlox (Phlox paniculata) were planted. Climbing and potted flowering plants adorned the wooden paling lattice and flagstone terrace (Figure 2.71). Two tall deciduous trees, one to the west of the balustrade and one south of the patio provided shade to the southern side of the house. Lining the stone pebble pathway to the lower gardens were deciduous trees and perennial planting beds. The lower garden consisted of Mrs. Spencer’s Elizabethan Tudor knot garden of boxwood (Buxus sp.) and old roses (Rosa sp.). The upper gardens were described in the Garden Club of America Annual Meeting booklet:

Fuchsias thrive against the blue walls of the terrace picking up the brilliant colors of the Chinese Goldfish bowl. Happily violets, (42 varieties), and all the primulas love the shadow, and many spring bulbs and precious natives have been led to spread and seed in wide areas made rich for them.\(^{64}\)

Mrs. Spencer continued to seek Steele’s assistance with the gardens by ordering a viburnum (Viburnum sp.) in June 1937 and fifty phlox (Phlox divaricata) in November 1944.

Many of the original plant materials in the upper backyard garden have been removed or poorly maintained. A few of the original ferns have made their way between the flagstone treads, but otherwise have


\(^{64}\) “Mrs. Thomas G. Spencer”, in The Garden Club of America Annual Meeting May 20, 21, 22 (Rochester, New York: The Authors, 1941), 32.
been replaced with boxwood (*Buxus sp.*) along the grass pathway. Spreading euonymus (*Euonymus fortunei*) covers the remaining wood paling lattice. Myrtle (*Vinca minor*) has inundated the flagstone terrace particularly along the balustrade (Figure 2.72). A maple (*Acer sp.*), hemlock (*Tsuga sp.*) and hedge yews (*Taxus sp.*) line the western side of the balustrade. Covering much of the shed-roofed patio is a mature wisteria (*Wisteria sp.*).

**Constructed Water Features**

No water features were constructed or proposed for the property.

**Small-Scale Landscape Features**

By June 1930, the rectangular stepping flagstone terrace and rectangular flagstone patio were implemented. The 1' to 2' wooden balustrade runs the length of the western edge of the terrace (Figure 2.73). In January 1929, Steele placed an order for 800 meters style Q palings @ 1 Franc 25 per meter. The French style paling was adhered to the dining room and kitchen exterior walls in the terrace and eastern square molded posts in the patio (Figure 2.74). Used as garden lattice, the wooden palings kept the climbing plants from adhering to the house.

All three elements remain, however the condition of the paling has deteriorated with sections missing in the patio and holes in the terrace paling. Portions of the flagstone terrace need to be reset and cracked stones replaced. The white painted wooden balustrade is in good condition.

**Condition of the Landscape**

The Harris-Watson-Spencer house is a significant landmark to the East Avenue community both architecturally and for its association with Steele. The stepping flagstone terrace and patio, wood balustrade and wood paling lattice are a good representation of Steele's early expression of European features. Although the plantings are overgrown, terrace and patio stones in need of replacement and resetting, and a deteriorating paling lattice, the upper garden design retains the initial character of Steele's work. The upper garden physically is in fair condition.

---

65 Fletcher Steele to Miss A. C. Archibald in Paris, France, 29 January 1929, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
Client # 327 Mr. and Mrs. Thomas and Harriett Hollister Spencer

Fletcher Steele Archives  
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library  
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry  
Syracuse, New York  
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719  
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory.  
The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

    FSMC: Photograph Book L-6, page 24.

Lantern Slide Collection:

    L-22: Photograph Album: Photos of Residence

Client Order Book Collection:

    FSCOB: File 2, Folder 32 (2 loose leaf orders): Plants and Paling, 1929 to 1944.
Figure 2.68: Existing condition plan of Cleary residence, August 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.69: Looking southward along stone pebble pathway towards lower garden, June 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.70: Looking southward along grass pathway, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.71: View of the stepping flagstone terrace and rear entrance, June 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.72: View of the remaining flagstone terrace and overgrown plant materials, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.73: View of the wood balustrade and wood paling lattice, June 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.74: View of the wood paling lattice in the terrace and patio, June 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).
Current Owner: Landmark Society of Western New York
Client # 423 Campbell-Whittlesey House
123 S. Fitzhugh Street
Rochester, New York 14608

Site History

Benjamin Campbell quickly built a fortune milling flour at the Genesee Falls. In 1835 he spent a good part of it to build a handsome Greek revival house, but six years later when the price of flour plummeted, he was bankrupt, and his house was sold at public auction. Frederick Whittlesey acquired it in 1852, and his family occupied the house until the need to preserve it led to the founding of the Landmark Society, which acquired it in 1937 and made it into the city’s first house museum.  

The Landmark Society continues to own the property.

Initially Fletcher Steele was hired by the Landmark Society of Western New York to redesign the east side entrance stairway. During the summer of 1937 Mrs. Selden, wife of a close friend and client, often aided Steele with his Rochester area clients, took photographs of the Campbell-Whittlesey property illustrating the current elevations and entrances to the residence (Figure 2.75). In April of 1941, Steele sketched two possible design alternatives for the treatment of the east entrance staircase (Figure 2.76). The east entrance staircase was never built for unknown reasons. In the late 1950s, the Landmark Society again hired Steele to design a kitchen garden, arbor and forecourt for the Campbell-Whittlesey House (Figures 2.77 and 2.78). A landscape development plan was created in 1958 for the property illustrating an enclosed kitchen garden with a well head and louvers and tall deciduous trees lining the edge of the garden filtering the sunlight into the space. In addition to the 1958 landscape development plan, five more plans were created during 1959 for the east arbor and south wall, garden fence, well head, forecourt and detail enlargements. However due to a lack of funds the kitchen garden sat idol until the summer of 1962 when funds were made available to install the brick paving. The following summer, the Rochester Garden Club donated funds for landscaping the property. Steele’s proposed lattice fence, arbor and kitchen steps still needed to be built. The only components of the 1958 landscape development plan to be implemented at

---

67 Fletcher Steele to Society for Preservation of Landmarks of Western New York, Inc., 8 December 1959 (Rochester Historical Society).
68 Mrs. (John) Jessie P. Woodward to Fletcher Steele, 6 June 1963 (Rochester Historical Society).
the Campbell-Whittlesey house were the stone walls and balustrade surrounding the garden and lining the eastern and northern property edges, brick paved terrace, and some of the specified plant materials.⁶⁹

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

It is unknown how large the original property was when Benjamin Campbell built the Greek revival residence, but the current property is 55 feet wide by 114 feet long located in the southwest corner of S. Fitzhugh Street and Troup Street. The Hoyt-Potter House, also owned and operated by the Landmark Society of Western New York is south of the residence with a two story apartment complex to the west. Directly north of the residence across Troup Street is Interstate 490. The Campbell-Whittlesey House is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. An existing conditions plan was created during the initial visit to the site by the author in June 2003 (Figure 2.79).

**Spatial Organization**

The 1958 landscape development plan illustrates three primary spaces, a small rectangular front yard, rectangular backyard and long linear eastern side yard (Figure 2.80). The raised lawn in the small rectangular front yard was edged with a stone retaining wall and wood balustrade along the northern and eastern sides and two pyramidal English oaks (*Quercus robur* 'Fastigiata') to the west. The views of downtown from the front portico were uninterrupted. The backyard ground plane consisted of a brick terrace surrounded by five to six feet tall lattice with louvers atop a stone retaining wall and to the west and south and an arbor to the east. The evenly placed deciduous plantings adjacent to the lattice enclosed the space and directed the views towards the proposed well house. The trees filtered the sunlight and views of the sky in the backyard. The eastern side yard was defined by the proposed stone retaining wall and balustrade with two openings for the stairway entrances to the residence.

The current spatial organization of the property is similar to the proposed 1958 plan except for minor alterations to the front and back yard. During construction of Interstate 490, the balustrade along the stone retaining wall in the front yard was removed and never replaced and it is unknown if the English oaks

---

were ever planted.\textsuperscript{70} In the backyard, the well house, arbor and garden lattice with louvers were also never built.\textsuperscript{71} The stone retaining walls defining the kitchen garden in the back yard and along the eastern side yard and front yard are extant.

\textit{Circulation}

The 1958 landscape development depicts pedestrian pathways connecting the backyard kitchen garden to the eastern and front entrances and a proposed parking/drop off lane for vehicles along S. Fitzhugh Street. Connecting the front portico to the backyard kitchen garden was a linear three feet wide walkway, material unknown, running along the western side of the residence. In the backyard kitchen garden terrace was a proposed set of stone stairs for the back entrance and a second set of stone stairs connecting to the existing stone walk leading to the eastern side entrance. The paving pattern for the majority of the patio was to be in soldier course, with a header course and herringbone pattern in cement adjacent to the residence. Continuing from the kitchen terrace down to S. Fitzhugh Street, Steele proposed additional stairs and check walls connecting to the proposed stone retaining walls and balustrades. Steele also proposed realigning the S. Fitzhugh Street sidewalk to accommodate the proposed parking/drop off lane.

The proposed western pedestrian pathway, backyard kitchen garden entrance stairs and vehicular parking/drop off lane were never built.

\textit{Topography}

Since the initial construction of the residence, the level of S. Fitzhugh Street has been lowered over the years to the point where retaining walls were necessary to maintain the grade surrounding the residence. At the time Steele proposed his 1958 plan and retaining walls for the property, S. Fitzhugh Street had reached its final and current grade. The eastern side of the property is approximately two feet higher than the grade of S. Fitzhugh Street. The front and back yard of the property are relatively level with the western side sloping slightly away from the residence towards the adjacent property.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
Vegetation

The 1958 landscape development plan lists the proposed plant materials for the Campbell-Whittlesey property. In the front yard, Steele proposed planting a hedge of common ninebark (*Physocarpus opulifolius*) along the stone retaining wall and two pyramidal English oaks (*Quercus robur* ‘Fastigiata’) at the western edge. In the backyard kitchen garden Steele proposed seven deciduous trees, specie unknown, placed at regular intervals along the western and southern edges. Two rectangular planters were created along the western edge of the arbor for kitchen herbs. Behind the garden lattice with louvers, Steele proposed planting a hedge of English hawthorns (*Crataegus laevigata*) and adjacent to the eastern kitchen garden stone wall four lilacs (*Syringa x rothomagensis*). On the eastern side of the residence in the raised planting beds, Steele proposed planting a hedge of boxwoods (*Buxus sp.*) between the existing entrance walkway and the retaining wall, flowering quince (*Chaenomeles sp.*) flanking the stairway entrance to the east side of the residence and a pyramidal English oak (*Quercus robur* ‘Fastigiata’) at the northeast corner of the residence.

Due to a lack of funds, only certain plant materials were ordered for the property. It is unknown what was purchased and/or planted in the front yard. The current plantings include a mixture of deciduous shrubs and English ivy (*Hedera helix*). In the backyard kitchen garden, the two planting beds for the herbs were never built or the English hawthorn hedge planted. Currently, there are seven crabapples (*Malus sp.*) and four lilacs planted where Steele has specified his seven deciduous trees and lilacs (Figure 2.81). The boxwood hedge (which came from the Ellwanger estate) lining the existing walk and flowering quince flanking the staircase to the eastern side entrance were planted. The pyramidal oaks Steele specified on his 1958 plan were ordered, but all planted on the eastern side of the property. Other current plant materials along the eastern side include hawthorn (*Crataegus sp.*) and English ivy (*Hedera helix*).

*Constructed Water Features*

A well house was proposed in the kitchen garden, but was never built. There are no current water features on the property.

---
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Small-Scale Features

Along the eastern and northern edges of the property, Steele proposed a wood balustrade ranging from two to three feet tall atop the stone retaining wall. In the backyard kitchen garden, Steele proposed a grape arbor, garden lattice with louvers and shutters and a well house. The wood grape arbor was depicted as having a arcing roof and spanning the entire depth of the terrace. Surrounding the terrace along the southern edge to expose the English hawthorn hedge was a decorative wood garden lattice atop the stone wall. Along the western edge the lattice was solid with shutters and louvers. These three features would never be built.

The only small scale feature to be built was the wood balustrade and stone seating wall in the kitchen garden and lining the eastern and northern property edges (Figure 2.82).

Condition of the Landscape

Although the Landmark Society of Western New York commissioned Steele as early as 1937 to design a new set of stairs for the eastern entrance to the Campbell-Whittlesey house, they were never built. Steele was hired again in 1958 to create a landscape development plan for the property, only portions of the plan were built, the small kitchen garden, balustrade and stone work on the site. It is believed that the majority of the proposed landscape development plan would have been implemented if the appropriate funding was available. The design Steele created for the Campbell-Whittenesly house illustrates his understanding of proportion and preferred usage of arbors and wood lattice. Although the garden has lost much of it’s initial integrity, it is still significant for its association with Steele. Of the features that were built from the 1958 plan, the kitchen garden terrace, stone walls and plant materials are physically in fair condition.
Client # 423 Campbell-Whittlesey House

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-24: Photograph Album: Client 423 Photos of the residence, elevations.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 5: File 30- Folder 423 Sketch of the steps, I trace drawing.
Loose Plans 423-19 Landscape Development plan with sections April 18, 1958.

Photostatic Print Collection:

FSPPVII: Folder 97: Plan of entrance stairs d-14 April 1941, Study of stairs d-15 April 1941
Figure 2.75: View of the east entrance and staircase, 1937 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.76: Proposed staircase for east entrance, April 1941 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.77: Proposed sketch elevation of the south wall of the kitchen garden, April 18, 1958 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.78: Proposed sketch elevation of the west wall of kitchen garden, April 18, 1958 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).

Figure 2.79: Existing conditions plan for Campbell-Whittlesey House, June 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.80: Landscape development plan for the Campbell-Whittlesey House, April 18, 1958 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.81: View of the kitchen garden from the eastern stairs looking south, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.82: View of the wood balustrade and stone retaining wall along S. Fitzhugh Street, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Mount Hope Cemetery  
Client #653: Mrs. Frank E. Gannett  
1133 Mount Hope Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14618

Site History

Mount Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America. The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting. Purchased on August 4, 1956, the Frank Ernest and Caroline Werner Gannett plot is located on Lot 247 in Section MM. There are currently two graves on the site.

Steele was hired in the late spring to early summer in 1958 by Mrs. Frank E. Gannett to create a memorial for her deceased husband Frank Gannett. In August 1958, Steele had developed an initial proposal for the cemetery lot, which was never constructed (Figure 2.83). Over the next year the design changed considerably from his initial scheme to the current “...sculpture relief based on an “endless knot” motif (in Quincy pink granite) surrounded by a field of black, mosaic tiles.” Orders were placed in the fall of 1959 for granite and other materials for the memorial. Installation of the memorial was underway in September of 1960 including preparation of the ground, furnishing of plants, and moving the granite knot to the grave site. Installation of the memorial was completed by October 15th 1960.

Historic/Existing Conditions

Historically and currently Lot 247 in Section MM is 480 square feet. The lot faces south surrounded by additional cemetery lots. Located to the north of the Gannett Lot is Lot 260 and Cedar Avenue, to the east Lot 248, to the south Lot 240 and Grove Avenue, and to the west Lot 246 purchased by the Frederick Pierson family (another Fletcher Steele client). Mount Hope Cemetery is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the cemetery lot in June 2003 (Figure 2.84).

---


74 Frank Ernest Gannett (1876-1957) was born in Bristol, New York to Joseph Charles Gannett and Maria (Brooks) Gannett. He married Caroline Werner c.1920 and became one of Rochester's most influential politicians. Frank Gannett was a newspaper editor and publisher; founder of Gannett newspaper chain and 1936 candidate for New York State Governor. In 1940 Gannett was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. (“Frank Gannett Dies”, *Unitarian Register*, February 1958).

Spatial Organization

Although a finalized plan for the lot is unavailable, photographs taken in October of 1960 show the completed memorial. The memorial was to be viewed from the south with the grade level granite memorial surrounded by a U-shaped evergreen hedge enclosing the space. Steele made use of an existing yew hedge (*Taxus* sp.) to the east to block views of neighboring gravesites.

The yew hedges have been removed and a contemporary black granite monument approximately three feet by five feet was added in the northern planting bed on the central axis.

Circulation Systems

Historically and currently, pedestrian access to the gravestones was from Grove Avenue.

Topography

Historically and current the lot is relatively level with the surrounding ground plane.

Vegetation Features

From the October 1960 photograph, the only plant material used was a horseshoe shaped yew hedge (*Taxus cuspidata* ‘brownii’).

The yew hedge was removed at an unknown date. A variety of plant materials such as pink, white and red azaleas (*Rhododendron* sp.), sedum (*Sedum* sp.) and astilbe (*Astilbe* sp.) have replaced the hedges.

Constructed Water Features

No water features were proposed or currently found on the lot.

Small-Scale Features

The October 1960 photograph shows a square granite panel surrounding the perimeter of the pink granite Celtic knot and black granite mosaic tiles (Figure 2.85). Level with the ground, the knot is surrounded by a mosaic of glossy black tiles. The south granite panel is inscribed Frank Ernest Gannett. The letters are approximately six inches high. South of the panel are two simple tablet headstones marking
the graves of Mr. Frank Ernest Gannett and Caroline Werner Gannett. Along the eastern edge between the yews hedges in the planting bed were two square white granite seats approximately one and one half to two feet square. The sides were detailed with an endless knot pattern. The seats were spaced approximately two to three feet apart.

At an unknown date, a large polished black granite monument was placed in the northern planting bed on the central axis (Figure 2.86). The six to seven foot tall monument reads “GANNETT” in large white lettering featuring a picture of a newspaper boy distributing newspapers followed closely by a dog. A rectangular white granite block approximately 6 to 10 inches tall has been added between the two square seats. The pink granite endless knot and black mosaic are extant.

**Condition of the Landscape**

The Gannett lot is one of Steele’s most intricately designed cemetery lots. Significant landscape features such as the endless knot, mosaic and granite stone seats are in good physical condition and contribute to the lot’s integrity. However the removal of the yew hedge and addition of the large polished black granite monument detracts from the simplicity of the original design and the site’s overall integrity. The overall physical condition of the lot is fair.
Client #653: Mrs. Frank E. Gannett

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-25: Scrapbook Albums: Client 653 Photos of the cemetery lot and Celtic knot.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 6: File 40- Folder 653 One drawing of the cemetery lot, d-1 August 1958.

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 11 (1 plate): Photo of knot pattern.

Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.83: Proposed development plan for Gannett cemetery lot, August 7, 1958 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.84: Current site plan of the Gannett cemetery lot, June 2003 (Drawing by author).

Gannett Cemetery Lot

Caroline Warner Gannett 1844-1879
Frank Ernest Gannett 1876-1937

June 10, 2003
Figure 2.85: Frank Ernest Gannett memorial at Mount Hope Cemetery after installation, October 15, 1960 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.86: Current condition of Frank Ernest Gannett memorial at Mount Hope Cemetery, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
POOR CONDITION

The practical client does not, or thinks he does not, need our help in being practical. He needs help in artistic endeavours. Just as long as we think first in terms of beauty and only subordinately of ways and means, that long will the appreciative client need and help us. To him goes our willing allegiance. He gives us our greatest need and happiness, the opportunity to work out our ideas.

- Fletcher Steele
Site History

George Ellwanger founded Mount Hope Nurseries with Patrick Barry in May of 1840 and created a horticultural empire for the next 78 years within the City of Rochester. In 1846, George Ellwanger married Cornelia Brooks, daughter of General Micah Brooks, giving birth to four sons. Of his four sons, the youngest, Edward S. Ellwanger was the only one to work with his father at the nursery until Edward’s death in 1897. He left his widow, Leah Cresswell Ellwanger with two small daughters, Helen Cresswell Ellwanger and Margaret Ellwanger to live in the ‘Gothic House’ at 609 Mt. Hope Ave., built for their uncle Henry Ellwanger in the 1870s. When George Ellwanger died in 1906, Leah and her two daughters moved into ‘the Big House’ at 625 Mt. Hope Ave. South of the Victorian residence at 625 Mt. Hope, on a gentle slope lies a garden designed and planted by George Ellwanger in 1867. “Among the garden’s main features are the old pear trees, planted by Mr. Ellwanger, the box edged paths, and specimens of Taxus cuspidata. Flowering shrubs and perennials, many still in their original positions, fill the borders.” Helen took an active role in the maintenance of the grounds and garden that her grandfather had so lovingly planted.” Besides her knack for gardening, Helen was a devoted preservationist and philanthropist. In 1937 she formed the Society for the Preservation of Landmarks in Western New York, was a member of the Rochester Garden Club and contributed to the Girl Scouts of America. When Helen died in 1982 at the age of 97, she left her family estate to the Landmark Society of Western New York. In 1983, Mr. and Mrs. Ferranti purchased the Victorian mansion and sold the ‘Gothic House’ to Ben Kendig. In 1986, the Landmark Society officially opened the Ellwanger Garden as a historic landscape museum. Currently, the Victorian Mansion is owned by the Ferranti family and the Ellwanger Garden is owned by the Landmark Society.

---

77 Ibid, 4.
Fletcher Steele was a personal friend of Helen Ellwanger and often visited the property and designed various components of the estate from 1923 to 1967. The earliest drawing pertaining to the Ellwanger property is dated May 9, 1923 and is a detailed plan and elevation of the garden gateway and fence. Although this particular hornbeam slat fence was never constructed, it may have influenced the design of the wooden fence later constructed in the rose garden. In February of 1925, “Fletcher Steele designed a two acre ‘tree garden’ fronting McLean Street where the old packing shed of the Mt. Hope Nurseries had once stood.”

Here in a small valley below the carriage house, Steele planted numerous varieties of crabapples (*Malus* sp.), cherries (*Prunus* sp.), hawthorns (*Crataegus* sp.) and peaches (*Prunus* sp.). In the early 1930s, Steele began envisioning a contemporary ‘avant garde’ rose garden between the carriage house and the greenhouses for Helen’s tree peony collection. By 1936, Steele had completed the design and installation of the rose garden, forecourt wall and improvements to the entry driveway. Additional projects in 1939 included converting the porte-cochere into a ‘glass room’ and designing a sundeck. As of November 1967, Steele was still making visits to the property and advising Helen about tree cutting and ordering a *Magnolia macrophylla*.

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

In 1980, Helen Ellwanger gave the ‘Gothic House’ at 609 Mt. Hope Avenue to the Landmark Society and after her death in 1982 she also left ‘the Big House’ at 625 Mt. Hope Avenue to the Landmark Society. The Landmark Society sold both properties to private parties, but kept the George Ellwanger Garden. The property at 625 Mt. Hope is approximately 3.5 acres located on the western side of Mt. Hope Avenue. The property is bordered by McLean Street to the south and single family residences to the north, west and east. This property is a contributing component of the Mt. Hope/ Highland Avenue Preservation District. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the site by the author in August, 2003 (Figure 2.87).

---

80 Ibid, 19.
81 Fletcher Steele, Planting Plan for Flowering Fruit Garden- Northern Half, No. 48-? February 1925, Landmark Society of Western New York.
82 Helen C. Ellwanger to Fletcher Steele, 14 November 1967, Rochester Historical Society Fletcher Steele Papers.
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Spatial Organization

During Steele's involvement with the property the landscape was composed of four distinct spaces, the Edward Ellwanger Garden, and Steele's designed forecourt, rose garden and flowering fruit orchard. Although Steele may have advised the Ellwanger family concerning plants within the Edward Ellwanger garden, a full description of the garden's characteristics are not included. However, the garden was historically significant to the development of property and the spatial organization of Steele's three designed components. The Edward Ellwanger Garden extended the entire length of the front yard from Mt. Hope Avenue to the carriage house and between the entry drive to the south and forecourt to the north. Steele's forecourt was located between the Victorian mansion to the north and the Edward Ellwanger garden to the south with the forecourt wall to the east and the entrance driveway and island to the west. The ground plane consisted primarily of gravel and well manicured planting beds. Views were directed towards the mansion and the entrance gateway/path into the Edward Ellwanger garden. Steele's terraced rose garden was situated to the west of the Edward Ellwanger Garden and between the carriage house to the south and Helen's greenhouses to the north. The ground plane consisted of a network of geometric gravel paths, concrete stairs and well manicured planting beds. The rose garden was open to the sky with views contained in the garden. Although there are no historic photos of the flowering fruit orchard, a 1925 plan depicts the orchard was located to the west of the carriage house in a valley. The orchard was defined by steep topography to the north and east and surrounding woodland to the west and south. The orchard had a grassy ground plane with filtered views to the sky.

Currently, the Edward Ellwanger Garden is enclosed by a hemlock hedge separating the garden from the driveway along the western, eastern and portions of the southern edges. The northern edge consists of an overgrown massing of shrubs and trees. The forecourt space has not been well maintained and is used as a parking lot. The overgrown plant materials obscure the views of the mansion, forecourt wall and entrance gateway/path into the Edward Ellwanger garden. During renovations to the property in 1983, Steele's rose garden design was removed for additional parking. The space continues to be defined by the carriage house, western wall and Helen's green house, but has lost its sense of intimacy. The flowering fruit orchard in the valley has been forgotten, poorly maintained and allowed to revert to a dense woody area.
Circulation Systems

The circulation system consisted of a vehicular driveway and pedestrian paths in the forecourt and rose garden. The gravel driveway entered the property along the southern edge of the Edward Ellwanger garden and continued along the garden to the carriage house. At the carriage house the driveway curved up hill along the Edward Ellwanger Garden and terminated in the forecourt. In the forecourt there was a rectangular stone slab walkway leading from the gravel driveway to the front porch and a walkway leading down from the forecourt into the Edward Ellwanger garden. Just west of the forecourt, there was a densely planted island and set of stone stairs leading to Helen’s greenhouses and rose garden. Depicted in the 1936 plan of the rose garden a complex system of turf walks, gravel paths and colored concrete stairways connected the western portion of the forecourt and the western entrance to the greenhouses (Figure 2.88). In one of the rose beds, small rectangular stepping stones penetrated the bed for better access to the roses.

Since the 1983 renovations to the property, both the vehicular and pedestrian circulation has been altered. The driveway continues to enter the property along the southern side of the Edward Ellwanger Garden and curve uphill past the carriage house, but at this point the drive way splits and creates a loop around the island planting bed. The overgrown vegetation in the forecourt has hidden much of the stone slab walkway leading to the front porch and rendered passage into the Edward Ellwanger Garden near impossible. Since the removal of the rose garden in 1983, all of the turf walks, gravel paths and much of the colored concrete stairways are gone. The spiral staircase and concrete walls along the eastern and northwestern corner of the rose garden are the only extant components of the garden.

Topography

Historically and currently, the Victorian mansion sits at the highest point on the property. The forecourt was relatively flat sloping slightly away from the mansion and situated approximately four feet higher than the Edward Ellwanger garden. Steele’s rose garden had three primary terraces with an elevation change of approximately seven feet from the top of the spiral staircase diagonally down to the southeast corner of the garden. At a three to five percent slope downhill from the forecourt and rose garden was the carriage house and further down hill at a ten to fifteen percent slope was the flowering fruit orchard. From the orchard to the Mansion there was approximately a twenty feet difference.
Overall, the current topography of the site has only been altered when the rose garden was removed and the space was raised and leveled with gravel to accommodate additional parking.

**Vegetation Features**

The vegetation features, during Steele's involvement with the property, in the forecourt, rose garden, flowering fruit orchard and entrance driveway were well manicured and significantly different creating a series of outdoor rooms. The forecourt was edged with evergreen beds including yews (Taxis sp.), pachysandra (Pachysandra terminalis), and Colorado blue spruce (Picea pungens). Often large rectangular clay pots planted with agapanthus (Agapanthus orientalis) flanked either side of the entrance to the Ellwanger garden. The rose garden was the jewel of Steele's work on the property. The concrete, multileveled abstraction was designed to provide places for Helen's two hundred roses, many of them old and rare varieties. The layout was complex, jigsaw puzzle-like, but pragmatic too- paths, beds, stairs, and walls fit together to create maximum access to the plants themselves" (Figure 2.89). 83 “Hybrid teas are in the majority, with one bed devoted to 'old roses.' Some of these, including Hebe's Lip, Arabella, York and Lancaster came from historic Mount Gulian at Fishkill on Hudson, gifts from Mrs. William E. Verplanck". 84 In the planting bed encapsulated by the circular staircase were a pear tree (Pyrus sp.) and a variety of clay pots planted with woody shrubs. Surrounding the rose garden was a wooden fence supporting grapevines (Vitis sp.). The two acre flowering fruit orchard downhill from the rose garden and carriage house had a wide variety of flowering trees. Primarily the orchard included red and large red Siberian crabapple (Malus baccata var.), yellow Siberian crab (Malus baccata var.), transcendent crabapple (Malus baccata var.), oblong crabapple (Malus sp.), Japanese flowering crabapple (Malus floribunda var.), Kwansan cherry (Prunus serrulata 'Kwanzan'), weeping cherry (Prunus subhirtella 'Pendula'), hawthorne (Crataegus sp.) and honeysuckle (Lonicera sp.). 85 In order to divide the entrance driveway from the Ellwanger garden, Steele planted a row of approximately 40 hemlocks (Tsuga sp.).

---

85 Fletcher Steele, Planting Plan for Flowering Fruit Garden- Northern Half, No. 48-? February 1925, Landmark Society of Western New York.
Much of the historical plant material on the property has been removed or completely overgrown with volunteer species. The forecourt is lined with yews (*Taxus sp.*) and English ivy (*Hedera helix*). During the 1983 renovations, many of the rose plants from Steele’s rose garden were moved into the Edward Ellwanger garden before demolishing the rose garden and creating additional parking (Figure 2.90). A portion of the northern terrace remains and is planted with creeping junipers (*Juniperus horizontalis var.*), Rose of Sharon (*Hibiscus syriacus*) and English ivy (*Hedera helix*). Surrounding the spiral staircase are remnants of the grapevines (*Vitis sp.*), a large black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*), day lilies (*Hemerocallis sp.*) and Rose of Sharon (*Hibiscus syriacus*). The remains of the flowering fruit orchard have been overgrown with European ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*), tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) and poison ivy (*Taxicodendron radicans*). Of Steele’s three designed spaces, the hemlock hedge along the driveway is only extant vegetative feature.

*Constructed Water Features*

There were and are no constructed water features on the site.

*Small-Scale Features*

The small-scale features in Steele’s designed forecourt and rose garden added to the detailing and atmosphere of the property. The primary feature in the forecourt was the forecourt wall. The wall consisted of a series of terra cotta Spanish balustrade tiles and stone urns atop white stucco posts (Figure 2.91). The wall stretched from the mansion down into the Ellwanger Garden. Adjacent to the forecourt along the mansion, Steele proposed converting the porte-cochere into a glass room. In February 1939, Steele proposed an elaborate wrought iron lattice system within the glass room (Figure 2.92). From the forecourt there was a set of three stone stairs that lead to the rose garden (Figure 2.93). The rose garden had a number of small-scale features including a bird house, wooden fence, colored concrete walls and stairways, ribbon glass wall and a stone seating bench. The wooden bird house was situated in the northeastern corner of the garden and stood approximate ten feet tall. The simple wooden fence had a wrought iron archway over the entrance in the northeastern corner. The strong pink colored concrete walls
and stairs were used in the terraces, pathways and the spiral staircase. Along the western edge of the garden, near the cutting garden was a stone bench fixed to the bottom portion of the spiral staircase.

Of the current property the forecourt wall, glass room and some small-scale features in the rose garden remain. The forecourt wall is intact, but many of the white stucco posts and stone urns are cracking or broken (Figure 2.94). The iron work in the glass room is still intact. The only features of the rose garden to remain are the northern concrete terraces and the spiral staircase. During the 1983 renovation the remaining the pink concrete walls were masked with a natural stone veneer.

**Condition of the Landscape**

Each of the three spaces that Steele designed, the forecourt, rose garden and flowering fruit orchard have not been maintained or have been demolished. Of the three, the forecourt is in the best condition with the forecourt wall still intact, but the lack of maintenance and need for repair has altered the once pristine and welcoming space. The curvilinear concrete stairs and retaining walls are all that remain of a once aromatic and delightful rose garden. The flowering fruit orchard much like the rest of the property has been forgotten and poorly maintained. The spaces that Steele initially designed for Helen Ellwanger have lost their integrity, but the remaining components of these spaces are still significant to the overall design Steele created and his experimentation with new construction materials during his career. Due to the removal and poorly maintained spaces, the overall physical condition of the landscape is in poor condition.

---

85 Fletcher Steele, Lattice in the Glass Room, No. 48-51 February 1939, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
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Client #49: Ms. Helen Cresswell Ellwanger

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719

This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-14: Photograph Album: Client 48 Photos of property.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 6: File 5- Folder 49 Four drawings of garden, fence and birdhouse.

Loose Plans d49-2 Planting plan April 24, 1923.

Photograph Collection:

L5920: 35mm Contact Prints: General views of rose garden.

Photostatic Print Collection:


Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC Album 1 (15 plates): plan, forecourt, rose garden, bird house and general views

Client Order Book Collection:

Planting and layout plans for Ellwanger Garden can also be found at Landmark Society of Western New York.

Client order references can also be found at Rochester Historic Society Fletcher Steele Papers.
Figure 2.87: Existing site plan for a portion of the Ferranti property including the George Ellwanger garden owned by the Landmark Society of Western New York, June 2003. Red line indicates the extent of Steele's involvement with the property. (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.88: Rose Garden plan, April 9, 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.89: View of the Rose Garden from the spiral staircase looking towards the carriage house, 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.90: View of the parking lot where the Rose Garden once was, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.91: View of the Spanish style Forecourt wall, July 1939 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.92: Lattice in the Glass Room, February 1939 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.93: View of the rose garden fence and bird house from the Forecourt, 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.94: Current condition of the Forecourt wall and plant materials, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owners: Mr. and Mrs. Ed and Kim Kay
Client # 375 Mr. and Mrs. Frederick T. Pierson
Kolaneka Farms
55 Mitchell Road
Pittsford, New York 14534

Site History

In 1903, Mr. Francis B. Mitchell purchased the Italianate residence and 283 acres of land on
Mitchell Road. Farm improvements included a race track at the corner of Marsh Road and Route 31, a
chicken coop located at present day 28 Mitchell Road and hiring landscape architect Alling Deforest to
landscape the estate.87 Alling DeForest’s 1913 planting plan called for a wrap around terrace surrounding
the music wing and a vegetable and rose garden further east of the residence. A semicircular entrance
driveway brought visitors to the front entrance while a service driveway and court were west of the
residence. A barn and carriage house were built and located northwest of the residence. In December of
1918, the main house burned from a chimney fire and “…in 1922, Mr. Mitchell rebuilt the Colonial
Revival style residence from plans by Gordon and Kaelber…”88 After Francis B. Mitchell’s death in 1924,
he left the 283 acre farm to his favorite niece Deeta C.M. Pierson. Shortly after marrying Frederick
Pierson, Jr. (date unknown), Deeta changed the farm’s interests from horses to dairy cows and enlarged the
east wing by adding a guest room above the library. Shortly afterward Deeta’s death in 1968 her two sons
subdivided the property for single family residences, leaving the initial property and structures at 55
Mitchell Road intact. Mr. and Mrs. Lyndon Wells, Jr. purchased the property and owned the property for
the next 30 years. During their ownership, the Wells hired landscape designer Ted Collins Associates, Ltd.
to update the foundation landscaping. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Kay purchased the property in
1998.

In 1931, Fletcher Steele was hired by Mr. Frederick T. and Deeta C.M. Pierson to create designs
for portions of the property. Reusing most of DeForest’s 1913 plan, Steele primarily focused on
redesigning the northern and eastern yards and pedestrian entranceways to the residence. For the north
terrace on March 20, 1931, Steele had designed a large rectangular turf panel with semicircular stairs
leading down to the meadow, a squash court, iron and stone steps of the back porch and a balustrade

87 Derek T. McKelvey, “The History of Kolaneka Farms” (High School Research Paper, Pittsford High
School, 1979), 7-8, 11.
wrapping around the porch’s turf terrace (Figure 2.95). Although the turf panel, squash court, and iron and stone steps were never built, orders were place on June 23, 1931 for a balustrade with a carved head on two sides of the rail over the balusters. In August of 1931, Steele placed orders for “Wrought Iron and Cast Iron Piazza Grille, Wrought Iron Steps and Extra Pattern work”, “two (2) Red Medina Stone Treads” in accordance with plans No. 375-19 and 375-21 and “Flagstone and Setting Iron Steps”. The Piazza Grille was used as lattice framing the entranceway from the porch to the turf terrace. In addition to the balustrade and iron work, Steele ordered evergreens, perennials and ground cover for an unknown location on the property. Between 1931 and 1936, Steele created drawing 375-24 “Study for Nursery Garden” which combines his earlier design for the northern yard (Figure 2.96). The east yard underwent further redesign in December 1936 “Study of the East Garden” where Steele proposed another rectilinear turf panel terminating at a semicircular water feature (Figure 2.97). Of Steele’s designs for the east garden, the turf panel and portions of the circulation system were implemented. Then in January of 1937 Steele redesigned the north terrace proposing a smaller version of his rectangular turf panel surrounded by planting materials (Figure 2.98). Portions of this design may have been implemented due to the plant orders that followed in 1936 to 1938 that make reference to the north terrace.

Historical/Existing Conditions

When the Kay’s purchased 55 Mitchell Road, their purchase included approximately 18 acres of the original 290 acre parcel. The property is located north of Mitchell Road with single family residences to the east, west and south of the property.

Spatial Organization

When Steele was hired in 1931, he proposed landscape designs for the back and eastern side yards. Although drawings 375-6 north terrace design, 375-24 study for nursery garden, 375-31 study of the

89 Fletcher Steele to Hollister Lumber Company, Ltd, 23 June 1931, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
90 Fletcher Steele to W. A. Snow Iron Works, Inc., 13 August 1931, Fletcher Steele to Whitmore, Rauber & Vicimus, 18 August 1931, and Fletcher Steele to 13 August, 1931, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives. These two plans 375-19 and 375-21 are not in the archive, but Steele’s scrapbook has photographs of the installed iron lattice work.
east garden and 375-35 the north terrace were never fully implemented, components such as the porch turf
terrace, and large lawn panel in the back yard and east garden were. A photograph taken in April 1931
depicts a gently rolling lawn in the back yard overlooking fields and a meadow. Along the house, a
deciduous and horizontal juniper hedge enclosed the porch’s rectangular lawn terrace filtering views of the
meadows to the north and leaving open views of the greenhouse to the north (Figure 2.99). The spatial
organization of the east garden is unknown.

The current arrangement of the backyard continues to include the porch’s turf terrace and a turf
panel, but the spatial arrangement is more open than Steele suggested (Figure 2.100). The sloping rolling
lawn in the north terrace has been terraced creating two flat lawn panels, the upper lawn terrace and the
lower terrace stretching to the northern meadow. Views of the agrarian landscape are uninterrupted. A
tennis court and row of deciduous trees define the eastern edge with the carriage house and another row of
mature deciduous and evergreen trees defining the western boundary. The east garden has a semicircular
space at the western end of the axis, very similar to Steele’s proposal in drawing 375-31 study of the east
garden. The large rectangular turf panel is defined by dense rows of evergreen plantings along the
northern and southern edges. Views are contained within the space and open to the sky.

Circulation

Steele continued to utilize DeForest’s circulation layout of the semicircular entrance driveway in
the front yard and a network of service driveways in the service yard to the west of the house, but proposed
new pedestrian circulation in the northern and eastern yards. Of the design proposals for the property,
Steele’s porch turf terrace and medina stone stairways were implemented. As a subspace of the back
porch, the rectangular turf terrace had a medina stone stairway in the southeast corner. The medina stone
stairway led from the turf terrace down to the east garden. In the east garden, sets of stone stairs were
implemented according to plan 375-31 study of the east garden. The proposed pathways for this design
were never implemented.

The current circulation patterns in the front and service yards continue to represent DeForest’s
original design for the property. In the backyard, the porch turf terrace, medina stone stairway and steps in
the east garden are extant. An additional three to four feet wide opening was created in the balustrade to
allow for a second stairway along the northern edge of the turf terrace. A long rectangular wooden deck spanning the entire length of the western wing was added at an unknown date. Remaining in the east garden are four stone stairways, one leading towards the current tennis court, two in the sunken semicircular space and one where the northern pedestrian pathway would have been (Figure 2.101).

Topography

Historically the backyard had a gently rolling slope starting at the porch and continuing down to the northern meadow. The current backyard has been terraced to create two relatively flat spaces, one as the porch turf panel and the lower terrace adjacent to the residence. At the far northern side of the lawn, the yard slopes gently away then gradually at an increasing steepness towards the fields. Situated approximately seven feet lower than the porch terrace, the east garden is relatively flat and two to three feet lower than Mitchell Road.

Vegetation Features

In May of 1931, Steele began placing orders for plant and stone materials. On May 27th, Steele ordered two Chinese fleecevine (*Polygonum auberti*) and two fox grape (*Vitis labrusca*).\(^1\) Then in September of 1931 a large plant order was placed for evergreen shrubs including twenty five rose daphne (*Daphne cneorum*) and fifty bigleaf wintercreeper (*Euonymus radicans vegetus*); perennials including fifty pink English Daisy (*Bellis perennis pink*), twenty five silver alyssum (*Alyssum argenteum*), fifty Christmas rose (*Helleborus niger*), fifty crested iris (*Iris cristata*), fifty houseleek (*Sempervivum laggeri*), two varieties of columbine (*Aquilegia sp.*), seven varieties of bellflower (*Campanula sp.*), eight varieties of dahlia (*Dahlia sp.*) and five varieties of pink (*Dianthus sp.*).\(^2\) It is unknown where vines, evergreens and perennials were planted on the property, but Mrs. Pierson did have a large greenhouse and potting house where she propagated much of the farm’s plants.\(^3\) After Steele had proposed his 1937 redesign for the north terrace, plant orders were placed for forty Swiss stone pines (*Pinus cembra*) and eighty dwarf mugo

---

\(^1\) Steele to Bay State Nurseries, Inc., 27 May 1931, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
\(^2\) Fletcher Steele to N. A. Hallauer, 1 September 1931, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
\(^3\) Mitchell Pierson, Jr. grandson of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Pierson, telephone interview with author, Rochester, New York, 20 January 2004.
pines (*Pinus mugo*) to be planted in the north terrace. Little information exists concerning the vegetation in the east garden. From Steele’s 1931 photographs, the western end of the garden is depicted having a semicircular planting of cedars and mature deciduous and other evergreens in the distance.

During the 1980s or 1990s, Ted Collins, Inc., redesigned the foundation planting surrounding the residence. The back yard has remained an open turf panel, but the foundation plantings along the house now include azaleas (*Rhododendron* sp.), Carolina Rhododendron (*Rhododendron carolinianum*), Catawba Rhododendron (*Rhododendron catawbiense* var. Nova Zembla) and daylilies (*Hemerocallis* sp.). In the porch’s turf terrace are a pink flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida rubra*) and Andorra junipers (*Juniperus andorra*). A little leaf linden (*Tilia cordata*) and Katherine Crabapple (*Malus ‘Katherine’*) partially screen the tennis court on the east side and pines (*Pinus sp.*) to the west screen the carriage house. The east garden is characterized by tall and densely planted evergreens along the northern and southern edges. Although the 1938 plant order for 40 Swiss stone pines and 80 dwarf mountain pines was meant for the north terrace, these plantings were most likely moved to the east garden considering the evergreen edges consist of mature Swiss stone pines and dwarf mountain pines. A large oak dominates the southwestern portion of the space with a few cedars remaining in the western semicircular space.

**Constructed Water Features**

In Steele’s 1936 redesign for the east garden he proposed a circular water feature terminating the eastern end of the space. The water feature was never built and currently no water features are on the property.

**Small-Scale Features**

After the balustrade for the porch’s turf terrace was ordered in June 1931, September 1931 photographs depict the installed balustrade (Figure 2.102). Also in the turf terrace were wrought iron and cast iron piazza grilles. Used as trellises, the eight highly ornate grilles each 8 to 10 inches wide and eight feet tall adorned the entrance to the turf terrace from the stone patio (Figure 2.103). The medina stone and

---

94 Fletcher Steele to Cherry Hill Nursery, 22 April 1938, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.
setting iron steps were constructed as the eastern staircase from the turf terrace to the east garden. It is unknown what small scale features historically were found in the east garden.

The only small scale features to remain on the property are the balustrade and cast iron piazza grilles. A section of the northern balustrade in the turf terrace has been removed for addition stone steps leading to the backyard. The wrought iron and cast iron piazza grilles were removed from the turf terrace at an unknown date and all eight since then have been stored in the carriage house cellar (Figure 2.104).

**Condition of the Landscape**

Although Steele created large scale designs for the north terrace and east garden, they were never fully implemented. Plant materials and small-scale features such as Median stone treads, flagstone and iron steps, wrought iron and cast iron piazza grilles and a balustrade enclosing the porch's turf terrace were built. Of the built work, the balustrade and stone steps remain, but the overall character of the porch area has been altered through the removal of the iron grilles and addition of contemporary plantings. The design work that Steele created for the Pierson's represents his interest in details. The wrought iron trellises, balustrade and stone stairs are common elements he repeats throughout his career. Although this property is significant for its association with Steele and characteristic of his type of work during this period of his career, it is not overly significant in comparison to his total body of work. The overall physical condition of the landscape is in poor condition.
Client # 375 Mr. and Mrs. Frederick T. Pierson

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

FSMC: Photograph Book L-6, page 69.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-24: Photograph Album: Client 375 Photos of backyard and residence.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 3: File 26- Folder 375 four drawings for the north terrace and east garden.


Photograph Collection:

L5202: 35mm Contact Prints: Photos of residence and landscape

Photostatic Print Collection:


Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.95: North Terrace design, March 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.96: Study for Nursery Garden in east yard, nd (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.97: Study of the East Garden, December 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.98: Redesign for the North Terrace, January 1937 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.99: View of the porch and hedges surrounding the turf terrace and cedars in the east garden, April 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.100: View of the porch and turf terrace with the east garden cedars in the background, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.101: Looking western from the east garden to the turf terrace stairway and balustrade, August 2003 (Photograph by author).

Figure 2.102: Balustrade after installation in turf terrace, September 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).
Figure 2.103: Wrought iron and cast iron piazza grilles in entranceway to turf terrace from the porch, September 1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.104: Wrought iron and cast iron piazza grilles in the carriage house cellar, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph and Karen Rulison
Client #409: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Taylor
1166 Clover Street
Rochester, New York 14610

Site History

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Taylor built the colonial revival residence in 1908. Joseph ("Tom") F. Taylor was president of the Bausch and Lomb Optical Company during the 1930s and 1940s. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Rulison, purchased the property from Joseph Taylor’s son in 1991.

"Joseph F. Taylor, for whom Steele started a garden in Rochester in 1936, found his good friend’s high-priced methods especially exasperating and wrote to voice his objections to a large bill. For nine hundred dollars all Taylor had to show, he said, was a pink stone platform and plans for lattice to surround it. Steele’s reply to Taylor’s complaint was characteristic; he managed to be conciliatory without yielding."95

The garden design that eventually developed included decorative wood lattice trellises on either side of a bluestone terrace, "...and a 'pink platform' that defined the sunken lawn panel."96 By June of 1942, the lattice trellises and bluestone terrace were in place and additional drawings were begun for a sunken lawn panel and terrace steps. Details of the terrace steps drawn in April 1946, illustrate a large deciduous tree central to the design and stone faced steps leading down to a lawn panel. Photographs taken in May of 1947 show the sunken lawn panel, arborvitae arches, lattice trellises and stone urns atop square stone pedestals in the back yard garden. "When the Taylors considered adding a new room to the back of the house in 1948, Steele became protective of the axis in his design."97 In response to the Taylor’s proposal, Steele created a garden plan for the remainder of the backyard garden in October of 1948 (Figure 2.105). The building addition and proposed expansions to the garden were never built.

Historic/Existing Conditions

The property historically and currently is approximately one acre situated on the east side of Clover Street. The properties to the north, south and east are all single family residences. An existing condition plan was created during the initial visit to the site by the author in August 2003 (Figure 2.106).

96 Ibid, 214.
97 Ibid.
Spatial Organization

The 1948 garden plan for the back yard at the Taylor residence consisted of two terraces, one a rectangular raised bluestone terrace and the other a sunken square turf panel surrounded by stone stairs. The raised bluestone terrace was enclosed by the residence to the west and lattice screens to the north and south. The views were directed towards the large deciduous tree within the sunken turf panel which provided an overhead plane (Figure 2.107). The turf panel was enclosed by a series of three arching arborvitae hedges along the northern and southern edges. Again the views were left open and directed toward the eastern end of the yard. The 1948 garden plan displays the eastern half of the yard enclosed by a proposed system of repeating semi-circular alcoves and a second raised terrace with stairs at the far eastern end. The semi-circular alcoves and eastern terrace were never built.

The overall character of the terrace spaces have been severely altered by the removal of the wood lattice trellises, large central deciduous tree and arborvitae hedges (*Thuja* sp.) (Figure 2.108). Three foot high deciduous shrubs have replaced the lattice and arborvitae hedges. Although the space no longer has a feeling of enclosure, the open views toward the east end of the property have been maintained.

Circulation

The approximately thirty-six by twenty feet bluestone terrace with pink medina stone edging located adjacent to the building was the formal entrance to the garden. To the east of the raised bluestone terrace was a sunken turf panel. Encircling the approximately forty by thirty feet rectangular shaped turf panel was a set of two stone steps and eight to ten feet tall evergreen hedges. At the far eastern end, Steele proposed another raised stone terrace and a set of stairs. There were no defined pathways connecting the turf panel with the proposed eastern terrace.

The current circulation system consists of a vehicular driveway, a pedestrian walkway, bluestone terrace and stone steps in the backyard. The linear asphalt driveway widens from a ten to twelve feet lane to over twenty feet just east of the residence to accommodate the four bay garage in the northeast corner of the lot. In the backyard, a linear three foot wide concrete walkway has been added at an unknown date to provide access from the secondary rear entrance to the driveway and the existing bluestone terrace. Two
small bluestone terraces have also been added at an unknown date along the concrete walkway. The bluestone terrace with pink stone edging and turf panel enclosed by stone stairs are extant.

**Topography**

The property historically and current slopes down toward Clover Street at a one to three percent slope and in the backyard towards the rear of the property also at a one to three percent slope.

**Vegetation Features**

Although the 1948 plan suggests additional plant material at the far eastern end of the property, the proposed design including plant materials was never built. Even though there are photographs of the terrace and plantings, there is no plant list or order forms to confirm the plant materials used at the property. The 1942 to 1947 photographs illustrate plant materials in the bluestone terrace including deciduous shrubs used to weave through the lattice trellis and smaller deciduous shrubs such as rhododendrons (*Rhododendron* sp.). Along the northern and southern sides of the turf panel were symmetrical plantings of three arching arborvitaes (*Thuja* sp.) with four upright arborvitaes or cedars anchoring the corners of the terrace (Figure 2.109). A large deciduous tree was the focal point of the garden.

The evergreen garden has since been removed at an unknown date and replaced with three foot tall shrubs and herbs including potentilla (*Potentilla fruticosa*), mint (*Mentha* sp.) and gray dogwood (*Cornus racemosa*). In place of the four upright arborvitaes or cedars a single upright yew has been planted in the south west corner of the turf panel planting beds. Two mature oaks in the eastern half of the backyard take the place of the proposed terrace.

**Constructed Water Features**

There were and currently are no constructed water features on the property.
Small-Scale Features

The photographs taken between 1942 and 1947 document the stone urns and wood lattice trellises used in the backyard garden. Placed on top of stone pillars in the two eastern corners of the sunken turf panel, the two stone urns and pillars stood approximately two to three feet tall at the inside corners of the eastern planting beds along the stone steps (Figure 2.110). The photographs also depict the approximately ten feet tall decorative wood lattice trellises surrounding the blue and pink stone raised terrace in a semi-circular fashion at the northern and southern ends of the terrace and along the back of the building (Figure 2.111). Small deciduous trees were planted behind the semi-circular lattice with intentions to weave the branches through the tiny squares in the lattice.98 There was also a small linear planting bed with climbing plants at the base of the lattice on the building.

The decorative wood lattice trellises and stone urns and pillars have been removed from the property at an unknown date (Figure 2.112).

Condition of the Landscape

The garden design that Steele created for the Taylor’s was an excellent example of Steele’s assimilation of landscape design features he studied while in Europe and his experimentation with wood lattice, topiary and relationship of sunken and raised terraces. The overall characteristic of the garden has been altered through the years by the removal of key features such as the lattice trellises, plant materials and other small scale features. Although the bluestone with pink edging terrace and stone work in the sunken turf panel are extant, the garden has lost its integrity. Due to the extent of alterations to the property and condition of the terraces, the garden is in poor physical condition.

98 Ibid.
Client #409: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Taylor

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, (315) 470-6719

This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 11: Loose plans: Details of cresting d-7B June 25, 1936
Flat File: Drawer 11: Loose plans: garden plan d-20 October 1948
Flat File: Drawer 11: Loose plans: Details of terrace steps d-15 April 2, 1946

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 10 (4 plates): sunken turf terrace, lattice and bluestone patio
Figure 2.105: Garden plan for the Taylor residence, October 1948 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).
Figure 2.106: Existing condition plan for the Rulison property, August 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.107: Looking westward towards the residence at the large deciduous tree in the sunken turf panel, May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.108: Looking westward towards the residence after the removal of the deciduous and evergreen plantings and the lattice screens, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.109: Looking southward across the terraces towards the arching arborvitaes, May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.110: Looking northwest across the sunken turf terrace towards the stone urn and wood lattice, May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.111: View of the bluestone terrace and pink platform with the decorative wood lattice trellises and an unknown woman, June 1942 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.112: View of the bluestone terrace and pink platform after the large deciduous tree and lattice have been removed, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
DEMOLISHED

Rhythm swings close as night turns to day and day to twilight; spring to summer and year to year. The landscape architect can bring rhythm to focus by his selection and location of materials. His work lacks the tense drama and climax of great poetry and music. But it has one precious advantage over them. Landscape architecture is part of nature itself. The story does not end. On it goes, getting more and more interesting as we get old and have time to understand.

- Fletcher Steele
THE DIOCESAN HOUSE
Current Owner: The Episcopal Diocese of Rochester
Client #30: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen and Elizabeth Sibley Stebbins
935 East Avenue
Rochester, New York 14608

Site History

The Tudor style residence was built in 1913 by Rufus A. Sibley (President of Sibley, Lindsay and
Curr, then largest department store in Rochester) as a wedding present for his daughter Elizabeth Adams
Sibley.99 Her new husband was Kingman Nott Robins (Treasurer of Associated Mortgage Investment, Inc).100
Elizabeth continued to live in the home after Kingman Robins died in February of 1923. In 1928 she married
Edwin Allen Stebbins (soon to be president of Rochester Savings Bank).101 Edwin Stebbins died in 1954 and
shortly there after, Elizabeth also died. After the death of Edwin and Elizabeth Stebbins in 1954, the property
was purchased on December 31, 1954 by the Episcopal Diocese of Rochester for office space.102 The Episcopal
Diocese is the current owner of the property.

In 1914, Fletcher Steele was commissioned to design a garden landscape for the Robins. By September
of 1915 Steele had a general plan for the arrangement of the property.103 It is unclear if Steele designed the front
terrace, but by July of 1917, a planting bed was created at the base of the terrace and earth work begun on
creating the tea garden.104 In December of 1923, Steele was working on a sketch for a wooden garden shelter.
Although never built, a 1923 photo of the site shows a stone walkway in the proposed area for the shelter. A
general plan for the property including the tea and rose garden was drafted in October of 1930 (Figure 2.113).
Early 1930 photos of the tea garden depict a stone and brick bench and matching table, seating walls, turf panel,
stone walkways, wooden posts and wrought iron fencing. Later that year, working drawings were being created
for the rose garden and the garden fountain. From 1930-1934 additional drawings were created pertaining to the

99 “Membership Reception at the Diocesan House” (Yearly Membership meeting for the Landmark Society of
100 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
102 Ibid.
103 Drawing #30-2A, General Plan for Arrangement created on September 1915, is listed in the SUNY-ESF
Fletcher Steele Archives as an available resource, but was unable to locate the drawing.
104 In the SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archive Scrapbook Collection are five photographs depicting the earliest
implemented design work on the property. The parapet terrace is depicted as a completed element of the front
yard with work just beginning on the tea garden leading to believe the terrace was built along with the mansion.
rose garden arches and iron railing supports.\textsuperscript{105} The initial planting and layout of the rose garden was completed by August 1931, with the fountain, iron arches and railings added between July 1932 and July 1935. Steele's work on the Stebbins property continued through the placement of orders for fertilizers, cottage and breeder tulips, rhododendrons, hydrangeas, other woody plant materials and various hybrid tea roses from 1942 to 1949.

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

Historically and currently the site is approximately 1.4 acres situated on the southeast corner of Barrington Street and East Avenue. This property is a contributing resource to the East Avenue Preservation District which includes an impressive promenade of mansions built in the early 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Across the street to the north are the Hutchinson House and George Eastman House. To the east lies a single family residence converted into apartments and to the south a single family residence. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the property by the author in June 2003 (Figure 2.114).

**Spatial Organization**

Historically, the property was composed of three primary spaces, the front yard, tea garden and backyard including the rose garden. The front yard had a grass lawn with an open view to East Avenue framed by deciduous plant material along the eastern and western edges (Figure 2.115). The tea garden along the eastern edge divided the front and back yard providing an outdoor room extension of the indoor solarium. In the tea garden the central grass panel allowed for open views to the sky while the wrought iron fencing, and brick/stone walls provided a sense of enclosure. Other vertical elements included a brick seating bench and taller deciduous trees along the eastern edge creating a backdrop when viewed from the solarium's brick terrace.\textsuperscript{106} The rear of the property had a mixture of lawn and dense planting beds on the ground plane (Figure 2.116). The planting beds obscured the views of the rose garden from the tea garden and camouflaged the compost pile.

\textsuperscript{105} Additional information and drawings of the Rose Garden fence, trellis and fountain are available in the photostatic print collection, Folders 144 and 145, SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives.

\textsuperscript{106} The Stebbins mansion was a center for dinners, meetings and elaborate parties. Mrs. Stebbins was described by her good friend, Georgianna Sibley as "a most gracious lady" who would serve cocktails from the solarium and entertain on the solarium's terrace. “Notes about the Diocesan House” (available at the Episcopal Diocese of Rochester at 935 East Avenue).
south of the tea garden. The rose garden was centrally located in the back yard with vertical elements including wrought iron arches and railings surrounding the space. A red brick garage to the west and stone wall or fence along the southern edges directed views toward the rose garden.

The spatial organization of the current property consists of the front yard and back yard. The front yard has a lawn with views open to East Avenue, but the views are not framed in the same manner as they were in 1917 (Figure 2.117). The eastern and rear portions of the property were severely altered shortly after the Episcopal Diocese bought the property in 1955. Once used to divide the front lawn from the rear of the property, the tea garden was demolished and replanted with grass creating open views to the back yard. A large asphalt parking lot has replaced the lawn and raised planting beds in the backyard (Figure 2.118). The existing garage continues to enclose the parking lot to the west while a gradually thinning line of deciduous trees to the east provide partial views into the neighboring yard.

*Circulation Systems*

The circulation system in the 1930 general plan includes a front walkway and terrace, walkways in the tea garden and back yard, and a vehicular driveway. The front pedestrian walkway, material unknown, was intended to run perpendicular to Barrington Street and end at the red brick parapet terrace, but was built as a sweeping curve from the sidewalk to the middle of the terrace. In the tea garden, a small raised rectangular stone patio with three stone stairs provided access from the solarium to the tea garden. The rectangular flagstone walkway in the tea garden surrounded the central turf panel and provided a connection between the solarium and the back yard. In the back yard two walkways, one connecting the rose garden to the porte-cochere and the other running parallel with the southern edge of the property do not appear in historic photographs. It is assumed that these two pedestrian walkways were never implemented. The single lane light-colored brick vehicular driveway ran along the southern side of the residence under the porte-cochere turning into the garage and exited onto Barrington Street.

Significant changes were made to the site circulation system after 1955. The three foot wide red brick front pedestrian walkway is extant and widens as it reaches the concrete stairs up to the parapet terrace. Although the tea garden no longer exists, to accommodate the American Disabilities Act, a concrete ramp
system was added south of the converted chapel. The original driveway entrance still remains, but was paved with asphalt when a second single lane asphalt driveway was added to the southern side of the garage in 1961. The second driveway is used as the primary entrance into the large L-shaped asphalt parking lot. The two driveways create an entrance and exit loop through the parking lot and back out onto Barrington Street.

*Topography*

The topography of the site sloped away from the residence towards East Avenue and Barrington Street as shown in historic photos. The tea garden and area around the rose garden were relatively flat. Existing topography of the site still slopes away from the residence with a slightly increased slope of one to three percent towards Barrington Street. The back parking lot slopes to the south.

*Vegetation Features*

Throughout the property there were mature deciduous trees, a collection of perennials and shrubs in the tea garden and a variety of roses in the rose garden. A purple beech (*Fagus sylvatica* 'Purpurea') was the focal point of the front yard with a massing of deciduous trees along the eastern property line. The tea garden had a central turf panel, with tree roses (*rosa* sp.), a variety of ivy, annuals and perennials planted to either side of the brick and stone bench and a variety of ferns and deciduous trees planted behind the bench. At each of the four corners along the flagstone walkway a wooden planter box was placed. Within the planting beds along the wood and wrought iron fencing a variety of annuals, perennials and flowering shrubs were planted. The back yard vegetation consisted of a few scattered maples (*Acer* sp.), elms (*Ulmus* sp.) and apples (*Malus* sp.). As of 1947 the raised planting beds consisted of a variety of deciduous and evergreen shrubs and small trees including shadblow serviceberry (*Amelanchier canadensis*), cockspur hawthorne (*Crataegus crusgalli*), alpine current (*Ribes alpinum*) and common lilac (*Syringa vulgaris*). Along the walkway near the proposed shelter, Amanogawa cherries (*Prunus serrulata* var.) were suggested in the 1930 plan, but never planted. Within the rose

---

107 After the Episcopal Diocese purchased the property, Mrs. Stebbins solarium was converted into a chapel and the solarium terrace now serves as the ADA entrance into the mansion.
108 Henry Kohankie & Son to Mr. Edwin A. Stebbins, 15 May 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
garden were many tree and shrub roses including hybrid tea rose varieties, “Mary Margaret McBride”, “Betty Urichard”, “Countess Vandal” and “Etoile de Hollande”.  

Many of the vegetation features in the front yard, the tea garden and the rose garden have been replaced or removed after the late 1950s. The front yard is primarily lawn except for a purple beech (*Fagus sylvatica* ‘Purpurea’), and three sugar maples (*Acer saccharum*) along East Avenue. The plantings at the base of the front terrace include mugo pines (*Pinus mugo*), Japanese boxwood (*Buxus microphylla*), hydrangea (*Hydrangea sp.*) and bearded iris (*Iris x germanica*). The back yard has copper beeches (*Fagus sylvatica* v.) and sugar maples (*Acer saccharum*) bordering the eastern and southern edges of the parking lot. Along Barrington Street, a large oak (*Quercus sp.*) and an apple tree (*Malus sp.*) flank either side of the southern driveway. The foundation plantings surrounding the bookstore include barberries (*Berberis sp.*) and yews (*Taxus sp.*).  

**Constructed Water Features**

A water fountain enclosed by an elaborate wrought iron structure was the proposed central element for the rose garden. A concrete base for the water feature was completed however no historic photographs depict the completed fountain or wrought iron enclosure.

Today the water feature along with the rose garden was demolished in 1961 for the parking lot.

**Small-Scale Features**

In the front yard, a set of four curved concrete stairs and red brick parapet terrace provided a grand entrance to the mansion. Along the eastern edge of the tea garden were red brick and stone capped walls two to three feet tall, a semi-circular stone bench and circular table (Figure 2.119). Defining the garden’s northern and southern edges was a wrought iron and wood fence five to six feet tall and rolled stone edging defined the planting beds. An opening in the southern fence flanked by two red brick stone capped pillars connected the backyard to the tea garden (Figure 2.120). Adorning the garden in each of the corners were square wooden planter boxes two feet tall. On the ground plane in the rose garden were decorative stone, stone and iron edging  

---

109 Additional roses ordered included Mme. Jules Bouche (white pink), Pink Dawn (pink) The Doctor (pink), Condessa de Sastago, Golden Rapture and Poinsettia. Bay State Nurseries to Mr. Edwin A. Stebbins, 21 April 1947 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
Surrounding the rose garden was an elaborate system of wrought iron fencing, arches and railings (Figure 2.122).

The concrete stairs and red brick parapet terrace in the front yard are extant. Of the gardens, all that remains of small scale features are a linear section of rolled stone edging and a vine-covered weathered section of the red brick stone capped walls along the eastern edge of the tea garden (Figure 2.123).

**Condition of Landscape**

After the Episcopal Diocese purchased the property, the tea garden was demolished c.1955 and the rose garden demolished in 1961 for parking (Figure 2.124). Of the two gardens, linear rolled stone edging embedded in the grass and a section of weathered red brick wall along the eastern property line are all that remain. The Stebbins was Steele’s first major clients in the Rochester metropolitan area. The creation of the tea and rose garden strongly depict Steele’s changing design styles and influence of the modernist idiom. If still intact today, the Stebbins property would be a significant component of Steele’s overall body of work. However, since the tea and rose gardens have been destroyed, there are no physical remains of the design and thus considered demolished.
Client #30: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen and Elizabeth Sibley Stebbins

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

FSMC: Photograph Book L-6, page 72.

 Scrapbook Collection:

L-14: Photograph Album: Client 30 Residence Exteriors and Landscapes.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 8, Folder 30-25 Blueprint of Garden Shelter.
Loose Drawing: 30-2A: General Plan for Arrangement, September 1915.

Photograph Collection:

L5352: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views; Rose Garden.
L5425: 35mm Contact Prints: General Views; Rose Garden.

Photostatic Print Collection:

FSPPX: Folder 144: Rose Garden Plan, d-59 October 6, 1930 revised November 17, 1930; Section Through Rose Garden, d-68 December 18, 1930; Rose Garden Fence, d-73A October 10, 1931; Iron Rose Support, d-77 September 20, 1933.
FSPPX: Folder 145: Fountain In The Rose Garden, d-nn December 10, 1930; Rose Garden Trellis, d-79 February 1934; Full Size Detail Of Finial, d-85 September 1934; Detail Of Finial d-86 October 1934.

Study Print Collection:


Client Order Book Collection:

Figure 2.113: Site plan for the tea and rose garden, October 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.114: Existing site plan for the Episcopal Diocese offices, June 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.115: View of the front yard and brick terrace from East Avenue, c.1917 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.116: Southeastern view of the planting mound dividing the grass area from the rose garden, c.1916 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.117: View of the front yard and brick terrace from Barrington Street, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.118: Southeast view of the backyard where the planting mounds once were, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.119: View of the brick and stone seating bench, walls and circular table at the northeastern end of the tea garden, c.1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.120: View of the stepped entrance to the tea garden, c.1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).
Figure 2.121: View of the rose garden with central water feature, wrought iron trellises and fencing, July 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.122: View of the rose garden trellis and treatment of planting beds, July 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.123: View of the remaining rolled stone edging and stone walkway along the northern side of the tea garden, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.124: View of the parking lot, the original site of the rose garden, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Mr. Thomas R. Frey and Mrs. Jacqueline Cady
Client #31 Mrs. George Clifford Buell
56 Berkeley Street
Rochester, NY 14607

Site History

The 2 ¼ story Colonial Revival residence was originally built by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cartwright in 1897 on the grounds of what was the William S. Little commercial nursery. "Mr. Cartwright was a civil engineer...and Mrs. Alice G. Cartwright was a teacher at the Mechanics Institute (now Rochester Institute of Technology)". After the Cartwrights moved to a house on Argyle Street in 1905, Mrs. Alida R. Ackerman purchased the property in 1909. "She and her deceased husband, William K. Ackerman, were presumably the parents of Mrs. Buell who was living with her husband, Mr. George Clifford Buell, Jr. at the house next door at what is now #22 Berkeley Street...". From 1911-12, the house directory lists the Ackerman house vacant, but by 1913 both the Buells and Mrs. Ackerman had moved back into the house at 56 Berkeley Street. Shortly afterward c.1915, the architectural firm of Arnold and Stern were commissioned to put on an $8,000 addition to the residence at 56 Berkeley Street. Mr. Buell died in 1922, while his wife and mother retained the home for a short period of time before selling it to Mr. and Mrs. Frank and Florence Lovejoy (Frank Lovejoy was vice-president of the Eastman Kodak Company). The residence was converted to a multiple dwelling with four or five apartments in the late 1940s or 1950s. Lewis Carpenter became the next owner of the property and loved the gardens. He made many changes to the back yard by replacing the azaleas and rhododendrons as needed and creating a brick patio to the north side of the property with a fountain and goldfish pond in the center. When the Carpenters decided to move c.1990, three neighbors (Fox, Crego and Bucket) decided to buy the property. In 1995, the current owners of the property, Mr. Thomas Frey and Mrs. Jacqueline Cady purchased the property and entered into a partnership with Mr. and Mrs. Rosen. Further changes to the garden have included the removal of overgrown evergreen and a mugo pine that had obscured half of the brick patio off the back porch. A blue and white garden was added in place of a twelve foot wide yew.

110 Architectural and Historical Building Data for 56 Berkeley Street, Landmark Society of Western New York, 1996.
111 Ibid.
112 Ibid.
Steele was commissioned in 1915 by Mrs. George Clifford Buell. Unfortunately, very little is known concerning the extent of Steele’s work for the Buells. A single scrapbook photograph of the property taken c.1915 exhibits an urn water feature, woody plant materials and a set of stone stairs in the current sunken garden along the northern edge of the property.

**Historic/Existing Conditions**

A single lantern slide from the Fletcher Steele Archives illustrates the character and layout of the landscape along the northern edge of the Buell’s property. The content of the slide no longer exists on the site. Historical information concerning the property was incorporated where applicable. The remainder of the document discusses the existing conditions of the property for future reference.

Historically and currently the site is approximately .4 acres situated on the eastern side of Berkeley Street. Once a single family residence, the Colonial Revival home has been altered to accommodate apartment units. To the north, east and south are single family and converted apartment properties. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the property by the author in August 2003 (Figure 2.125).

**Spatial Organization**

The spatial organization of the current property is comprised of three primary spaces, the front yard, sunken garden and back yard. The rectilinear shaped front yard has a combination of lawn and ivy on the ground plane with views of the building framed by two street trees, a Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) and linden (*Tilia* sp.) (Figure 2.126). Views from the street into the northern sunken garden are obscured by a large Colorado blue spruce (*Picea pungens*), river birch (*Betula nigra*) and arborvitae (*Thuja* sp.) hedge. The sunken garden is a shaded rectilinear space with a combination of a stone terrace and planting beds on the ground plane. The space is enclosed by a chain link fence to the north, building to the south and densely planted planting beds to the east and west. The back yard is divided into two halves, the garden space and garage space. The northeast half of the back yard consists of a mixture of lawn and planting beds on the ground plane. Views are directed towards the two red brick patios due to a wooden
fence and densely planted edges. The southeast half consists of an asphalt and concrete driveway with a four bay garage.

_Circulation_

The current circulation system includes a front walkway, stone paths, patios and a vehicular driveway. A linear red brick front walkway connects the front porch to the concrete sidewalk. The porch and porch stairs are concrete with a second tier of red brick stairs closer to the sidewalk. The irregular flagstone pathway along the northern edge runs from the sidewalk through the sunken garden to the backyard. There are two sets of flagstone stairs descending and ascending from the sunken garden and a set of red brick stairs leading from the sunken garden to the basement door. In the backyard, a newly added linear stepping stone pathway connects the asphalt driveway to the lawn. Two red brick patios, one along the northern edge (Figure 2.127) and one connected to the screened in back porch (Figure 2.128) serves as gathering and entertainment spaces. The L-shaped asphalt and concrete vehicular driveway runs along the southern edge of the property connecting Berkeley Street to the four bay garages. From the driveway there are two entrances to the residence.

_Topography_

Overall the site slopes towards Berkeley Street with the residence and the back yard at the highest points on the property. The front yard slopes approximately three to five percent towards Berkeley Street creating two terraces. The northern side yard has a sunken shaded patio approximately three to four foot below the grade of the residence. The backyard is a relatively flat space with it slightly sloping away from the residence.

_Vegetation Features_

The current foundation plantings in the front yard include a yew hedge (*Taxus sp.*) in a bed of English ivy (*Hedera helix*) and junipers (*Juniperus horizontalis*). Lining the red brick front walkway are dwarf Alberta spruces (*Picea glauca 'Conica'*) and two deciduous street trees, a Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) and a linden (*Tilia sp.*) along Berkeley Street. Along the northern edge are an arborvitae
hedge (*Thuja sp.*), large Colorado blue spruce (*Picea pungens*) and a river birch (*Betula nigra*). The sunken garden has a variety of rhododendrons (*Rhododendron sp.*), azaleas (*Rhododendron sp.*) and evergreen plants. English ivy (*Hedera helix*) is creeping into the space from the front yard while a large dawn redwood (*Metasequoia glyptostroboides*) and Katsura tree (*Cercidiphyllum japonicum*) provide afternoon shade. In the backyard between the flagstone stone path and the porch side red brick patio is a small herb garden. Along either side of the northern red brick patio are numerous azaleas (*Rhododendron sp.*) and false cypress (*Chamaecyparis sp.*). Along the eastern edge of the back yard is a densely planted bed including yews (*Taxus sp.*), azaleas and rhododendrons (*Rhododendron sp.*), Kousa dogwood (*Cornus kousa*), spruces (*Picea sp.*), hydrangea (*Hydrangea sp.*), holly (*Ilex sp.*), pine (*Pinus sp.*), and birch (*Betula sp.*). Dividing the garden space from the driveway is a blue and white perennial garden and hedge of forsythia (*Forsythia x intermedia*). Foundation plantings along the driveway include rose of sharon (*Hibiscus syriacus*), spirea (*Spiraea sp.*), English ivy (*Hedera helix*), nasturtiums and other annuals.

**Constructed Water Features**

In the photograph taken by Steele, a stone urn shoots a water jet into the air and lets the water spill over the edges (Figure 2.129). Currently, there are no water features on the site.

**Small-Scale Features**

Featured in Steele’s photograph are a set of three flagstone stairs leading from the sunken turf panel to the back yard.

Small-scale features on the current property include railings, fencing and sculptural elements. In the front yard lining the red brick walkway are two pairs of black wrought iron railings. Decorative wrought iron railings also adorn the flagstone steps in the sunken garden (Figure 2.130). A chain link fence along the northern edge runs from the sidewalk to the dawn redwood and then changes to a wooden slat fence to the northeast corner. In the back yard, wooden and plastic lawn furniture personifies the patio spaces. Between the wooden fence and northern red brick patio is a redbrick pillar and wooden lattice screen. Atop the brick pillars were a pair of wooden circular globes. To the west of the northern red brick
patio is a three foot tall wrought iron sundial. A six foot tall wooden lattice fence divides the lawn space from the driveway and a L-shaped wooden lattice fence extends northward from the corner of the garage.

**Condition of the Landscape**

Although Steele was hired by the Buells in 1915 and a lantern slide of the property exists in the archive, there are no other supporting documents stating that Steele designed a garden or a portion of the Buell’s property. From the archival material, it is difficult to discern the overall significance of the property in relation to Steele’s other garden designs. Due to major alterations of the northern side of the property, Steele’s work at the property has been determined demolished.

---

**Client #31 Mrs. George Clifford Buell**

Fletcher Steele Archives  
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library  
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry  
Syracuse, New York  
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719  
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-14: Photograph Album: Client 31 Sunken garden
Figure 2.125: Existing Site Plan at 56 Berkeley Street, August 2003 (Drawing by author).

Figure 2.126: View of the front yard from Berkeley Street, August 2003 (Photograph by author).
Figure 2.127: View of the northern red brick patio with the brick columns and wooden lattice screen in the background, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).

Figure 2.128: View of the herb garden and red brick porch patio, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.129: View of urn water feature and sunken garden north of the residence, c.1915 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.130: View of the shade patio and sunken garden north or the residence, August 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Rochester Business Alliance
Client #44: Mr. Rufus A. Sibley
930 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

Site History

The grey wooden framed residence was built by Rufus A. Sibley (President of then largest
department store in Rochester, Sibley Lindsay and Curr) c.1880. The lot was “…some 800 feet deep,
running from East Avenue to University Avenue. Its entrance hall with tapestry covered walls and massive
stairway of imported cherry wood leading to a large square hall lighted with Tiffany stained glass windows,
and the dining room, somber as the era demanded, with leather paneled walls and elaborate lighting
fixtures, are well known to many Rochester residents.” 113 Rufus Sibley died in 1928 and his son John R.
Sibley who was living in Spencer, Massachusetts at the time, sold the property to Charles F. Hutchison and
his wife in 1929. Mr. Hutchison was an early associate of George Eastman and controller of film and plate
emulsion at Eastman Kodak Company and University of Rochester Trustee from 1932-59. The 40 room
Sibley residence was dismantled with the exception of one spacious 30’ by 44’, mahogany-paneled and
beamed room that was incorporated into the Hutchison’s 1930 Neoclassical Revival style home. In 1951,
the Hutchison’s donated the residence to the University of Rochester where the residence was used for
student union and recital activities until 1959. Renting from the University of Rochester, the Unitarian
church briefly used the Hutchison House for meetings from 1959 until 1962, when the property became the
Eastman School of Music’s director residence through 1975. The university gave the residence to the
George Eastman House in 1972 to be used for storage for the Museum of Photography. The museum
leased the property to the Industrial Management Council in 1985. The George Eastman House continues
to own and rent the Hutchison Estate.

Steele was commissioned in 1915 by Rufus Sibley for design work at 930 East Avenue. However,
the Sibley residence was dismantled in 1929 and no drawings, photographs or records pertaining to what
Steele may have designed for the Sibleys have been found. The current condition of the gardens are
considered demolished.

113 “Wreckers Raze Old Homestead of Rufus A. Sibley to Replace it with New Home for C. F. Hutchison,”
Democrat and Chronicle, n.d., East Avenue #384 – 1005 Book II at Landmark Society of Western New
York.
Current Owner: Rochester Museum & Science Center
Clinet #48: Mrs. Warham Whitney
22 South Goodman Street
Rochester, New York 14607

Site History

The Victorian mansion was built in 1886 by Mr. Warham Whitney an early Rochester miller and owner of Warham Whitney & Co. “Architect Claude Bragdon designed these handsome rooms and made other alterations in 1895...”, remodeled the mansion in 1906 and made further alterations in 1917 when an addition was being added.114 In 1936 the house was converted into the Columbia School for girls. The mansion remained part of the Columbia school until the school merged with the Allendale School in 1973. “Mr. and Mrs. M. Herbert Eisenhart purchased the property for the Rochester Museum & Science Center to convert the Columbia School gymnasium into the Eisenhart Auditorium”.115 In March 1979, the Rochester Museum & Science Center wanted to expand its School of Science and Man with plans to “…include a new building on the site of the former Whitney House, off South Goodman Street between Eisenhart Auditorium and the south wing of the former Columbia School property...”.116 Portions of the Whitney house were demolished in November 1979 saving the ballroom and palm room and “…important architectural features like the exterior stonework and leaded-glass windows and reinstalled them in the new building.”117 The Gannett School is currently situated on the original site of the Whitney House and is owned and operated by the Rochester Museum & Science Center.

Fletcher Steele was hired in 1916 to design gardens for Mrs. Warham Whitney. It was believed the Whitney’s might have had elaborate gardens, but was demolished when the Columbia School was built. There are no records, photographs or archival evidence of the gardens.

Condition of the Landscape

Although Steele was hired to design gardens for Mrs. Warham Whitney, there are no remains or evidence of the gardens. The current condition of the garden is demolished.
Site History

Mt. Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America.\textsuperscript{118} The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting. Of the many famous people and families buried at the cemetery, the Sibley's of Rochester have many family plots on site. Rufus A. Sibley (President of Sibley, Lindsay and Curr) purchased Lot 16 in Range 5 on November 25, 1895. The lot was divided into four quadrants for the burial of Sibley's immediate family and their families. There are currently 11 graves on the site.

Steele was hired in the spring of 1930 by Rufus Sibley's son, John R. Sibley to design a planting plan for the Sibley Memorial. By July 28, 1930, Steele had developed a planting plan for the site (Figure 2.131).\textsuperscript{119} From May to June of 1931, plant materials were ordered for the horse-shoe like ring surrounding the burial lot. In September 1931, orders were placed for a galvanized finished edging to line the planting beds.

Historic/Existing Conditions

Historically and currently Lot 16 in Range 5 is 660 sq. feet. The lot faces west onto Fifth Avenue. Located to the east of the Sibley Lot is Lot 17, to the north Lot 10 and to the south Lot 22. Mt. Hope Cemetery is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial site visit to the cemetery lot by the author in June 2003 (Figure 2.132).

Spatial Organization

The July 1930 planting plan for the Sibley Memorial spans the entire length of the Lot in the shape of a horse-shoe with a westward opening along Fifth Avenue. The heavily planted beds contained primarily low lying woody shrubs with larger evergreens to the east providing a back drop for the Sibley Monument. The central space was lawn with views open to the sky.

The overall spatial organization of the site still remains, however all of the plant materials have been replaced and pruned so that the Sibley Monument is not easily visible from Fifth Avenue.

Circulation Systems

As shown in Steele’s 1930 planting plan, the pedestrian access to the grave stones was through a grassy opening along Fifth Avenue between the scarlet firethorn and holly to either side of the entrance. Currently, the Lot has yews flanking the entrance.

Topography

Historically and currently the site gently slopes towards Fifth Avenue at one to three percent.

Vegetation Features

The 1930 planting plan shows a horse-shoe shaped bed packed with a variety of plant materials. The horse-shoe is somewhat symmetrically planted with scarlet firethorn (*Pyracantha coccinea* v. *Lalandei*), holly (*Ilex sp.*), Japanese Yew (*Taxus cuspidata*), daphne (*Daphne sp.*), rhododendron (*Rhododendron* v. *Wilson*), boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens* v. *handsworthiensis*) and Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis* v. *sieboldii*) lining the western side of the Lot and entrance (Figure 2.133). Along both the northern and southern boundaries of the Lot, the planting composition was relatively the same implying symmetry, but many of the plant materials are skewed slightly to keep the untrained eye moving through the beds. Plants used in these beds included Japanese pieris (*Pieris japonica*), cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*), bigleaf wintercreeper (*Euonymus radicans vegetus*), inkberry holly (*Ilex glabra*), rhododendron (*Rhododendron* v. *carolin.*) and many of the same plant materials used along the western boundary. The eastern boundary served as a backdrop for the Sibley Monument. The plant materials included the Swiss stone pine (*Pinus cembra*), pyramidal arborvitae (*Thuja pyramidalis*), Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis* var. *sieboldii*), scarlet firethorn (*Pyracantha coccinea* var. *Lalandei*), inkberry holly (*Ilex glabra*) and other plants used along the northern and southern boundaries. In addition to the multivariate planting scheme, Steele proposed

\[119\] The north arrow on Steele’s planting plan is facing the wrong direction. Refer to the current site plan for true north direction.
four types of ground covers including vinca (Vinca minor), evergreen candytuff (*Iberis sempervirens*), Christmas rose (*Helleborus niger*) and galax (*Galax aphylla*).

The current site plantings are comprised of evergreen plant materials. Two mushroom shaped yews (*Taxus* sp.) flank the entrance to the Lot with a single hemlock (*Tsuga* sp.) in the northwestern and southwestern corner of the Lot (Figure 2.134). The remainder of the lot is surrounded by five to six foot clipped yews and two pines (*Pinus* sp.) one along the northern and southern sides of the Lot. Instead of ground cover, the beds are mulched.

**Constructed Water Features**

No water features were proposed or currently are found on the lot.

**Small-Scale Features**

Although already existing on the site when Steele was commissioned to design the cemetery lot, the Sibley Celtic Cross is the focal point of the Lot. Designed in the traditional Celtic fashion, the granite cross is elaborately decorated including a circular design in the center symbolizing eternity. In addition, when Steele designed the Lot, five family members were already buried on site. The rectangular simple block granite markers with plaques lined the northern edge of the Lot. When Steele designed the planting beds he proposed the beds to be lined with galvanized steel.

Currently the Sibley Celtic cross, all five of the original simple block granite markers and the galvanized steel edging remain on the lot and in good condition. Six additional simple block granite markers have been added to the Lot since Steele’s 1930 design, five along the southern side of the Lot and Elizabeth Sibley Stebbins grave at the base of the Sibley Celtic cross.

**Condition of the Landscape**

Steele’s July 28, 1930 planting plan proposed a wide variety of plant materials for the lot that highlighted the importance of the Sibley Celtic cross. However, all of these plants have been removed and replaced with larger evergreens that mask the Sibley Celtic cross from Fifth Avenue. Although the original galvanized steel edging is still in place, the removal of the plant materials and thus Steele’s original design intent for the site leaves the Sibley cemetery Lot in a demolished condition.
Client 328: Mr. John R. Sibley

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Manuscript Collection:

FSMC: Photograph Book L-6, page 85.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-22: Photograph Album: Client 328 Photos of cemetery plot.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 3, File 21- Folder 328 Planting plan.

Client Order Book Collection:

FSCOB: File 2, Folder 33: Plant order receipts
Figure 2.131: Planting plan for the Sibley Memorial, July 28, 1930 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Drawing Collection).

Figure 2.132: Existing Site Plan for the Sibley Cemetery Lot, June 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.133: Looking eastward towards the Sibley Celtic Cross from Fifth Avenue, c.1931 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.134: Current condition of the Sibley Lot in Mt. Hope Cemetery, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Current Owner: Ms. Dorothy C. Morton Et AL  
Client #397 Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz  
444 Oxford Street  
Rochester, New York 14625

Site History

The gothic revival residence was built in 1910 by Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz. Mr. Hofheinz was named principal of the newly established Rochester Dental Dispensary at the University of Rochester in 1916, but died suddenly. Mrs. Rudolf Hofheinz donated the laboratory equipment in her husband’s memory. 120 Little is known concerning the chronology of the property, except that the current residence has been converted to apartments and is owned by Ms. Dorothy Morton.

Fletcher Steele was commissioned in 1934 to design a garden to provide privacy and a sense of enclosure to the backyard. The garden plan created in January 1934 illustrates a small rectangular garden lined with evergreen hedges and interior rectangular beds containing flowering shrubs and herbaceous materials (Figure 2.135). Later that year, Steele proposed a garden shelter, one similar to the Edwin Allen Stebbins garden shelter, and in October of 1935 he sketched a lattice screen and seat to be placed along the backside of the residence. Photographs taken in July of 1935 show the eastern half of the completed garden looking towards the neighbor’s garages and residences. A majority of the proposed 1934 plan was implemented except for a single planting bed running north and south. After the garden was completed Mrs. Hofheinz continued to order plant materials through Steele into the early 1940s.

Historic/Existing Conditions

Historically and currently the site is 50 feet wide by 145 feet long situated on the east side of Oxford Street. To the north, south, east and west across the street are single family residences, most of which have been converted into apartments. A site plan documenting existing conditions was created during the initial visit to the property by the author in September 2003 (Figure 2.136).

Spatial Organization

The backyard garden consisted of central lawn panel used for a clothes reel surrounded by linear planting beds punctuated with a square planting bed in each of the four corners of the central lawn. The
garden was enclosed by fencing and hedges of Japanese yew (*Taxus cuspidata* ‘capitata’) and American arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*) along the north, east and southern edges (Figure 2.137). Views were directed inward towards the central planting beds by the hedges and fencing, along the neighboring garages and residences were clearly visible above the fencing. In 1941 Steele wrote about the Hofheinz garden for the Garden Club of America annual meeting and said:

> This small charming garden is an excellent example of space composition. The careful choice and arrangement of plants according to size, height, and quality enlarge the apparent size of the small area. Here also is illustrated that close planting can be done successfully when properly cared for. There is a tidiness about the garden that is much to be envied.121

The current spatial organization of the site consists of two spaces, the front yard and back yard. The front yard is bounded by a driveway to the north and south and Oxford Street to the west. Lawn is the only planting used in the front yard. The back yard plantings have been removed and replaced with a large asphalt parking lot (Figure 2.138). The fencing and hedges have been removed and replaced with a thinly planted and poorly maintained median dividing the parking lot from the neighbor’s parking lot. A new fence has been added along the eastern edges of the property. The views, character and organization of the space has been severely altered.

*Circulation*

At the base of the back door, Steele proposed concrete paving to run the length of the back side of the residence. From the concrete paving at the doorway was an opening into the lawn covered yard. Circulation through the yard was directed by the rectangular and square planting beds. Three openings, one along each side between the Japanese yew hedges allowed for access to the fencing and proposed climbing roses (*Rosa* sp.), wisteria (*Wisteria* sp.) and clematis (*Clematis* sp.). A gate was also proposed in the southeast corner of the garden connecting to the neighbor’s yard or south side of the residence.

The current property consists of pedestrian walkway in the front yard and a patio in the backyard and a vehicular driveway and parking area. In the front yard, the L-shaped concrete walkway connects the covered porch to the sidewalk. Of Steele’s original design the only remaining portion is the medina stone

patios in the back yard along the residence. The small square shaped ground level patio connects to the raised covered square medina stone patio. Neither patio is at the base of an entrance to the residence. Off the raised medina stone patio is a circular stone walkway that connects to a doorway along the south side of the residence. The dominant feature on the property is the large asphalt driveway and oversized asphalt parking lot in the backyard. The driveway enters the property along the northern edge and continues the length of the property and expanding into a parking area taking up the rest of the backyard.

Topography

From the July 1935 photographs, the backyard was relatively flat with raised planting beds. The current property slopes at approximately a one to three percent slope towards Oxford Street and remaining relatively flat from the front façade to the eastern edge of the backyard.

Vegetation Features

The January 28, 1934 garden plan proposes a wide variety of plant materials for the small rectangular backyard. Along the fencing edging the yard, Steele proposed planting a number of climbing plants including Chinese wisteria (Wisteria sinensis ‘alba’), clematis (Clematis montana rubens), euonymus (Euonymus sp.), Higan cherry (Prunus subhirtella pendula), crabapples (Malus sp.), roses (Rosa sp.) and spirea (Spiraea sp.). Planted just in front of the fencing were long hedge rows of Japanese yews (Taxus cuspidata ‘capitata’) and in three of the four corners were groupings of five or more American arborvitae (Thuja occidentalis). Also located in the hedge planting beds were two white and one pink dogwood (Cornus sp.), scarlet firethorn (Pyracantha coccinea ‘Lalandei’) and a border hedge along the grass of dwarf Japanese quince (Chaenomeles japonica). The dominant feature of the garden was an existing elm tree. Proposed in the 1934 plan, but never built was an eastern rectangular bed utilizing the elm tree as a focal point of the garden. The two proposed planting beds to the north and south of the rectangular turf panel and closes reel were constructed and symmetrically planted with two standard wisteria surrounded by fern leaf peonies (Paeonia tenuifolia). Each bed had four groupings of five plants. The central plant, Japanese anemone (Anemone japonica) was surrounded by four plantings of mums (Chrysanthemum amelia). It is unknown if the western most square and rectangular beds and the hedge of euonymus (Euonymus patons
sieboldianus) was ever implemented. Once the garden plantings were in place, Mrs. Hofheinz continued to order plant materials from Steele including an order for 100 Lily-of-the-Valley (Convallaria majalis).\footnote{Fletcher Steele to John S. Ellsworth, 23 November 1943 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).}

The vegetation features of the rectangular garden in the back yard have been completely removed and paved over for parking. A raised planting median with wisteria, hemlock (Tsuga sp.) and Norway maples (Acer platanoides) divide the parking lot from the neighboring southern parking lot. A variety of maples and hemlocks are planted along the mediums to the east of the parking lot. A giant oak on the adjacent property to the north is the focal point of the back yard.

\textit{Small-Scale Features}

In the 1934 general plan, Steele proposed a concrete paving strip along the back side of the residence and space allocated to a garden bench. In September of that year, he designed a small wood garden shelter surrounded by plant materials for the Hofheinz garden (Figure 2.139). Continuing his experimentation with wood lattice work, Steele proposed in October of 1935 a lattice screen and seat for the patio area (Figure 2.140). It is unknown if the patio, bench, shelter or lattice screen were ever constructed.

Currently in the back yard there are two median stone patios, wood lattice work and a red brick pillar (Figure 2.141). The red brick pillar capped with stone anchors the northeast corner of the square ground level medina stone patio. The patio connects to a stair that leads to the raised covered median stone patio. In each of the corners is wood lattice work similar to Steele’s style of wood lattice screen during the 1930s and 1940s.

\textit{Condition of the Landscape}

The small rectangular garden Steele designed for Mrs. Hofheinz was unique for its size and use of existing plant materials. Simple yet diverse in its plantings, the central planting beds were a burst of color in comparison to the surrounding evergreen hedges. Although the small garden illustrated Steele’s extensive knowledge of plant materials and planting combinations, it was not overly significant in terms of Steele’s greater body of residential designed landscapes. At an undetermined date after 1940, the garden was removed for additional parking needs. The current condition of the lovely small garden is demolished.
Client #397 Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Drawing Collection:

Flat File: Drawer 4: File 27: Folder 397 Sketch of garden shelter.

Photostatic Print Collection:


Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 9 (2 plates): Garden views.

Client Order Book Collection:

FSCOB: Folder 109 (1 loose leaf order) for lily of the valley.
Figure 2.135: Garden plan for Mr. Rudolph H. Hofheinz, January 28, 1934 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.136: Current condition plan for 444 Oxford Street, September 2003 (Drawing by author).
Figure 2.137: Looking eastward across the central turf panel towards the neighboring garages, July 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.138: Looking eastward across the parking lot towards neighboring garages, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.139: Sketch of the garden shelter for Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz, September 1934 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.140: Sketch of lattice screen and seat, October 1935 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.141: The medina stone patios and lattice screen are the only remaining features of the garden, September 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Site History

The Victorian style residence was built c.1880 by Miss M. Louise Kelly. Little information is known concerning the residence and the property until the 1960s when Miss Kelly willed the property to the Rochester Institute of Technology who subsequently demolished the residence and gardens for a parking lot.\(^{123}\)

Fletcher Steele was hired by Miss Kelly in the early 1930s to design a garden for her southern side yard and backyard. Although there are no historic site plans for the property, sketches and photographs of the property are available. In 1936, Steele began sketching proposed designs for the west stone wall of the garden and small-scale decorative features such as a bench along the west wall and an elaborate iron rail for one of the garden’s water features (Figure 2.142 and 2.143). Garden construction began in the spring of 1936 with the implementation of the northern garden stone walls with red brick caps and cascading water feature. By August of 1936, the majority of the garden walls and cascading water feature were complete and construction on the stone work defining the sunken terrace was underway. Photographs of the garden taken in March 1937 illustrate the completed stone work and placement of decorative features such as the iron railing and inscribed columns flanking the water feature. Wood lattice screening and a raised seating area at the western end of the garden were also completed. It is unknown when the garden and residence were removed and replaced for parking.

Historic/Existing Conditions

Historically and currently the property is approximately one half acre situated on the east side of Oxford Street one block north of East Avenue. The property would have been a contributing resource to the East Avenue Historic Preservation District. The current parking lot is bordered by a single family residence to the north and a business facility to the south.

\(^{123}\) Ms. Louise H. Klinke, interview with author, Rochester, New York 16 August 2003. According to Ms. Klinke, who is Ms. Kelly’s niece, the property had a wonderful formal garden with a large copper beech. When Ms. Kelly donated her property to RIT, at the time the university was known for tearing down residences and gardens and replacing them with parking lots.
Spatial Organization

The rectangular sunken garden was located south of the residence, spanning from Oxford Street to the garage located just east of the residence. The garden proper was approximately five feet below grade and enclosed by stone retaining walls with red brick caps on the north, and stone walls to the south and west sides (Figure 2.144). Breaking the strict rectangular form; the semi-circular stairs and cascading water feature, red brick water basin and raised seating area extended into the rectangular space. The ground plane was primarily turf with a line of boxwood planted around the sunken turf panel stone edging. At the eastern end of the garden, a small entrance through the stone walls led to a wood arbor and planting area. The stone wall at the western end was higher to obstructed views of the garden from Oxford Street, but the views within the garden were open and directed towards the semi-circular redbrick stairs and cascading water feature.

After Ms. Kelly left the property to the Rochester Institute of Technology, the university demolished the residence, filled in the sunken garden and graded the property for parking. The L-shaped parking lot has two entrances, one off Oxford Street and the other off Merriman Street. The larger rectangular parking lot built over the Kelly property accommodates approximately seventy cars and the smaller rectangular lot to the east accommodates approximately twenty cars (Figure 2.145). The parking lot is highly visible from Oxford Street compared to Ms. Kelly’s secret sunken garden.

Circulation

Photographs taken in 1936 illustrate the property having a vehicular driveway and stairways through out the sunken garden. The one lane linear gravel driveway entered off Oxford Street and ran between the residence and the garden to the rear of the property and terminated at a one car garage. Leading down to the garden from the driveway was a pair of red brick semi-circular stairs approximately three foot wide split by a central water feature and at the western end was a set of three to four stone stairs leading to the seating area along the west wall. It is unknown if there were defined pedestrian pathways throughout the garden.

All of the historic vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems have been removed from the property and replaced with an L-shaped parking lot connecting Oxford Street to Merriman Street.
Topography

The sunken garden was approximately five feet below grade of the residence and driveway and was relatively flat. The turf panel in the center of the garden was six inches lower (Figure 2.146).

The garden has since been filled in and the residence demolished for a parking lot. The current site is relatively flat except for some grass planted medians between the parking lot and Oxford Street.

Vegetation Features

There are no plant lists or order forms available for the property. However, photographs taken in the summer of 1936 show the south retaining wall and raised beds planted with an assortment of evergreens such as junipers (*Juniperus* sp.), arborvitae (*Thuja* sp.), and cypress (*Chamaecyparis* sp.) and smaller deciduous shrubs such as Japanese pieris (*Pieris japonica*), euonymus (*Euonymus* sp.) and holly (*Ilex* sp.). In addition to the raised planting bed, a newly planted single row of boxwoods (*Buxus* sp.) was shown lining the inside perimeter of the stone edging defining the sunken turf panel (Figure 2.147). East of the stone walls were a wood arbor covered with climbing wisteria (*Wisteria* sp.), and various other woody plant materials.

When the parking lot was added the original plant materials in the garden and around the residence were removed. Two grass medians have been created to divide the parking lot from Oxford Street and separated the larger parking area from the smaller parking lot off Merriman Street. A line of deciduous tress including oaks (*Quercus* sp.) and maples (*Acer* sp.) filter the views of the neighboring properties.

Constructed Water Features

Although there were two water features in the garden, the cascading water feature dividing the semi-circular stairs was the focal point of the garden. Originating from a spigot incorporated into the iron railing at the top of the stairway, an arching stream of water fell approximately two feet to the rectangular stone basin below (see Figure 2.148). Across the sunken turf panel and directly opposite the cascading water feature was a water basin edged by two decorative red brick steps approximately one foot above the ground plane (see Figure 2.149).

There are no remaining constructed water features on the property.
Small-Scale Features

Continuing his experimentation with iron and wood mediums, Steele designed many decorative small scale features for Ms. Kelly's garden. The wrought iron railing was approximately three feet tall and nine feet wide with detailed floral and bird motifs. Flanking the semi-circular stairs was a pair of iron posts inscribed with floral motifs and topped with iron work representing a flame (Figure 2.148). In the center of the western stone wall was a ten to twelve feet long stone bench with iron arm rests. The bench sat on a raised stone terrace framed by stone and red brick capped seating walls topped with a foot of wood lattice. Between the summer of 1936 and March of 1937, wood lattice screening along the top of the wall and a six to seven feet tall wood arched structure was added to the red brick water basin along the southern side of the garden (Figure 2.149). The eastern end walls stepped up with the topography and allowed for a small entrance to the rear of the property. In the backyard along the southern edge was an eight to ten feet tall unadorned wood arbor (Figure 2.150). It is unknown how wide or long the arbor spanned.

There are no remaining small-scale features on the property.

Condition of the Landscape

The sunken 'secret' garden Steele designed for Ms. Kelly between 1936 and 1937 was an excellent example of Steele's use of materials such as stone, wood, iron and plants to define the space. In the majority of his gardens, Steele designed and implemented a unique small scale feature made out of iron or wood. In Ms. Kelly's case, the iron railing with floral and bird motifs and inscribed floral pattern iron poles were unique to her garden. If still intact, the Kelly garden would have been significant not only because of its association with Steele, but also due to the intricate metal work and spatial organization of the garden. However, there are no physical remains of the garden, thus the condition of the garden is demolished.
Client #410: Miss M. Louise Kelly

Fletcher Steele Archives
Housed at Franklin L. Moon Library
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Syracuse, New York
Flora Nyland, Archivist (315) 470-6719
This collection provided the bulk of the primary-source documentation for this inventory. The following materials were examined.

Scrapbook Collection:

L-24: Photograph Album: Client 410 Photos of residence and staircase

Photostatic Print Collection:

FSPPVII: Folder 92: Study of west wall of garden d-5 April 1936, Iron rail d-16 August 1936

Study Print Collection:

FS/SPC: Album 10 (6 plates): sunken garden, masonry work, planting beds, water features
Figure 2.142: Study of the west wall of garden, April 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).

Figure 2.143: Sketch of iron rail for garden, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Photostatic Print Collection).
Figure 2.144: View of the sunken garden looking across the turf panel towards the west wall and Oxford Street, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.145: View of the current parking lot looking eastward from Oxford Street, June 2003 (Photograph by Author).
Figure 2.146: Looking northward across the sunken turf panel towards the semi-circular stairs and cascading water feature, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).

Figure 2.147: Looking southwest toward the red brick edged water basin and stone bench, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.148: Looking northward at the semi-circular red brick stairs, water feature, iron railing and inscribed iron posts, March 1937 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Figure 2.149: Looking southward from the driveway towards the wood lattice and arching structure, March 1937 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Scrapbook Collection).

Figure 2.150: Looking southwest at the arbor towards the sunken garden, August 1936 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Study Print Collection).
Chapter 3

Recommendations

Introduction

This final chapter of the thesis focuses on treatment recommendations for Fletcher Steele’s historic designed landscapes. The proposals outlined below are viable approaches to the treatment of the properties. The recommendations are the initial ideas developed based on research and analysis of this thesis (Chapters 1 and 2), and on discussions with preservation professionals. It is important to note that the ideal would be the implementation of all of these proposals. However, these recommendations are intended to be part of the future long-term preservation of the historic designed landscapes, and their implementation will directly depend on the homeowners and professionals in the Rochester area.

Four approaches are currently recognized by the Secretary of the Interior for the treatment of historic resources; Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction.¹ "A treatment is a physical intervention carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal..."² Following are the definitions of the four primary treatment approaches as defined by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:

**Preservation** is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this

² Ibid, 6-7.
treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

**Rehabilitation** is defined as the act or 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.

**Restoration** is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

**Reconstruction** is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.³

Based on these definitions, and on the needs and intended use of the historic designed landscapes, rehabilitation will not be discussed since none of the fifty-eight visited properties warrant this treatment. The treatments and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* provide a necessary philosophical framework for a consistent and holistic approach to the management of all historic resource types including buildings, sites, structures, landscapes, districts and objects (See Appendix A). The *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* apply the treatments and standards to specifically landscapes. This chapter addresses three different areas requiring attention: treatment guidelines, additional research and recommendations for future planning efforts of the historic designed landscapes.

**Treatment Guidelines**

This section is devoted to each of the three treatments: preservation, restoration and reconstruction. Each treatment section begins with a definition of the treatment, followed by the distinct goals that comprise each treatment standard. Accompanying each of the three treatment sections are a list of gardens that would be applicable to the primary treatment. A case-study example for each treatment will follow demonstrating how these treatment guidelines are applied.

**Preservation** is the retention of the landscape’s existing form; features and materials provided that such actions will not result in a degraded landscape condition or threaten historic resources.⁴ Preservation

---

³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid, 20.
treatments emphasize protection, maintenance and repair, while replacement of features is minimized. The six distinct goals associated with preservation are as follows:

1. **Identify, Retain, and Preserve Historic Materials and Features** - to identify the form and detailing of those features and materials that are important to the landscape’s historic character and which must be retained in order to preserve that character.

2. **Stabilize and Protect Deteriorated Historic Features and Materials as a Preliminary Measure** - a cultural landscape may need to be stabilized or protected through preliminary measures until additional work can be undertaken. Stabilization may include structural reinforcement or correcting unsafe conditions. Protection generally involves the least degree of intervention and is preparatory to other work.

3. **Maintain Historic Features and Materials** - maintenance includes treatments such as removing rust, re-application of protective coatings, pruning, monitoring age and health of plant materials and cleaning of drain inlets.

4. **Repair (Stabilize, Consolidate and Conserve) Historic Features and Materials** - strives to retain the maximum amount of existing materials and features while utilizing as little new material as possible.

5. **Limited Replacement in Kind of Extensively Deteriorated Portions of Historic Features** - this involves limited replace in kind of portions of historic features when there are surviving prototypes.

6. **Accessibility Considerations/ Health and Safety Considerations/ Environmental Considerations and Energy Efficiency** - this addresses the work done to meet accessibility requirements; health and safety code; environmental requirements; or limited retrofitting measures to improve energy efficiency.5

Although the recommended treatment for specific landscape features can sometimes be restoration and reconstruction, preservation is the most appropriate treatment for the following designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area because these gardens have maintained Steele’s original design intent, are significant in relation to his overall body of work and have integrity.

Client # 40: Mr. and Mrs. Atkinson and Charlotte Whitney Allen garden  
Client # 327: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas and Harriett Hollister Spencer garden  
Client # 387: Mrs. Adrian G. Devine garden  
Client # 390: Mrs. Raymond Bentley garden  
Client # 423: Campbell-Whittlesey House garden  
Client # 425: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen Stebbins garden  
Client # 442: Mr. John M. Steele cemetery lot  
Client # 468: Mr. Homer and Margaret Woodbury Strong garden  
Client # 480 & 486: Mrs. William AE Drescher cemetery lot  
Client # 503 Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr. cemetery lot  
Client # 609 Mr. and Mrs. John C. and Kate Louise Trahey  
Client # 632 Mr. and Mrs. Harold C. Townsend  
Client # 653 Mrs. Frank Ernest Gannett cemetery lot  
Client #657 Dr. and Mrs. Robert J. Callihan garden  
Client #674 Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Nancy Turner garden

---

5 Ibid.
Case Study Example

The Atkinson and Charlotte Whitney Allen garden at 32 Oliver Street is a good example of a designed landscape that has retained its historic character and original cultural landscape features. The character of a cultural landscape is defined by its spatial organization, circulation, topography, vegetation and small scale features. Each of the following landscape characteristics and features were evaluated based on the preservation guidelines.

Spatial Organization- The existing spatial organization and land patterns of the landscape have been retained over time.

Circulation- All circulation features including alignment and materials of the existing circulation system have been preserved.

Topography- The topographic variation including shape, slope, elevation, aspect and contour have been retained.

Vegetation- Although many of the plant materials in the garden have been replaced with in-kind species, some plants and arrangements were not replaced in-kind with historic features. For example when the large oak in the backyard turf panel was removed, three fleshy hawthorns were planted along the south wall in its stead. It is recommended that the garden vegetation under go restoration. Vegetation from other historic periods should be removed and replaced with in-kind plantings according to Steele’s 1916 plan and photographs of the property.

Constructed Water Features- The water features on site have been retained and preserved, however additional maintenance of the features is recommended. In addition to the non-destructive methods of daily, seasonal and cyclical maintenance, the water features mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems should be routinely checked.

Small Scale Features- Portions of the pair of wrought iron decorative poles in the drinking pit have rusted through. It is recommended that the poles be repaired.

Restoration is to make the landscape appear as it did at a particular- and most significant- time in its history. Restoration can include the removal of features from other periods; missing features from the
restoration period may be replaced, based on documentary and physical evidence, using traditional materials or compatible substitute materials.⁶ The seven distinct goals associated with restoration are as follows:

1. Identify, Retain, and Preserve Materials and Features from the Restoration Period- to identify the form and detailing of those existing materials and features that are significant to the 1959 restoration period.

2. Protect and Maintain Materials and Features from the Restoration Period- protection generally involve the least degree of intervention and is preparatory to other work; it may be accomplished through permanent or temporary measures.

3. Repair Features and Materials from the Restoration Period- when the physical condition of parts of features from the restoration period requires additional work, repairing is recommended. Features and materials that are significant to the period should be initially focused on. Repairing may also include the limited replacement in-kind of extensively deteriorated materials or parts of features, and using surviving prototypes as a model.

4. Replace Extensively Deteriorated Features from the Restoration Period- replacing an entire feature from the restoration period that is too deteriorated to repair may be appropriate. Together with documentary evidence, any remaining physical fabric of the historic feature should be used as a model for the replacement.

5. Remove Existing Features from other Historic Periods- work is included to remove or alter existing historic features that do not represent the restoration period.

6. Re-Create Missing Features from the Restoration Period- this involves re-creating features that were significant to the landscape at a particular time, but are now missing.

7. Accessibility Considerations/ Health and Safety Considerations/ Environmental Considerations and Energy Efficiency

Although the recommended treatment for specific landscape features can sometimes be preservation and reconstruction, restoration is the most appropriate treatment for the following designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area because these gardens were initially significant designed landscapes, but have lost integrity due to the removal of significant landscape features, lack of maintenance and need of repair.

Client #49: Ms. Helen Ellwanger garden
Client # 409: Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. and Hilda Taylor garden
Client # 375: Mrs. Frederick T. Pierson garden
Client # 569 Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr. garden

Case Study Example

The Helen Ellwanger garden at 625 Mt. Hope Avenue is an example of a designed landscape that has had its historic character altered and many of its historic features removed or in need of repair. The three

⁶ Ibid, 92.
primary spaces that will be evaluated are the orchard, rose garden and forecourt. Although the primary recommended treatment for the Ellwanger garden is restoration, it is recommended the rose garden undergo reconstruction. The character of a cultural landscape is defined by its spatial organization, circulation, topography, vegetation and small scale features. Each of the following landscape characteristics and features were evaluated based on the restoration guidelines.

Spatial Organization

Orchard- The existing spatial organization of the orchard has been retained and preserved.

Rose Garden- In the rose garden three of the four spatial defining features, the colored concrete retaining walls to the north and west and the carriage house to the south, have retained and preserved the overall spatial organization of the space.

Forecourt- The spatial organization of the forecourt has been retained and preserved.

Circulation

Orchard- Pedestrian circulation system in the orchard is unknown.

Rose Garden- Several historic features such as walkways and stairs have been removed. It is recommended that the missing circulation features in the rose garden that existed during the restoration period be reconstructed.

Forecourt- A set of stone stairs was removed at an unknown date to create a circular vehicular drop-off loop. Although the stone stairs existed during the period of significance, the historic circulation of the forecourt was not a critical component of Steele’s design for the garden. It is recommended that the existing circulation patterns be retained and preserved in the forecourt.

Topography

Orchard- The gully that the flowering fruit orchard existed in has been retained and is recommended to be preserved.

Rose Garden- The terraces of rose beds were removed in 1983. It is recommended that the historic topography of the rose garden be reconstructed.

Forecourt- The topography of the forecourt has been retained and should continue to be preserved.
Vegetation

Orchard- It is recommended that the successional tree growth be removed from the flowering fruit orchard and the orchard replanted with the historically specified flowering and fruit trees.

Rose Garden- It is recommended that the vegetation from other historic periods be removed and the garden replanted with the historically specified roses and other plant materials.

Forecourt- It is recommended that the vegetation from other historic periods be removed and the forecourt replanted with the historically specified plant materials.

Constructed Water Features

There were no historically constructed water features on the site.

Small Scale Features

Orchard- It is unknown if there were small scale features located in the orchard.

Rose Garden- It is recommended that the stone veneer applied to the pink colored concrete retaining walls be removed and the wooden slat fencing and iron work be reconstructed.

Forecourt- The terra cotta Spanish balustrade tiles and stone urns atop white stucco posts are deteriorating. It is recommended these small scale features be repaired through reinforcing the materials that comprise these features or limited replacement in-kind or which compatible substitute materials.

Reconstruction addresses those aspects of treatment necessary to re-create an entire non-surviving landscape with new material. There is far less (if any) extant historic material prior to treatment and, in some cases, there may be nothing visible. Because of the potential for historical error in the absence of sound physical evidence, this treatment can be justified only rarely and, thus, is the least frequently undertaken treatment. The six distinct goals associated with restoration are as follows:

1. Research and Document Historical Significance- the treatment reconstruction begins with researching and documenting the landscape’s historical significance to ascertain that its re-creation is essential to the public understanding of the property.

2. Investigate Archeological Resources- the goal of physical research is to identify spatial organization and land patterns, features, and materials of the landscape which are essential to an accurate reconstruction, while leaving those archeological resources that are not essential undisturbed.

---

7 Ibid, 130.
3. Identify, Protect and Preserve Extant Historic Features- its is never appropriate to base a reconstruction upon conjectural plans or designs, or the availability of different features from other landscapes. Thus, any remaining historic features and materials, such as remnants of a fountain, walkway or pond, should be retained, when practical, and incorporated into the reconstruction.

4. Reconstruct Non-Surviving Landscapes- features are addressed in general, always emphasizing the need for an accurate depiction... In the absence of extant historic materials, the objective in reconstruction is to re-create the appearance of the historic landscape for interpretive purposes.

5. Interpret the Reconstructed Landscape- to make clear to the visiting public that the landscape is not authentic; rather, it is a portrayal of the past for interpretive purposes.

6. Accessibility Considerations/ Health and Safety Considerations/ Environmental Considerations and Energy Efficiency- a reconstructed landscape may be considered as essentially new construction.

Although the recommended treatment for specific landscape features can sometimes be preservation and restoration, reconstruction is the most appropriate treatment for the following designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area because these landscapes have either been completely demolished or have had major significant components of the designed landscape removed.

Client #30: Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen Stebbins garden
Client # 31: Mrs. George Clifford Buell
Client # 44: Mr. Rufus A Sibley
Client # 48: Mrs. Warham Whitney
Client # 328: Mr. John R. Sibley
Client # 397: Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz
Client # 410: Ms. Louise Kelly
Client # 668: George Eastman House

Case Study Example

The Edwin Allen Garden at 935 East Avenue was an example of a designed landscape that lost its historic character and features due to demolition in the 1950s. The property had two distinct spaces, the tea and rose garden. The parking lot is currently situated over the historic location of the rose garden, but the tea garden space has potential to be reconstructed. The character of a cultural landscape is defined by its spatial organization, circulation, topography, vegetation and small scale features. Each of the following landscape characteristics and features were evaluated based on the reconstruction guidelines.

Spatial Organization- reconstructing the historic spatial organization or land patterns consists of including the size, configuration, proportion and relation of landscape units; relationship of features to landscape units; and the landscape units themselves. The existing strip of rolled stone edging, section of red brick wall, scaled plans and historic photographs of the tea garden would provide sufficient starting points for reconstructing the garden.
Circulation- The historic raised stone patio remains and has been partial preserved. However, a concrete ADA ramp was added at an unknown date to the eastern edge of the patio in place of three historic stairs leading from the patio to the tea garden. It is recommended that the ADA ramp is removed from the east side of the patio and the historic stone stairs be reconstructed. The rectangular flagstone walkway encircling the tea garden’s central turf panel should be reconstructed utilizing traditional materials with substitute materials used as long as they recreate the historical appearance.

Topography- The historic topographic feature of the tea garden has been retained and should continue to be preserved.

Vegetation- It is recommended that the non-surviving historic vegetation features of the tea garden be reconstructed. Although historic genus, species and cultivar are preferable, substitute materials may be used as long as they recreate the historic appearance-namely habit, form, color, texture, bloom, fruit, fragrance, scale and context.

Constructed Water Features- There were no constructed water features associated with this space.

Small Scale Features- It is recommended reconstructing the non-surviving small scale features such as the semi-circular stone seating bench, wrought iron fencing, red brick walls and wooden rectangular planting boxes to depict the documented historic appearance. Although traditional materials such s masonry, wood, and architectural metals are preferable, substitute materials may be used as long as they recreate the historical appearance.

Additional Research

Although an extensive amount of research was completed for the purpose of this thesis, a number of other projects beyond the scope of the thesis need to be initiated. There are two types of additional research projects: those needed to be completed before any further physical changes take place, and those needed to add to the historic record of the properties.

For the forty-four clients and properties I was unable to visit due to financial and time constraints, those with an unknown condition and properties Steele only provided consultation services to, it is recommended that additional research and inventory of the properties be undertaken in order to adequately
and comprehensively address all historic design intent and existing condition concerns. Surveying and documenting identified properties with archival materials is the highest priority.

For the properties previously inventoried, future efforts should explore additional research and documentation of the properties by conducting cultural landscape inventories using the methods outlined by the U. S. Department of the Interior National Park Service and the Cultural Landscape Inventory User’s Manual. Since many of the properties are listed as contributing resources to local historic preservation districts, the information on the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form concerning the condition and composition of the landscape should be amended.

**Future Planning Recommendations**

The following planning recommendations have been identified as a result of continued consultation with local preservation advocates, professionals and homeowners:

1) **Educate owners of Steele properties concerning the benefits of listing a historic property in the National Register.**

“The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 assigns the National Register of Historic Places a central role in recognizing buildings, sites, districts, structures, and objects significant in American history, archeology, architecture, engineering, or culture, and identifying them as worthy of preservation.”[^8] Benefits of being listed in the National Register includes honoring the property by recognizing its importance to the community, State or Nation, and eligibility for Federal historic preservation funding. Listing a property in the National Register still allows property owners to make alterations to their property, provided that no Federal license, permit or funding is involved.[^9] Owners of listed properties are also not obligated to open their properties to the public, restore or maintain them.

It is recommended that U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service brochures such as “The National Register of Historic Places” and “My Property is Important to American Heritage, What Does That Mean?” be made available at preservation advocacy organizations such as the Landmark Society of Western New York and the Rochester Historical Society. In addition, a public forum sponsored by the New

[^8]: U.S. Department of the Interior, “My Property is Important to American Heritage, What Does That Mean?” The pamphlet was completed by the National Register of Historic Places Division of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, nd.

[^9]: Ibid.
York State Historic Preservation Office or Preservation League of New York State should be held to allow property owners and interested individuals the opportunity to interact and question preservation professionals.

2) Increase the interpretation of the gardens through brochures and walking tours.

Communities that embrace their heritage often share an understanding of the events, people and places that bear some degree of importance in illustrating that history. Citizens know where the memorable activities occurred, where significant individuals lived and where key social issues and cultural trends left their mark on the city. What most residents often overlook, however, are the less obvious but equally important reminders of the past - the places that may be too familiar because of the current uses and associations that overshadow their relationship to history. A walking tour and brochure program targeted at Rochester’s historic design landscapes will enhance the potential for tourism and other forms of community enterprise, but also will identify historic sites and help ensure a greater appreciation for the city’s history.

The walking tours and brochures will promote and encourage Rochesterians to value their homes, residential neighborhoods and designed landscapes as important reminders of the past, as well as engender a desire to preserve these places for the community at-large. In addition, the tours and brochures will provide residents with direct links to specific historic events, people or trends important in shaping Rochester’s history.

3) List eligible Fletcher Steele associated and designed properties on the National Register of Historic Places.

Although many of Steele’s designed landscapes are components of contributing resources to Rochester’s preservation districts, only one, the Campbell-Whittlesey House, is listed individually on the National Register of Historic Places. Additional properties that should be documented and nominated include Steele’s childhood home at 20 Monroe Avenue, Allen garden at 32 Oliver Street, Calihan garden at 780 Allens Creek Road, Strong mansion and garden at 700 Allens Creek Road and Townson garden at 215 Ambassador Drive.
Conclusions

Fletcher Steele’s work served as a pivot point between classical Beaux Arts formalism and the slowly emerging modernist idiom. As a true eclectic, Steele selected ideas from Italian, French, Chinese and Modernist traditions. Strongly influenced by his travels and the modernist gardens at the 1925 Exposition Internationale des Arts Decoratifs et Industriels Modernes (International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts), he emphasized the artistic and aesthetic approach to landscape design in his residential designs. Fletcher Steele is an early to mid 20th century landscape architect who designed more than 500 gardens throughout the New England and Mid-Atlantic States and whose garden designs are being altered or demolished due to a lack of knowledge and increasing need to accommodate the automobile in residential areas.

The designed landscapes of Fletcher Steele in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area embody the essence of Steele’s design aspirations and ideals. Since Robin Karson published Steele’s biography *Fletcher Steele, Landscape Architect: An Account of the Gardenmaker’s Life 1885-1971* in 1989, many additional archival resources and information concerning Steele’s work in the Rochester have been brought to light. With this thesis, a master list of Steele’s Rochester area clients has been developed. It is apparent from the information gathered and presented in this thesis that many of Steele’s designed landscapes have been altered to some varying degree or completely removed from the property. As a result of this documentation, and the recommendations offered they provide property owners, preservation planners and
preservation advocates guidance in decision-making, resulting in a more accurate interpretation of the whole property or resource and stressing the importance of preserving these landscapes.

The findings of the existing conditions and the site analysis process documented the alterations that have occurred to Steele’s designed landscapes over time, and clarify the current and future needs to preserve these innovative garden designs. While there are numerous properties that have been altered or demolished, there are five properties where the landscape is remarkably intact. These properties are the Allen garden, Devine garden, Townson garden, Calihan garden and Turner garden. Treatment recommendations have been suggested based on physical analysis and on the fact that the landscape and features of the gardens exemplify Steele’s eclectic approach to design.

This thesis should serve as the foundation for educating property owners and as a treatment guide aimed at retaining the existing garden fabric and the preservation management of Steele’s designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area. Although seventy-five of Steele’s clients/designed landscape have been identified and documented, additional research concerning each of the properties is needed. Community leaders, preservation advocates, scholars and property owners should take an active role in augmenting this inventory and in educating Rochesterians concerning Steele’s designed landscapes in the Rochester, New York metropolitan area and his importance to the landscape architecture profession.
Appendix A

List of Consultations, Unknown Condition and Properties not Visited

Consultation

Client #32  Mr. Fletcher Harper Sibley  
9 Prince Street  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1954)

The Italianate revival style residence at 11 Prince Street was built in 1883 by Hiram Sibley (co-founder and President of Western Union Telegraph Company) as a wedding present for his daughter Emily Sibley.¹ When Emily Sibley was living at 11 Prince Street, she may have hired Steele to design the small perennial garden behind the library wing. This would explain the early client number and drawing numbers before Steele’s 32-7 drawing for F. Harper Sibley in 1954. However, little is known about the garden and no specific designer has been accredited to this design.² After F. Harper Sibley bought the property and demolished the Italianate residence, Steele was commissioned to create a design for the front yard. In September of 1954 Steele had designed an elaborate spiral parterre garden. The parterre garden was never built and the front yard remains an open lawn. There are no records or remains of Steele’s proposed design ever being implemented.

¹ This paraphrase is taken from a one page property description titled The Watson Library in 11 Prince Street File Folder at Landmark Society of Western New York. No author, date or page number appear, nor is the publication identified.
² In August 1997 Cynthia Howk of Landmark Society of Western New York had a discussion with Miss Elizabeth Holahan, then president of Rochester Historical Society, concerning the current exterior landscaping at 9 Prince Street. Howk asked Miss Holahan if she knew of any plans, name of designer for the garden/site at #9. Miss Holahan said that very little is known; she asked J. S. Watson Jr. many times about this, but he had little knowledge of the property...". 11 Prince Street File Folder, Landmark Society of Western New York.
When Eastman died in 1932 he willed his property to the University of Rochester who used the property as the President's house. "The grounds, landscaped in a formal style, have been much simplified by President and Mrs. Valentine since they came to live there in 1935. The gardens were originally laid out by Alling DeForest but virtually all flower beds have now been removed to make way for lawns. The original axis has been destroyed, the rose gardens having been turned into a circular green garden which leads to an espaliered Allee. The allee, suggested by Fletcher Steele, is on the foundation of what was Mr. Eastman's orchid house." Additional research is needed concerning the allee.

Andrew Wolfe "...earned his bachelor's and master's degrees in English from Harvard University. He also served in Europe in World War II as a sergeant in military government." After moving to Rochester, Mr. Wolfe founded Historic Pittsford, a community group dedicated to the preservation of historically and architecturally significant buildings in the Erie Canal Village. "His and the group's first project was the restoration of the Phoenix Building, a three-story brick edifice from the Federal era that was an inn for most of the 19th century. The structure's unique past had been hidden by a conversion in the early 1900s into the Old Heidelberg brew haus, the construction of a gas station off the front porch and a fire. In 1965 the Phoenix Building became home to Mr. Wolfe's newspaper business, whose flagship newspaper was the Brighton-Pittsford Post. His operation grew from three newspapers in 1956 to nine with a circulation of 45,000 in 1996, the year the company was sold to the Canandaigua Messenger operation."  

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Wolfe had just moved into a new house in the early 1950s and were in need of some landscaping. Mrs. Wolfe's aunt, Elizabeth S. Stebbins, was a good friend of Mr. Steele's and asked him to do a sketch for the proposed landscaping at 99 Babcock drive. Steele completed the conceptual design, but the Wolfes could not pay for the type of work the Steele was proposing for their property. Ms.

---

Wolfe claims to have the original sketch, but was unable to locate the drawing. She does however have notes pertaining to the sketch, which have yet to be obtained. The proposed work was never implemented.

Client # 669     Mr. and Mrs. William Selden  
Elm Place  
8899 East River Road  
Avon, New York 14414  
(1963)

Col. William Markham first came to the Genesee Valley in 1756 and urged his sons to come back and settle. One son also named William Markham, came back and claimed 160 acres in lieu of his service with a governmental expedition, the Phelps-Gorham Survey.6 “The estate Markham settled was called Elm Place in honor of a mammoth elm tree used before the coming of the white men as a meeting place for the Tuscaroras, Irondequoits and other Indian tribes that roamed the area.”7 In the early 1900s, Elm Place passed by marriage into the Selden Family. It is during the third generation of Selden’s, George Baldwin Selden, that Alling DeForest in March 1911 created a plan for Elm Place. Approximately 90% of the plan was implemented. The Seldon family continued to live at Elm Place for the next 75 years when in 1986, Mr. and Mrs. William Seldon, George Seldon’s grandson, sold Elm Place to current owner Karen Hopkins.

Although Steele had previously completed work for his father Henry R. Selden in the mid to late 1930s and 1960, William Selden commissioned Steele c. 1963 to develop the area just north east of the mansion. In the July 1963 plan, Steele proposes an in-law apartment with garage, shady paved terrace garden, and vegetable garden and small pool area northeast of the mansion. Six years later Steele bills Mr. Selden for services on the 9th of September 1969 concerning advice about Elm Place revision.8 Upon visiting the property in 2003, no such structure or gardens were ever implemented.

---

7 Ibid.
8 Fletcher Steele to Mr. William M. Selden, 14 January 1969 (Rochester Historical Society).
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Client # 681  Mr. and Mrs. William and Eleanor McQuilken
777 Allen's Creek Road
Rochester, New York 14618
(1965)

A friend of the family brought Fletcher Steele over to take a look at the property. For one hour, Steele suggested and marked which trees needed to be removed in 1965. He did not do any design work for the McQuilkens.9

Client # 682  Mr. and Mrs. Daniel and Nancy Robbins
35 Schoolhouse Lane
Rochester, New York 14618
(1965)

My husband and I were relative newcomers to Rochester when we met in 1961 and then married in 1964. We left our small apartments and moved into a newly built and unlandscaped home in February 1965. We wanted to do our own landscaping but didn't know where to start. A business associate told me that we should call a "very good landscape architect, Fletcher Steele", which I did. I called him and told him our dilemma and he replied, "Oh that would be a very good project for an old man". Little did I know that I was akin to asking Rembrandt for advice on painting the bathroom.

He arrived one cold Sunday morning in his frock coat and striped trousers and spent the next two hours with us talking about landscape design. He never put a pencil to paper but rather gave us his philosophy of landscaping. I soon discovered that he was hard of hearing and that I was repeating my questions as his meter was running. We later received a bill for $75, a great sum in 1965. After a month or so of mulling over what we had learned, we asked him back. When I showed him some sketches I had made, he revealed to that he couldn't see them because he didn't have his glasses. He then took us outside and, in the best fashion of the method school of acting, he positioned himself in the yard with arms held high, taking the place of a tree. When we couldn't see "that ugly garage door across the street", he placed a stake where a tree should go. He still never wrote anything on paper, but we had a much better understanding of his vision for our yard. To cap off the evening, I apologized for the simple meatloaf dinner I had asked him to stay for. He said, "Oh that's all right. I don't have my teeth".

We did do our own work and were rewarded the next year at the end of the July 4th weekend when he ambled around back to find us pulling the last weeds in our garden. He said, "Now doesn't that look better than your neighbor's?10

The bill Steele had sent the Robbins was for "Advice given on February 20th, 1966 on disposition of landscape elements at 35, Schoolhouse Lane, Brighton, namely what to plant along road: how to place flower garden in sun between house and road with background of flowering trees and shrubs and fences; Informal paved areas among trees back of house to create a Wild, half shade garden; and names of some plants to begin, etc.11

---

9 Eleanor McQuilken, telephone interview with author, 12 June 2003.
10 Nancy S. Robbins to Author, 23 June 2003 (Copy in SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
11 Fletcher Steele to Mr. Daniel H. Robbins, 10 March 1966 (Rochester Historical Society).
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Frame engaged Steele in February of 1965 and told him what they were planning to do with the property. Steele came back with plans suggesting a very formal reflecting pool garden and design that did not reflect the Frame’s original concept for the property.\textsuperscript{12} Steele then issued a bill on March 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1965 for services from February 20\textsuperscript{th} through February 28\textsuperscript{th} concerning a preliminary visit, conference, study and plans.\textsuperscript{13} This concluded the correspondence between Steele and the Frames.

In March of 1970, Steele had issued a bill for services rendered concerning an outline of a general plan of development for the property on Cellingsworth Drive.\textsuperscript{14} In a telephone conversation with Mr. Morgan he said “We had moved to Rochester and lived on a side of a gully, a yard that is not terribly big less than an acre and had him (Steele) come to make an estimate and his recommendations made no sense for what we wanted. We had two little girls at the time and he suggested putting up a labyrinth on our front lawn and a gazebo looking over the gully. We did not carry on any of his recommendations.”\textsuperscript{15}

Very little information is known concerning the extent of Steele’s involvement with the Carlson’s property. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Chey purchased the property in 1997 with very little information given about the garden. The residence was built in 1945 by Chester Carlson. The Carlson’s planted a grove of evergreen trees along side Crescent Hill Road. When the Chey’s moved in, the landscape was in poor condition. The Chey’s altered the front and backyard, but were able to leave the existing grove of evergreens.

\textsuperscript{12} Robert B. Frame, telephone interview with author, 4 September 2003.
\textsuperscript{13} Fletcher Steele to Mr. Robert B. Frame, 8 March 1965 (Rochester Historical Society).
\textsuperscript{14} Fletcher Steele to Dr. William L. Morgan, 30 March 1970 (Rochester Historical Society).
\textsuperscript{15} Dr. William L. Morgan, telephone interview with author, 4 August 2003.
The Italianate residence was purchased in 1868 by Hiram Sibley (founder and first president of Western Union Telegraph Company). In 1887 the deed to the residence was transferred to Hiram’s only son, Hiram Watson Sibley. During the early 1900s the residence was modernized and tastefully changed “...to the then-popular neo-Georgian style by removing the porch, cupola, and cornices; reducing windows to classical scale and adding mullions; and applying a brick façade, ionic pilasters, and Georgian doorways.” In 1911-12, the residence was deeded to Hiram Watson Sibley’s son, Fletcher Harper Sibley and his wife, Georgianna. The transformation of the residence was complete in 1912 with “...a new servants’ wing, library and dining room designed by John Gade, Hiram Watson’s brother-in-law. (Gade, a New York City architect, also designed the Memorial Art Gallery, built in 1913. The gallery was a gift of Hiram Watson’s sister, Emily Sibley Watson, in memory of her son James G. Averall, an architecture student).” F. Harper Sibley and his wife occupied the Sibley family residence for the next sixty years. When Georgianna Sibley died in 1976, the Schlegel Corporation purchased the property in September 1976 and opened in December 1977 as their new world headquarters. The Schlegel Corporation was the first corporation to apply for income tax credits under the Tax Reform Act of 1976. The corporation hired landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn in 1978 to revamp the existing plantings in the north eastern portion of the residence and the entry drive. For over twenty years the Schlegel Corporation occupied the Sibley residence. In 1998 Rural Opportunities Inc. purchased the property and is the current owners of the property.

Steele was hired in 1921 by F. Harper Sibley for design work at 400 East Avenue. Although there are no records, photographs or archival evidence of his work for the Sibley’s, the current site conditions have components consistent with Steele’s design style including a wall mounted three tiered fountain system with

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Planting Plan, September 11, 1978 (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University).
fish/shell motif and red brick walkways, decorative walls with arches. Additional research is necessary to determine the extent of Steele's involvement with the property and the condition of his possible design.

Client # 391 Mr. William Brewster Lee  
320 Barrington Street  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1932)

The Mr. and Mrs. Shuster purchased the property in 1906 and built the residence c.1910. The Shusters lived at the property until 1924 when in 1925 Mr. and Mrs. William Brewster Lee purchased the property. The Lees were very active in their neighborhood with Mrs. Lee publishing a booklet entitled "Barrington Street Then and Now" to help maintain the quality of living in their neighborhood. In 1983, Richard and Theresa Williams purchased the property from Ms. Lee. Shortly there after, the Williams sold the property in 1989 to current owner Ms. Molly Benjamin. At the time of purchase, the landscaping was altered to its current condition. Ms. Benjamin stated "The original owner, who was here until about 1985, (as I am told) had a design of many brick paths ending in statuary, employed three gardeners, and had a squirrel zapper for squirrels climbing her bird feeder that show operated from her kitchen window...However, when I moved in (1989), the backyard consisted of nothing but grass, a rim of Hawthorne trees at the back (probably original), some myrtle, and a privet hedge that has become a tree...I have redone it in my style, eliminating grass, using ground cover, a decorative pool, brick patio, etc.".  

Steele was commissioned c. 1932 to create a general plan for the estate of W. Brewster Lee Esq. The general plan for the property is the extent of information known concerning Steele's involvement with the property. Additional research concerning the development of the general plan and Steele's further involvement with the property is necessary.

Client # 396 Mr. and Mrs. Edward Peck and Agnes Bartlett Curtis  
2669 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14610  
(1934)

Agnes married Edward Peck Curtis, Sr., a WWI flying ace and future vice-president of Eastman Kodak in 1924. Mr. Curtis became Major General Curtis, serving Dwight Eisenhower, and Mrs. Curtis became administrative assistant of the Eastern Area American Red Cross. When the Curtis's moved back to

---

22 Molly Benjamin, email correspondence to author, 26 October 2003.
Rochester, they moved the Colonial style residence from the east side of East Avenue to the west side and its current location at 2669 East Avenue. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Calabrese purchased the property in 1968 and have since added a circular driveway and drop off area, cleared out the western portion of the lot and added/ moved plant materials to the backyard and have added a garage and workshop. The Calabrese's are currently adding a two story wing to the residence.

Steele was engaged in 1934 to create a general plan for the estate of Edward P. Curtis, Esq. The general plan for the property is the extent of information known concerning Steele's involvement with the property. Additional research concerning the development of the general plan and further involvement with the property is necessary.

Client # 406  Mrs. Charles W. Dodge  
                 330 Oxford Street  
                 Rochester, New York 14618  
                 (1935)

Charles Wright Dodge was on the biology faculty of the University of Rochester from 1890 to 1931. Dodge is listed as a client in the SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, but no archival information concerning Steele's involvement with the property has been located. Additional research concerning this property is needed.

Client # 407  Mrs. Henry R. Selden  
                 Elm Place  
                 8899 East River Road  
                 Avon, New York 14414  
                 (1936-1960)

Col. William Markham first came to the Genesee Valley in 1756 and urged his sons to come back and settle. One son also named William Markham, came back and claimed 160 acres in lieu of his service with a governmental expedition, the Phelps-Gorham Survey. "The estate Markham settled was called Elm Place in honor of a mammoth elm tree used before the coming of the white men as a meeting place for the Tuscaroras, Iroquois and other Indian tribes that roamed the area." In the early 1900s, Elm Place passed by marriage into the Selden Family. It is during the third generation of Selden's, George Baldwin Selden, that Alling DeForest in March 1911 created a plan for Elm Place. Approximately 90% of the plan was

---

23 Charles Wright Dodge Papers, 1891-1930 (Rare Books, Special Collections, and Preservation, Rush Rhees Library at University of Rochester).
24 Jack Jones, "Saying goodbye to 4 generations of family history" Democrat and Chronicle (August 18, 1983).
implemented. The Seldon family continued to live at Elm Place for the next 75 years when in 1986, Mr. and Mrs. William Seldon, George Seldon’s grandson, sold Elm Place to current owner Karen Hopkins.

When George Selden’s son, Henry R. Selden married Mary Markham in 1922 and took over Elm Place, they commissioned Fletcher Steele to redesign the entrance driveway. In August 1936 Steele created a map of the immediate grounds surrounding the English manor style mansion. By October of 1936 Steele had revised the alignment and the grading of the entrance driveway. During the next twenty years, it is unknown what work Steele did or continued for the Seldens. In January of 1960, Steele began work on a proposed garage addition at the north end of the mansion. It is believed that the proposed garage addition was never built, but additional research is necessary concerning the alterations made to the entrance driveway and Steele’s changes to Alling DeForest’s original design for Elm Place.

Client # 434  Mrs. Kenneth Field  
35 Brunswick Street  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1937)

The Tudor style residence was built c. 1909 and was first occupied by realtor Alexander Baird and his family. When Ms. Louise Klinke purchased the property in September 1993 the property had been significantly altered. The front yard was primarily grass and the backyard had been paved over for extra parking. However, neighbors had mentioned there being a flagstone patio in the backyard at one point. The flagstone had been removed and taken from the property by the previous owners. Steele was hired in 1937 by Mrs. Kenneth Field. The type and extent of work Steele did for Mrs. Field is unknown. Additional research is necessary to ascertain the extent of Steele’s involvement with the property.

Client # 482  Mr. Andrew Jackson (Jack) Warner  
Mount Hope Cemetery  
1133 Mt. Hope Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14618  
(1943)

Andrew J. Warner (1884 – 1965) was a music and drama critic for the Rochester Times-Union from 1918 to 1961. A.J. Warner’s father, J. Foster Warner, was born in Rochester and worked as a successful

---

25 Ibid.  
architect in the city. In 1943, Mr. Warner engaged Steele to propose planting at a cemetery lot in Mt. Hope Cemetery. Steele proposed planting scheme included 200 white and red myrtle (Vinca minor), 250 daffodils (Narcissus sp.), one white and one lavender lilac (Syringa sp.) and fifteen Christmas roses (Helleborus niger). Soil preparation included ordering fertilizers, humus and charcoal for the lot. Continuing his work with the Warner’s, in November 1944 Steele ordered an additional 175 blue, red and white myrtle (Vinca minor), ten Christmas roses (Helleborus niger) and ten Madonna lilies (Lilium candidum) for the lot.

Current condition of the lot is unknown.

Client # 483 Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Drescher
99 Pelham Road
Rochester, New York 14610
(1943)

The Tudor style residence was built between 1923 and 1924 by Homer Witmore. The Witmores sold the property to Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Drescher in 1929. The Dreschers lived at the residence until 1946 when they sold the property to William Luke. During the mid 1950s, the property had been sold to Mr. and Mrs. Gregory who had planted the Norway maple and filled in the pond. In 1969, the property was sold to Mr. and Mrs. Moriarty who shortly thereafter sold the property in 1972 to the Tekampe family. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. William and Marion Wilmot purchased the property in 1977.

Although Steele has a client number for the property, no archival information relating to Steele’s involvement with the property has been located. However, some landscape features suggest the possibility of Steele’s involvement and warrants further research.

Client # 521 Mr. and Mrs. Hollister Spencer
597 Allens Creek Road
Rochester, New York 14618
(c. 1950)

The Colonial style residence situated on 1.3 acres was built in 1947 by Mr. and Mrs. Hollister and Betsy Spencer. The Spencer’s lived at the residence for only three years before selling to the Wilsons. During the mid to late 1960s, the Wilsons sold the property to the Olin family. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas and Kathleen Eagle purchased the property in 1977 from the Olin's. The Eagles have made numerous alterations to the landscape. The circular island in the driveway has been removed and paved over; a third bay to the garage added and the northern bank was regraded and edged with timber beams in

---

the 1980s. Also in the 1980s, large rhododendrons were planted along the north side of the driveway and a bluestone patio was added overlooking the Rochester Country Club golf course.\textsuperscript{29}

Although Steele has a client number for the Spencers, no archival information relating to Steele’s involvement with the property has been located. However, in 1948 Katherine Wilson Rahn was engaged to create a landscape plan of the development of the Allen’s Creek Road property.\textsuperscript{30} There are numerous letters and invoices documenting her work with the Spencers. Additional research is needed to determine the extent of both Steele’s and Rahn’s involvement with the property.

Client # 568
Ms. Elizabeth Holahan
70 East Boulevard
Rochester, New York 14607
(1952)

The Federal style residence situated on approximately 1.5 acres was built in 1816 by Oliver Culver, founder of the Town of Brighton and Saint Luke’s Church. The residence originally stood near the intersection of Culver Road and East Avenue when in 1906 the residence was moved to its present location in what was an extensive apple orchard belonging to the Oliver Culver’s farm.\textsuperscript{31} While remaining in the hands of his descendents, gradually falling into disrepair until 1945 when Ms. Elizabeth Holahan purchased the residence and carefully restored it to its original condition.\textsuperscript{32} Currently the future of the property is uncertain since Ms. Holahan passed away in December 2002.

Although Steele has a client number for Ms. Holahan beginning in the early 1950s, no archival information concerning Steele’s involvement with the property has been located. However, in 1957 local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn was sketching designs and ordering plant materials for the property.\textsuperscript{33} Additional research and documentation of the landscape should be conducted to find out the extent of Steele’s and Rahn’s involvement with the property.

\textsuperscript{29} Mrs. Kathleen Eagle, interview with author, 9 October 2003.
\textsuperscript{30} Hollister Spencer to Mrs. Katherine Wilson Rahn, 26 August 1948 (Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University).
\textsuperscript{31} This paraphrase is taken from a two page property description titled “The Oliver Culver House, 70 East Boulevard” in the 70 East Boulevard File Folder at Landmark Society of Western New York. No author, date or page number appears, nor is the publication identified.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Katherine Wilson Rahn Papers, (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University).
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Client # 633  Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth House
230 Ambassador Drive
Rochester, New York 14610
(1955)

The Colonial style residence situated on a half acre lot was built in 1955 by Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth House. The history of property owners is unknown. The current owners of the property are Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Judith Columbus.

Although Steele has a client number for the Houses for 1955, no archival information concerning Steele’s involvement with the property has been located. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine the nature of Steele’s relationship with the Houses.

Client # 643  Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Lewis Stern Jr.
3365 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, New York 14610
(1957)

The Colonial style residence situated on 1.1 acres was built in 1936 by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur L. Stern Jr. The history of property owners is unknown. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. David and Ilene Flaum, purchased the property in October 1990.

The Sterns engaged Steele c. 1957 for a landscape plan of the property. By March of 1958, Steele’s proposed a design for the south garden, drawing 643-10 was an elaborated mixture of modern curves and classic formalism. However, it is unknown if the design or portions of the design were ever implemented. Shortly there after in October 1960, the Sterns engaged local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn for a planting plan surrounding the swimming pool area. In a letter to Rahn, Arthur Stern states:

We have studied carefully the preliminary drawings you made for our garden, and we are very enthusiastic about most of the ideas. Frankly, however, the cost of doing this work is more than we had anticipated, particularly since there is other work in the garden which we feel must be done also.

I understand that you have advised Mrs. Stern that this work can be done as well in the spring as now. Under these circumstances, if agreeable to you, we would like to consider it further over the winter and decide definitely in the spring just how much of the job we wish to do at this time. Perhaps we could achieve somewhat the same effect as you have planned by using less expensive stock, or perhaps we shall be able to do only that part of the work which is the most important at this time.

If you so desire, we shall be very happy to pay now for the plans which you have drawn, with the amount to be used as a credit against your fee when we go ahead with the portion of the work which we decide to do next spring.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{34} Arthur L. Stern to Katherine Wilson Rahn, 23 October 1960 (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University).
Additional information concerning Rahn's development of the Stern property is available at Cornell University. Additional research is necessary to determine the extent of Steele's involvement with the property.

**Client # 672**  
The B'rith Kodesh Congregation  
2131 Elmwood Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14618  
(1963)

Temple B'rith Kodesh was the first Jewish congregation in the city of Rochester. The congregation in 1909 was located downtown at Grove and Gibbs Street where it remained until the opening of the current building on Elmwood Avenue in 1962. An additional education wing was added in the last five years.\(^{35}\)

Steele was engaged by the congregation in 1963. The extent of Steele's involvement with the property is unknown, however additional research should be conducted particularly the inner courtyard with red brick paths and terraces.

**Client # 673**  
Spencer Memorial  
Mount Hope Cemetery Lot  
Rochester, New York 14620  
(c.1963)

Mount Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America.\(^{36}\) The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting.

George A. Hollister purchased all of Lot 119 in Section G on December 10, 1842. On April 2, 1863 Emmett H. Hollister purchased all of the adjoining Lot 119 ½. The combined area is 600 square feet.\(^{37}\)

Although Steele has a client number for the Spencer Memorial, no archival information concerning Steele's involvement with the cemetery lot has been located. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine the extent of Steele's association with the cemetery lot.

**Client # 685**  
Dr. and Mrs. Morris J. and Mary Reita Hanchar  
25 Stoneham Road  
Rochester, New York 14625  
(1966)

The Tudor style residence situated on approximately one half acre was built in 1937 by Mr. Jim Gleason. The lot size was expanded in the 1940s and again in the 1966. Dr. and Mrs. Hanchar purchased the

\(^{37}\) Frank Gillespie, letter to the author, 29 May 2003.
property in 1965. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the property was sold in a sheriff’s auction and bought by Mr. and Mrs. David and Patricia Wier in 1986.\(^8\) The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Paul and Sandra Schneider, purchased the property in May 1993.

The Hanchars initially commissioned local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn to redesign the landscape c. 1966. In May of 1966 Rahn had proposed a landscape remodeling plan for the property including widening the existing driveway and addition a drop off loop and adding a formal garden with pebble pathways. For unknown reasons, the Hanchar’s decided to discontinue their relationship with Rahn and engaged Steele. He proposed designs for the property including an elaborate wrought iron fence and gate and geometrically planted front yard. Although Steele billed the Hanchars in March 1967 for a preliminary visit, general recommendations for development, study of grounds and plans for the front garden, iron gates and fences, the work Steele proposed was never built, however portions of Katherine Wilson Rahn’s design may have been implemented. Additional research is necessary to determine the extent of Rahn’s involvement with the property development.

Client # 687 Werner
Mount Hope Cemetery
1133 Mt. Hope Avenue
Rochester, New York 14620
(1967)

William E. Werner purchased the east half of lot 116 in Section MM on May 27\(^{th}\) 1898. This parcel covers 350 square feet. Although Steele has a client number for the Werner cemetery lot in 1967, no archival information concerning the lot have been located. However, the relief on the Werner monument may have been designed by Steele. Additional research is necessary to determine the extent of Steele’s involvement with the cemetery lot.

Client # 693 Mr. Henry M. Hamlin
4357 Nine Mile Point Road
Fairport, New York 14450
(1968- 1970)

The Colonial style residence situated on approximately five acres was built in 1920. Little is known concerning the owners of the property. The current owners of the property are Mr. and Mrs. John and Colleen Broman.

\(^{38}\) Sandra Schneider, interview with author, 22 June 2003.
Henry Hamlin engaged Steele c. 1968 to redesign the entrance driveway to the property. In May 1968 Steele billed Hamlin concerning “advice on alteration and development of the land around residence.”39 By October of 1968, Steele had proposed a circular driveway with drop off loop and additional parking areas. A year and a half later, Steele sent a large bill concerning services rendered from May 22nd 1968 to February 25th 1970 for “Twenty seven visits concerning conferences with Mr. and Mrs. Hamlin; changes in driveway, readjustments of landscape and planting, painting of barn, planting and direction of same, with all necessary revisions…plans, plant lists worked out, and ordered.”40 Although the proposed alterations to the entrance driveway were never built, additional research should be conducted concerning the other work Steele did for the Hamlins.

Properties not Visited

Client # 3  
Mr. and Mrs. Herbert L. Pells Ward
Bushnell’s Basin, New York
(1914)

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

Client # 51  
Mr. and Mrs. Edward Griffith and Helen B. Miner Jr.
2 Argyle Street
Rochester, New York 14607
(1916)

The Italian Renaissance residence was built in 1906 and designed by Claude Bragdon, Rochester’s most notable early 20th century architect. Mr. and Mrs. Miner moved into the residence in 1906. Miner was President and General Manager of the Pfaufler Co., a steel equipment company. Helen B. Miner lived at the residence until her death in 1964 when she willed the property to her daughter Elinor M. Lamont. Elinor Lamont in turn sold the property to Sarah Martin in November 1964.41 During the 1960’s the residence was modified for multiple unit occupancy. Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client.

39 Fletcher Steele to Mr. Henry M. Hamlin, 22 May 1968 (Rochester Historical Society).
40 Fletcher Steele to Mr. Henry M. Hamlin 25 February 1970 (Rochester Historical Society).
Client # 53  Mr. Freeman C. Allen  
Rochester, New York 14610  
(1916)

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

Client # 118  Mrs. Edith Hale  
Rochester, New York  
(1922)

Although there are six scrapbook photographs of the client’s property in SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, the extent of work and location of the garden still needs to be determined.

Client # 140  Mrs. Frank Hawley Ward (Clayla Werner Ward)  
18 Grove Place  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1923)

The residence at 18 Grove Place was built in 1855. Clayla Louise Werner met her future husband Frank Hawley Ward in New York City were she went to attempt a career on the stage. Married in February of 1922, the Wards occupied 18 Grove Place until 1967 when Clayla gave the property to the Landmark Society in memory of her husband.\textsuperscript{42} Steele was commissioned c.1923 to create a design for a tea garden. A drawing done in April 1923 illustrates a stone terrace enclosed by brown stained lattice. A seat, plantings beds and pots adorned the proposed space. A visit to the site is recommended to find out the condition of the tea garden Steele suggested.

Client # 205  Mr. Levi S. Ward  
855 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1925)

Other than an order placed in July 1925 for “forty-eight sections of rustic rattan panels as per sample submitted”, little information is known concerning Steele’s involvement with the property.\textsuperscript{43} A visit to the property is recommended.

Client # 236  Mr. Phillips Payson  
Rochester, New York

Other than a client name, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

\textsuperscript{42} “Frank Hawley Ward Family Papers, 1894 - 1965” (Rare Books, Special Collections & Preservation, University of Rochester).

\textsuperscript{43} Commercial Reed & Rattan Co., to Levi S. Ward, 9 July 1925 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
Client # 246  Mr. and Mrs. George Dana Boardman Bonbright  
950 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1926)

George Bonbright moved into the residence at 950 East Avenue in 1907 and resided there until his death in 1939. His widow later divided the residence into apartments sometime before 1959 when it was partially destroyed by fire, but rebuilt as an apartment building in 1964. 44 Other than an order placed in May 1926 for two silver lindens (Tilia argentea), little information is known concerning Steele’s involvement with the property. 45 A visit to the property is recommended.

Client # 590  Mr. John Goetz  
251 Nunda Boulevard  
Rochester, New York 14610  
(c.1961)

Other than a bill for professional services relating to a visit to the property, little information is known concerning the extent of Steele’s involvement with the property. 46 Additional research and a visit to the property are suggested.

Client # 601  Mr. and Mrs. Michael Watson  
4016 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14610  
(1952)

Steele was commissioned c. 1952 to create a general plan for the property. In December of 1952, Steele had developed a proposed landscape plan for both the front and backyards including a greenhouse, valley space, laundry yard, kitchen garden, terrace and vale space and elaborate swimming pool area with twin sunbaths. It is unknown if the proposed plan was implemented. Additional research and a visit to the property are recommended.

Client # 603  Dr. David B. Jewett  
Rochester, New York  
(c.1952)

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

45 Moon’s Nurseries to Mr. G.D.B. Bonbright, 1 May 1926 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
Mr. Herman M. Cohn was son to Herman C. Cohn (founder of Superba Cravats, the oldest and largest manufactures of neckwear in the United States). Mr. Herman Cohn engaged Steele c. 1957. Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. Additional research and a visit to the property are recommended.

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. Additional research and a visit to the property are suggested.

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

Other than a client number, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

The split level residence was built in 1963 by Dr. and Mrs. William Sawyer. The Sawyers initially sought professional landscape services in spring 1964 from local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn. However in a letter dated September, 1964 Helen stated:

> Were very enthusiastic about your suggestions and appreciate that you've given it all much time and thought, which you've shared with use. I hesitate to ask, but would you consider continuing the landscaping, but give the contract for the lawn to a lower bidder? If not, could we buy the plans you've already made? We certainly want to pay you for all

---

46 Fletcher Steele to Mr. John Goetz, 21 October 1961 (Rochester Historical Society).
the consultations and time you’ve given use, and we can’t help but be influenced by and benefited by, your plan to date.47

Steele was engaged shortly thereafter to aid with the planting of the heather bed and cultivation of the border. Additional research and a visit to the property are recommended.

Client ### Mrs. Walter Dabney Blair (Elizabeth Hollister Frost) Rochester, New York

Other than a client name, no archival information has been located pertaining to this client. The address of the client still needs to be determined.

---

47 Helen Sawyer to Katherine Wilson Rahn, 27 September 1964 (Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University).
Appendix B

List of Good, Fair, Poor and Demolished Properties

Properties in Good Condition

Client #40  Mr. and Mrs. Atkinson and Charlotte Whitney Allen
            32 Oliver Street
            Rochester, New York 14607
            (1915-1964)

Refer to pages 25 – 39 for a complete property description.

Client #387  Mrs. Adrian G. Devine
            3550 Elmwood Avenue
            Rochester, New York 14610
            (1931-1943)

Refer to pages 40 – 50 for a complete property description.

Client #390  Mrs. Raymond Bentley
            125 Old Mill Road
            Rochester, New York 14618
            (1932-1952, 1963)

Refer to pages 51 – 62 for a complete property description.

Client #442  Mr. John M. Steele
            Mount Hope Cemetery Lot
            Rochester, New York 14620
            (1938)

Mount Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America.\(^\text{48}\)

The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting.

Jennette Lampert, Mary Steele, Emma E. Lampert, Carrie L. McKindley, Adella L. Carson and Henry W.
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Lampert purchased all of Lot 215 in Section C on November 16, 1888. The lot was 477 square feet. On the same date the Lot Register shows the transfer of the East part of this lot to John M. Steele.49

When his father passed away in 1936, Steele designed a classic shouldered tablet in black slate of exceptional quality. The inscription reads “In memory of John Mason Steele who died Nov. 29th 1936, in the 85th year of his age. He was born, lived and died in Pittsford, New York.” When Steele’s mother Mary passed away in 1943 and his sister Esther in 1964, Steele also designed similar tablet markers for their graves. Fletcher Steele’s own gravestone was designed before he died to match the other three black slate tablets for his family.

Client # 468  Mr. and Mrs. Homer and Margaret Woodbury Strong
700 Allens Creek Road
Rochester, New York 14618
(1938- c.1941)

Refer to pages 63 – 73 for a complete property description

Client # 503  Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr.
Mount Hope Cemetery Lot
Rochester, New York 14620
(1945- 1953)

Mount Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America.50

The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting.

Caroline Thompson purchased all of Lot 141 in Section D on September 12, 1874. This lot covered 1000 square feet. Her heirs sold the 500 square feet designated as the East ¼ of Lot 141 to James S. Watson on July 26, 1876.51

When Emily Sibley Watson died in 1945, Steele was hired by James Sibley Watson to design Mrs. James Sibley Watson’s memorial. By May of 1946, Steele had placed an order for Blue White Westerly (Sullivan) granite to be trucked and set in Mt. Hope Cemetery.52 Later that year in September plant orders were placed for 375 periwinkle (Vincia minor) and 375 periwinkle (Vincia minor alba) for the Emily Sibley Watson Estate. This is the extent of information known concerning Steele’s involvement with Mrs. James Sibley Watson’s memorial. However after James S. Watson’s death in 1951, Steele placed another order in

49 Frank Gillespie to author, 29 May 2003.
51 Frank Gillespie to author, 29 May 2003.
52 J. Danelli & Sons Granite and Marble Artistic Memorials to Fletcher Steele, 20 May 1946 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
Sibley Watson's memorial. However after James S. Watson's death in 1951, Steele placed another order in September of 1952 for a Blue White Westerly granite memorial in memory of James S. Waston. In a letter to the Rochester Carting Company dated April 1953 Steele discusses the delivery and placement of the memorial:

You are to get from the Western Express Company the stone made by John Evans Company for the J. S. Watson lot, at 195 Dewey Avenue, Rochester, NY. You will take it to the Watson Lot in the Mount Hope Cemetery.

The foundation for the stone has already been laid. This monument will rest on this foundation. The height of it is to be so that the highest point on the ledger stone of Mrs. Emily Sibley Watson will be level with a point on the James Sibley Watson monument 1 ¼” below the half-round molding at the bottom.

The bill for this work is to be made against the James Sibley Watson Estate, Security Trust Company, and sent to me for approval.

In addition to the two individual monuments, there is a Celtic cross monument to the Watson family on the lot. Before this initial research, the design of the three Watson monuments has been accredited to local architect Claude Bragdon. Additional research is suggested to accredit design of the monuments to the proper designer.

Client # 632  Mr. and Mrs. Harold C. Townson
215 Ambassador Drive
Rochester, New York 14610
(1955-1957)

Refer to pages 74 – 84 for a complete property description

Client # 657  Dr. and Mrs. Robert J. Calihan
780 Allens Creek Road
Pittsford, New York 14618
(1959-65, 1968)

Refer to pages 85 – 98 for a complete property description.

---

52 J. Danelli & Sons Granite and Marble Artistic Memorials to Fletcher Steele, 20 May 1946 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
53 John Evans & Co. to Fletcher Steele, 29 September 1952 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
54 Fletcher Steele to Rochester Carting Company, 15 April 1953 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
The 1850 gothic revival residence is situated on approximately 6.6 acres on the west side of Thomas Avenue. The western boundary consists of the Genesee River with neighboring single family residential properties to the north and south.

Commissioned in 1961, Steele designed a large berm to provide a buffer from the noise of Thomas Avenue. By May 1962, Steele had created a plan for the berm, made several visits to the grounds and placed plant orders. A month later, Steele continued his visits to the property and had the planting plan and plant label list completed. The D’Amandas claim to have Steele’s original planting plan for the berm, but were unable to locate the plan. The D’Amandas also have a home movie featuring Steele on the property directing the construction of the berm. The majority of existing plant materials are from Steele’s initial planting of the berm. Additional research concerning the berm is suggested.

Refer to pages 99 – 111 for a complete property description

“The Memorial Art Gallery was the fifty-first American art museum to open during a period of escalating construction in the field. Of the seventy-nine American institutions then exhibiting art, only ten had been organized before 1870. And of those seventy-nine, nearly half were “organically connected with educational institutions” - colleges, universities, or libraries.”55 The initial Memorial Art Gallery building with its deep portico, frescoed arches and bronze doors built in 1913, was becoming increasingly crowded and the need for an expansion to the original building was apparent. As early as 1954, plans for an expanded Gallery had been entertained.56 Initially the board examined plans to expand northward, but the “temporary” brick wall would have made expanding difficult. It seemed that “…wings to the east or west

would be practical on the remaining land...".\textsuperscript{57} Following in the footsteps of the newly expanded Albright Gallery in Buffalo, in July 1962 the Memorial Art Gallery commissioned architect Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill to prepare plans for the new Gallery wing.\textsuperscript{58} "The Bunshaft plans showed expansion to the west (toward Prince Street) with a two-story wind for offices, library, restaurant and snack bar, and workshop studios."\textsuperscript{59} However, the cost of the proposed plans was more than what the Memorial Art Gallery was willing to spend and resulted in dismissing Bunshaft's plans. In 1964 the Memorial Art Gallery hired the Rochester firm of Waasdorp, Northrup and Kaelber to design plans for an expansion wing east of the original 1913 Gallery. In September of 1966, ground breaking had begun for the Waasdorp, Northrup and Kaelber 30,000 square foot building. The new building would double the size of the original 1913 building and the 1926 addition combined.

At the request of Sibley Watson, Fletcher Steele was engaged. "Steele's initial plan called for trees lining a circular drive in from of the 1913 grand entrance...This impractical if glorious notion was discarded."\textsuperscript{60} Instead Steele proposed a linden allee that ran parallel with the recently completed wing. The linden allee with walk between connected the two buildings and soften the two different architectural styles. In addition to the allee, in the "Outdoor Sculpture Gallery" a small courtyard to the rear of the building, "...Steele was faced with the problem of finding a tree that would survive despite almost impossible shallow root space. He wrote to Donald Wyman at the Arnold Arboretum for advice...Wyman somewhat mischievously suggested Tree-of-Heaven (Ailanthus altissima) for the difficult spot."\textsuperscript{61} The linden allee with stone walk between are in good condition, but the suggested "Outdoor Sculpture Gallery" may have been demolished when the 1987 Vanden Brul Pavilion was erected. Additional research concerning the "Outdoor Sculpture Gallery" is suggested.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, 140.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, 141.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.
Dr. David Mactye had already spent several years landscaping, digging a pond and cutting horse trails on the eighty-five acres of land he purchased in 1965 on the south side of Baker Road before buying additional land in the area. To be used as a summer home, Mactye purchased the estate of Raymond Baker at 8830 Baker Road c. 1970. The elephant theme at Elephant Hill derives from the time when Dr. Mactye told a visiting friend that he had always wished to live by the sea. His friend responded, “In that case, I fear you have bought a white elephant!” During his time at Elephant Hill, Mactye made improvements to the landscape and renovated the house and outbuildings. In 2002, the current owners Mr. and Mrs. Mark Gilbride purchased the property and have since used the 213 acres for raising Alpacas.

When Steele met Dr. David Mactye in 1968, he was asked to visit Mactye’s farm and “…look it over with an eye toward doing some work there.” Later that year, the three of them traveled to Haiti. Upon their return, from April through September 1970, Steele advised three landscape projects. The first project was a suggested stone terrace adjacent to the farmhouse. The raised stone terrace was to have a metal-pipe trellis covering. Steele suggested the trellis be at least twelve feet high so that the wisteria racemes don’t get tangled in women’s hats. Mactye was not planning on entertaining many women with hats, so the suggested trellis became an eight to nine foot tall wooden frame trellis. Mactye was concerned about overwhelming the little farmhouse. The second major project Steele suggested was to create a wooded buffer along Baker Road to block the view of the Street from the residence. Named after an old friend, ‘Daisy Woods’ consisted of bare root deciduous plants randomly planted with a backhoe were all planted in one day. Finally, Steele suggested building a wooden fence along the road. Although Steele suggested a four rail fence, Mactye used a three rail fence.

Since the Gilbrides purchased the property, the stone terrace with wooden trellis, ‘Daisy Woods’ and wooden fencing have been maintained and are extant.

---

62 “Dr. David Mactye, 8830 Baker Road, Bloomfield”, Smith Tour of Homes, May 2002.
64 Fletcher Steele to Dr. David Mactye, 4 September 1970 (Rochester Historical Society).
Fletcher Steele was engaged by Perham between May 20th 1970 to July 5th 1971 for conferences and inspections of the lilac beds and laying out the brick walk. 65

The half acre property located west of Main Street South, was purchased by the current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Cummings from Robert Cooper Jr. in January 1993. After the Labor Day storm of 1998, the Cummings added a red brick walkway and terrace on the south side of the residence to match the front walk leading down to Main Street. The lilac hedge along the eastern and southern edges of the property is mature and in good condition, however a couple of lilacs have been lost on the southern hedge. The lilacs flower all shades of lavender. The red brick walk Steele suggested and laid out remains and is in good condition.

Properties in Fair Condition

Client # 327   Mr. Thomas G. and Mrs. Harriet Hollister Spencer
               1005 East Avenue
               Rochester, New York 14607
               (1929, 37, 44)

Refer to pages 113 – 121 for a complete property description

Client # 423   Campbell-Whittlesey House
               123 South Fitzhugh Street
               Rochester, New York 14606
               (1937-58)

Refer to pages 122 – 131 for a complete property description

Client # 425   Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen and Elizabeth Sibley Stebbins
               1818 Lake Road
               Webster New York
               (1937-46)

The Cape Cod summer house built in 1929 is secluded and situated on seven acres with approximately 600 feet of lake frontage. The Mr. and Mrs. Stebbins purchased the property c. 1935. Shortly after WWII, the Stebbins had an addition built for the maid. When the Stebbins died in 1954, Mrs. Swan a close relative inherited the property. Shortly afterward, she sold the property in May 1960 to
Other than the November 1938 sketch plan for the property, no additional archival information concerning Steele’s involvement with the property has been located. However, Elizabeth Stebbins grand daughter, Ms. Jane Gorsline-Crofts was remembers visiting her grandparents at their summer cottage. She said that “the back of the house had a clover filled field. There was also a picking garden and arbor with grapes.”

The open field and grape arbor are in extant and in good condition.

Client # 480  Mrs. William AE Dresher  
Mount Hope Cemetery Lot  
Rochester, New York 14620  
(1943- 49)  

Mount Hope Cemetery opened in 1838 and is the first municipal Victorian cemetery in America. The 196 acre cemetery has a glaciated topography making the site famous for its picturesque setting.

William A.E. and Annie B. Drescher, his wife, purchased all of lots 142 and 143 in Section I. Lot 142 is recorded as covering 868 square feet, and lot 143 covers 850 square feet.

Steele was commissioned in 1943 to create a planting plan for the Drescher family lot. In an order placed on May 31, 1943, eight Japanese yews (Taxus cuspidata), two Pfitzer junipers (Juniperus pfitzeriana), fourteen creeping junipers (Juniperus horizontalis), five Christmas roses (Helleborus orientalis niger) and one tree peony (Paeonia suffruticosa). In November of that year, Steele ordered 100 Lily of the Valley (Convallaria majalis) and two specimen red leaf Japanese maples (Acer palmatum), to be selected as a pair. Also in December of 1943, Steele ordered 250 myrtle (Vinca minor), 200 Boles myrtle (Vinca minor), 230 white myrtle (Vinca minor), one Japanese yew (Taxus cuspidata), twelve Christmas roses (Helleborus orientalis niger), manure, humus and charcoal for the cemetery lot. To edge the planting beds, in June 1944 Steele ordered treated Cypress ¾ inch thick by 4 ½ inch high. In addition to the planting and edging, in July 1945 Steele designed two stone benches in Barre Granite with end

ornamentals. To finalize the cemetery lot in 1949, Steele ordered five pounds of grass seed mixture. “This mixture contains creeping blue grass, a strain of Kentucky blue grass, creeping Ben, true creeping fescue, and a small quantity of perennial rye grass.”

---

68 Frank Gillespie to author, 29 May 2003.
69 Fletcher Steele to Theodore Schwamb Co., 6 June 1944 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
70 Mr. A. N. Peckham to Mr. Hugh E. Cooke, 22 March 1949 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
be selected as a pair. Also in December of 1943, Steele ordered 250 myrtle (Vinca minor), 200 Boles myrtle (Vinca minor), 230 white myrtle (Vinca minor), one Japanese yew (Taxus cuspidata), twelve Christmas roses (Helleborus orientalis niger), manure, humus and charcoal for the cemetery lot. To edge the planting beds, in June 1944 Steele ordered treated Cypress ¾ inch thick by 4 ¾ inch high. In addition to the planting and edging, in July 1945 Steele designed two stone benches in Barre Granite with end ornamentals. To finalize the cemetery lot in 1949, Steele ordered five pounds of grass seed mixture. “This mixture contains creeping blue grass, a strain of Kentucky blue grass, creeping Ben, true creeping fescue, and a small quantity of perennial rye grass.”

The current cemetery plot has lost some of the original plant materials including one of the red leaf Japanese yews, all groundcover, perennials and the treated Cypress edging. The granite benches, evergreens and one of the red leaf Japanese maples remain and are in good condition.

Client # 609  Mr. And Mrs. John C. and Kate Louise Trahey
744 Lake Road
Webster, New York 14580
(1954- 57)

The old style residence built in 1930 is situated on 10.5 acres along the edge of Lake Ontario. In 1954 Mr. John Trahey commissioned Steele to create a design for the west side yard. Although no historic plans have been located for the property, there are numerous plant orders for the property from 1954 to 1957. The majority of the plants ordered for the garden took place in 1954 which included Japanese andromeda (Pieris japonica), rhododendrons (Rhododendrons Boule de Neige and laetevirens), clematis (Clematis huldine), English ivy (Hedera helix), climbing hydrangea (Hydrangea petiolaris), dwarf euonymus (Euonymous fortunei kewensis), cotoneaster (Cotoneaster sp.) and a wide variety of herbaceous plants. In the spring of 1955, Steele placed another large order for plant materials including shad blow (Amelanchier canadensis), red and black chokeberry (Aronia arbutifolia and melanocarpa), Chinese and vernal witch hazel (Hamamelis mollis and vernalis), spice bush (Lindera benzoin), scarlet elderberry (Smbucus pubens), yellow-root (Xanthorrhiza simplicissima) and four varieties of viburnum (Viburnum

68 Frank Gillespie to author, 29 May 2003.
69 Fletcher Steele to Theodore Schwamb Co., 6 June 1944 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
70 Mr. A. N. Peckham to Mr. Hugh E. Cooke, 22 March 1949 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
71 Henry Kohankie & Son to Mr. John C. Trahey, 1 October 1954 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
In addition to his spring order, in October of 1954, Steele placed an order for 1600 boxwood (Buxus
suffruticosa). From 1955 through 1957, Steele's plant orders consisted primarily of herbaceous plant
materials and replacement plantings for the garden.

Over the years, the composition of plant materials in the garden has been greatly altered. There are
no remains of the boxwood, and many other woody plants Steele ordered for the garden. The hardscape that
Steele may have designed is extant. Additional research is needed for this garden.

Client # 653  Mrs. Frank E. Gannett
&  Mount Hope Cemetery Lot
654  Rochester, New York 14620
(1958-60)

Refer to pages 132 – 138 for a complete property description

Properties in Poor Condition

Client # 49  Ms. Helen Ellwanger
625 Mount Hope Avenue
Rochester, New York 14620
(1923-59)

Refer to pages 140 – 152 for a complete property description

Client # 375  Mrs. Frederick T. Pierson
Kolaneka Farms
55 Mitchell Road
Pittsford, New York 14534
(1931-37)

Refer to pages 153 – 166 for a complete property description

Client # 409  Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. and Hilda Taylor
1166 Clover Street
Rochester, New York 14610
(1936-48)

Refer to pages 167 – 177 for a complete property description

Client # 569  Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr.
6 Sibley Place
Rochester, New York 14609
(c.1953-61)

The Colonial revival residence was built in 1887 for Arthur C. Smith of the law firm Smith, Oliver
and Smith. Mr. Smith is also well known for his short story writing. Mr. Smith lived at the property until

---

72 Horton's Nurseries, Inc. to Mr. John C. Trahey, 20 April 1955 (SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives).
1925 when Mr. James Sibley Watson purchased the property. Mr. Watson and his first wife Hildegarde lived at the property until Hildegarde’s death in 1976.\textsuperscript{73} Shortly thereafter, Mr. Watson remarried. Ms. Nancy Watson Dean, his second wife continues to own the property after his death in 1983.

In a letter to the author, Ms. Dean said: after Hildegarde’s death, he asked me to help him edit her memoirs, as we had been close friends. There are mentions of Steele’s visits in Hildegarde’s appointment book, saying they (the gardens) cost a thousand dollars but were worth it.\textsuperscript{74} Steele was commissioned c. 1953 to design a semi-circular studio entrance to the garden and advise the planting in the western half of the garden. A preliminary sketch plan of the studio entrance was drawn in March 1953. A second sketch nd. illustrates an elevation of the proposed studio entrance to the garden. Very little is known concerning the placement and implemented design. Steele continued his work with Hildegarde through the 1950s and early 1960s. In March 1961, Steele sent Hildegarde a bill for professional services from July 27\textsuperscript{th} 1960 to March 29\textsuperscript{th} 1961 concerning on site conferences and information regarding Japanese iris, plant list of wild flowers and shady plants, preliminary plan for garden lattice on house and in semi-circle.\textsuperscript{75} At the time Nancy Watson married Dr. Watons, she remembers:

...the Fletcher Steele design still there, and I remember garden parties Hildegarde gave, with outdoor tables and chairs arranged on brick paving, which is mostly still there, and we still use the furniture. The garden itself extends from the back of the house to the back wall of the greenhouse, where a dense forest took over. All that part of the garden is Fletcher’s design, except I remember vividly, had only a few white or blue flowers, mostly gorgeous ferns of different sizes that are still there and a mature white birch. We (my gardener of 30 years) and I, added some color, near the house. Before adding a lap pool 40 feet long, attached to the house on its Northeast corner, my son took photographs from an upstairs window in the winter, showing the exact Fletcher Steele design. By that time, the dense forest had been transformed into a large vegetable and fruit garden on the north half, and a wonderful collection of mature tree peonies on the southern half, which is not in full riotous bloom...\textsuperscript{76}

The studio entrance, terrace and group of white birches amidst a massing of ferns have been removed. A portion of the fern massing and original red brick paving remains. A copy of Ms. Dean’s son’s photograph should be obtained and additional research conducted to determine the extant of Steele’s involvement with the property.

\textsuperscript{73} "6 Sibley Place", Architectural and Historic Building Data (Landmark Society of Western New York, 1989).
\textsuperscript{74} Ms. Nancy Dean Watson, email correspondence to author, 6 June 2003.
\textsuperscript{75} Mrs. James Sibley Watson to Fletcher Steele, 30 March 1961 (Rochester Historical Society).
\textsuperscript{76} Ms. Nancy Watson Dean, email correspondence to author, 6 June 2003.
Properties Demolished

Client # 30  Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Allen and Elizabeth Stebbins  
935 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14607  
(1914-1936)

Refer to pages 178 – 190 for a complete property description

Client # 31  Mrs. George Clifford Buell (Ackerman)  
56 Berkeley Street  
Rochester, New York 14607-1405  
(1915)

Refer to pages 191 – 198 for a complete property description

Client # 44  Mr. Rufus A. Sibley  
930 East Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14607-2296  
(1916)

Refer to page 199 for a complete property description

Client # 48  Mrs. Warham Whitney (Fanny P. Arnot)  
22 South Goodman Street  
Rochester, New York 14620  
(1916)

Refer to page 200 for a complete property description

Client # 328  Mr. John R. Sibley  
Mount Hope Cemetery Lot  
Rochester, New York 14620  
(1930-31)

Refer to pages 201 – 206 for a complete property description

Client # 397  Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz  
444 Oxford Street  
Rochester, New York 14625  
(1934-37, 1943)

Refer to pages 207 – 216 for a complete property description

Client # 410  Miss M. Louise Kelly  
90 Oxford Street  
Rochester, New York 14618  
(1936-1937)

Refer to pages 217 – 226 for a complete property description
After George Eastman's death in 1932, the property came under ownership of the University of Rochester to serve as the official residence of its presidents. Changes to the property were inevitable. “Plans drawn in 1936 by Robert Chamberlain, a landscape architect employed by the University, show modifications of the grounds surrounding the Eastman House in an effort to reduce the cost of maintaining the twelve-acre estate. Some gardens, including the Terrace Garden and West Garden, were ‘simplified’ by replacing extensive flower beds with turf. Other, like the Cut-Flower Garden, were completely re-designed.” In 1947 the Eastman House was chartered as George Eastman House, Inc., which accelerated the changes to the property through this new use. “In the years that followed, the Dryden Theatre was built in the area between the residence and the carriage house and the carriage house was transformed into the Mees Gallery. Eastman’s Peony Garden and greenhouse range were replaced by parking lots for the increasing number of staff and visitors.” At this time during the 1960s, Steele has a client number for the Eastman House. Little archival information has been located concerning his involvement and design work for the Eastman House. However when the Eastman House decided it was necessary to expand the Museum facilities in the 1980s they hired landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn from 1982 to 1986 for work on the west garden restoration, driveway and sighting the new 73,000 square foot archival building. During her work on the grounds, she photographed a circular garden space surrounded by hemlocks. It is believed this space may have been designed by Steele in the 1930s with the Valentines. However, there is no way to tell if it was a later addition in the 1960’s to the 1980’s. This space circular garden space was on axis between the Rock Garden pergola and the steps off the East Terrace. In 1989, the Museum constructed the new archival building in this space. If Steele has any association with the space, it has since been demolished. Additional research should be conducted concerning Steele’s relationship with the Valentines and his possible work with the George Eastman House in the 1960s.

78 Ibid, 22-23.
Appendix C

Master List of Fletcher Steele’s Rochester Area Clients

Introduction

As new clients would be added to Fletcher Steele's file, they received a client number. The client numbers run consecutively however, since many of Steele’s clients were not in the Rochester area, the numbers represent periods of time when Steele was designing in Rochester. The client name listed next to each client number is the original client. The bolded type represents the current owners of the property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Site Visited</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Herbert L. Pells Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bushnell Basin, New York (1914)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Episcopal Diocese of Rochester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>Mr. And Mrs. Edwin Allen and Elizabeth Stebbins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>935 East Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14607 (1914-1936)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas R. Frey and Mrs. Jacqueline P. Cady</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. George Clifford Buell (Ackerman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 Berkeley Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14607-1405 (1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>Ms. Joan De R. O'Bryne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Prince Street (Historically 11 Prince Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Albert and Frances Paley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Prince Street (Carriage House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Fletcher Harper Sibley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Prince Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester New York 14607-1609 (1915, 1954)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Site Visited</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Atkinson and Charlotte Whitney Allen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mr. Rufus A. Sibley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Mrs. Warham Whitney (Fanny P. Arnot)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ms. Helen Ettwanger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Edward Griffith Miner Jr.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mr. Freeman C. Allen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mr. Fletcher Harper Sibley, Esquire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Mr. John M. Steele, Esq.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Mrs. Edith Hale</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Mrs. Frank Hawley Ward (Clayla Werner)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Levi S. Ward Esquire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Phillips Payson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Site Visited</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#246</td>
<td>Mr. Tsu Yao and Yun Tze Hung</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. And Mrs. George Dana Boardman Bonbright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>950 East Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14607 (1926)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#327</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Mark and Kathryn Cleary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Thomas G. Spencer and Mrs. Harriet Hollister Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1005 East Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14607 (1929, 37, 44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#328</td>
<td>Mount Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John R. Sibley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cemetery Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14620 (1930-31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#375</td>
<td>Mrs. and Mrs. Ed and Kim Kay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Fredrick T. Pierson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kolaneka Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Mitchell Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsford, New York 14534 (1931-37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#387</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Gary and Constance Mauro</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Adrian G. Devine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3550 Elmwood Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14610 (1931-43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#390</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Allen and Susie Spencer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. (Mary) Raymond Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125 Old Mill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14618 (1932-52, April 1963)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#391</td>
<td>Ms. Molly Benjamin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. William Brewster Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320 Barrington Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14607-3307 (November 1932)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#396</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Marcia Calabrese</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Edward Peck Curtis Esq. (Agnes Bartlett)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2669 East Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14610 (March 27, 1934)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#397</td>
<td>Mrs. Dorothy C. Morton et. al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Rudolph H. Hofheinz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>444 Oxford Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14625 (1934-37, 1943)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#406</td>
<td>Singer Real Estate L.P.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Charles W. Dodge (Louise Wolcott Hooker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330 Oxford Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester, New York 14618 (1935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Site Visited</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#407</td>
<td>Ms. Karen Ann Hopkins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#409</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph R. and Karen Rulison</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#410</td>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#423</td>
<td>Landmark Society of Western New York</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#425</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Nancy and Peter Whitcombe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#428</td>
<td>George Eastman House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#434</td>
<td>Ms. Louise H. Klinke</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#442</td>
<td>Mount Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#468</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. David Swinford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good/ Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#480</td>
<td>Mount Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Site Visited</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #482    | Mr. Andrew Jackson Warner
         | Cemetery Lot
         | Rochester, New York 14620 (1943) | Yes | Unknown |
| #483    | Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Drescher
         | 99 Pelham Road
         | Rochester, New York 14610 (1943) | Yes | Unknown |
| #503    | Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr.
         | Cemetery Lot
         | Rochester, New York 14620 (1945-1953) | Yes | Good |
| #521    | Mr. And Mrs. George Hollister Spencer
         | 597 Allens Creek Road
         | Rochester, New York 14618 (c.1951) | Yes | Unknown |
| #567    | Mr. and Mrs. Andrew D. Wolfe
         | 99 Babcock Drive
         | Rochester, New York 14610 (1950) | Yes | Consultation |
| #568    | Miss Elizabeth Holahan
         | 70 East Boulevard
         | Rochester, New York 14610 (1952) | Yes | Unknown |
| #569    | Mrs. James Sibley Watson Jr.
         | 6 Sibley Place
         | Rochester, New York 14609 (c.1953-61) | Yes | Poor |
| #590    | Mr. And Mrs. John E. Goetz
         | 251 Nunda Boulevard
         | Rochester, New York 14610 (1951) | No |
| #601    | Mr. And Mrs. Michael Watson
         | 4016 East Avenue
         | Rochester, New York 14618 (1952) | No |
| #603    | David Jewett
         | Pittsford, New York 1952 | No |
| #609    | Mr. and Mrs. John C. and Kate Louise Trahey
         | 744 Lake Road
<pre><code>     | Webster, New York 14580 (1954-57) | Yes | Fair |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Site Visited</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#632 Mr. and Mrs. John and Mary Parke</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#633 Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Judith Columbus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#640 Ms. Charlotte-Stein Trustee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#643 Mr. and Mrs. David and Ilene L. Flaum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#644 Rochester Historical Society</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#645 Mr. And Mrs. Sherman Selden</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#653 Mount Hope Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#654 &amp; Cemetery Lot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#657 Mr. and Mrs. David and Mary Khalil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#666 Mr. and Mrs. Louis and Allis D'Amanda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#668 George Eastman House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#669 Mr. And Mrs. William M. Selden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Site Visited</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #672    | **Temple B’Rith Kodesh**  
**The B’rith Kodush Congregation**  
2131 Elmwood Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14618 (1963) | Yes          | Unknown     |
| #673    | **Mount Hope Cemetery**  
Spencer Memorial Cemetery Lot  
Rochester New York 14620 (1963) | Yes          | Unknown     |
| #674    | **Mr. Andrew Stern and Mrs. Melissa McGrain**  
Mr. and Mrs. Richard and Nancy Turner  
22 Stoney Clover Lane  
Pittsford, New York 14534 (1963-71) | Yes          | Good        |
| #677    | **Mr. And Mrs. Wilbur L. Coon (Eleanor W.)**  
Fairport, New York | No           |             |
| #679    | **Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. and Kathleen A. Smith**  
Dr. and Mrs. William Alfred Sawyer  
39 Old Farm Circle  
Pittsford, New York 14534 (1965) | No           |             |
| #681    | **Mr. and Mrs. Read D. and Mary McNamara**  
Mr. and Mrs. William and Eleanor McQuilken  
777 Allens Creek Road  
Rochester, New York 14618 (1965) | Yes          | Consultation |
| #682    | **Mr. and Mrs. Daniel and Nancy Robbins**  
Mr. and Mrs. Daniel H. Robbins  
35 Schoolhouse Lane  
Rochester, New York 14618 (1965) | Yes          | Consultation |
| #685    | **Mr. Robert B. Frame**  
Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Frame  
12 Whitestone Drive  
Rochester, New York 14625 (1965) | Yes          | Consultation |
| #686    | **Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. and Sandra M. Schneider**  
Dr. and Mrs. M.J. Hancher  
25 Stoneham Road  
Rochester, New York 14625 (1966) | Yes          | Unknown     |
| #687    | **University of Rochester Memorial Art Gallery**  
University of Rochester Memorial Art Gallery  
500 University Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14607 (1967-68) | Yes          | Good        |
| #687    | **Mount Hope Cemetery**  
Werner  
Cemetery Lot  
Rochester, New York 14620 (1967) | Yes          | Unknown     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Site Visited</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#688</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Mark Gilbride</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. David Macye “Elephant Hill”</td>
<td>8830 Baker Road Bloomfield, New York 14469 (1967-70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#688</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Cummings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. G. Porter Perham</td>
<td>99 Main Street South Pittsford, New York 14534 (1967-71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#693</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. John and Colleen Broman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. And Mrs. Henry M. and Sally Hamlin</td>
<td>4357 Nine Mile Point Road Fairport, New York (1968)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>###</td>
<td>Dr. William Morgan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. William Morgan</td>
<td>160 Collingsworth Drive Rochester, New York 14625 (1970)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>###</td>
<td>Mrs. Walter Dabney (Mary Fay)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culver Road Rochester New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>###</td>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Fan K. Chey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Chester F. Carlson (Dorris)</td>
<td>133 Crescent Hill Road Pittsford, New York 14534 (1963)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Interview with Ms. Faith Thoron Knapp

Introduction

On February 20, 2003 the author had the opportunity to interview Ms. Faith Thoron Knapp at her home in Cazenovia, New York, past employee of Fletcher Steele's Boston Office. Shortly after the interview, Ms. Knapp died at her home in Cazenovia, New York on April 30, 2003 at age 84. Ms. Knapp was not comfortable with the interview being recorded. The author has transcribed the interview notes to best answer the questions presented.

Ms. Knapp was born and raised in the Boston area, attended the Harvard School of Landscape Architecture for Women from 1936 to 1940. After working for Steele for three years, she moved to New York City in the 1950s. Ms. Knapp and her husband Robert H. Knapp, lived in an apartment on Broadway and 28th Street for the next twenty years. In 1971, they moved from New York City to Cazenovia, New York permanently. Ms. Knapp became very civically conscious and rapidly involved herself with organizations such as the Stone Quarry Art Park, Cazenovia College, the Everson Museum and land planning and conservation work through the Cazenovia Preservation Foundation, Cazenovia Advisory Conservation Commission and Action Plan. This interview is dedicated to an extraordinary woman who had a strong appreciation for the landscape architecture profession and love of the arts.

Questions

Before your employment with Fletcher Steele, where did you receive your education and what was the focus?

The world was moving into WWII. In 1939 war was declared in Europe. I was twenty-two in 1940. At the time I was attending the Harvard School of Landscape Architecture for Women. Fletcher
Steele was on the school board along with Arthur Shurcliff, Elen Biddle Shipman and Beatrix Ferrand. This was before the age of feminism. The landscape architecture profession was an exception where women were on top in an otherwise male oriented society. However it was still difficult to keep women in the profession. They would be trained in the office and then go and have a family.

**How did you come about a job with Fletcher Steele’s Boston office?**

Steele had called the school letting the department know he needed someone for the planting design department. The school asked Ms. Knapp to fulfill the position. Ms. Knapp remembers the interview well and mentioned that it was “one of a kind”. During the interview Steele presented Ms. Knapp a design problem. Steele said “I need steel edging for Ms. Choate”. Ms. Knapp responds “Where is it to be used?”. Steele then said “think about it”. This was a test and Ms. Knapp needed to be able to defend her answer. She then went into the general work area. The work area was sent up as such; the front office consisted of Steele’s office and secretary and bookkeeper, the back part of the office had the draftsmen, architects and engineers. Ms. Knapp went to the client drawers and pulled our plans for Ms. Choate estate. After doing some arithmetic, she figured out the amount of steel edging needed would cost approximately $1500. Ms. Knapp wrote out the amount of material and money for the test problem. Steele then rang his office bell as a signal for her to return to the office with the information. After reviewing the information, Steele told Ms. Knapp to type up the order to be mailed. That was how she was hired.

Ms. Knapp was in charge of planting design and as such her pay level was $19.95 a week. This was a higher paying job than a court stenographer. Even secretaries at the time were paid approximately $15.00 a week. This was during a whole different period of practice. The engineers could do road alignment but the landscape architects would “fit” the road into the landscape considering aesthetics etc. The role of women in Steele’s office was primarily in planting design and secretarial. The men were draftsmen. After working there for two years, Ms. Knapp reminisced about a particular incident in the office describing that Steele’s office was on the building’s eighth floor and that something happened in the office that made Steele reduce a girl to tears...as a result that girl left the office. One day Steele rang his office bell for Ms. Knapp to enter the office. He then proceeded to ask her “Why don’t you cry?” Ms. Knapp answered “It is not my way of handling pressure”. She felt Steele was very fair and a funny individual.

**While in the office, what did your work schedule consist of? Did you travel for client business or visit site projects?**

During this time the whole country was involved with the war; rationing, rolling bandages etc. In Steele’s Boston office, the horticulture department had between six and ten professionals that were knowledgeable in plant materials. Steele used large nurseries from Boston, Rochester and Ohio because of their interesting stock. Perhaps this is why planting design was very important. During the early years in the office, she assisted in implementing the designs by finding plant materials to match Steele’s travel notes. Steele’s clients consisted of mostly private work- people with money and estates. He was on retainer with rich clients such as Ms. Choate and the Stoddards. Although her work consisted of primarily office work, Ms. Knapp did travel to Gloucester and the Stoddard garden where she took notes on how the plantings were working and also experimented with plant materials and shapes. On another occasion she traveled to Naumkeag concerning the blue steps. While visiting Naumkeag there was a large flower show in town. At dinner, she sat next to the gardener for Marshall Field estate who was “wonderful company” she exclaimed. The gardener gave her a card to get in to the flower show the next day. To beat the crowds she went at 6:30am. In terms of Rochester clients, Ms. Knapps only contact with when Steele would come back from a trip and ask her to find materials to fulfill the design idea. In addition to planting design and materials, Ms. Knapp was in charge of packing Steele’s bags for trips. She did mention that Steele was always trying to find projects for the women in his office. One of the projects consisted of a needle point rug. She does not know where the rug is now.

**During our pervious phone conversation you mentioned that you had worked for Fletcher Steele for three years. Why did you leave the office?**

Ms. Knapp left the office because “Steele had a very strong vocabulary of solutions”. Ms. Knapp was not sure she wanted to follow this design method. She did not want to become a poor imitation of Steele through her professional career.
Appendix E

List of Repositories Consulted and Results

SUNY-ESF Fletcher Steele Archives, Franklin Moon Library, Syracuse New York 13210
(315) 470-6719
Archives contain: Drawings, photographs, plans, negatives, client order books, Photostat prints of sketches, renderings and site plans, photographic prints and pictures, lantern slides, albums, scrapbooks, notes and postcards. Very useful source and the primary source of information for this thesis.

Landmark Society of Western New York, Rochester New York 14608
(585) 546-7029
Useful information regarding the architectural and historic history of buildings and neighborhoods in Rochester and vicinity, including photographs, descriptions of style, dates of construction, and building histories. Collections include architectural surveys, atlases and plat books, Braden and Arnold plans, Historic American Buildings Survey and plans, landmarks historical file- files on buildings and neighborhoods and photograph and slide collection-photographs of demolished and existing historical structures.

Rochester Historical Society, Rochester New York 14607
(585) 271-2705
Location of a small collection of Fletcher Steele related papers, plans and correspondence. Collections include a full set of Rochester City Directories, scrapbooks of local history, maps, architectural drawings and genealogical information on most pioneer families of Rochester. Very useful for information concerning many of Steele’s 1850 through 1970 clients.

Department of Rare Books, Special Collections and Preservation, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, Rochester New York 14627
(585) 274-4477
Archives contain: unique, rare and special research materials including books, manuscripts, photographs, maps, prints, broadsides and other printed ephemera. Useful information specific clients for which they have a collection of family papers.

Rare and Manuscript Collections, Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca New York 14853
(607) 255-3530
Useful information regarding local landscape architect Katherine Wilson Rahn and her relationship with approximately a dozen of Fletcher Steele’s Rochester clients. Sources were predominantly plans, sketches, correspondence and notes.

George Eastman Collection, George Eastman House, Rochester New York 14607
(585) 271-3361 x242
The collection contains manuscripts, photographic materials, personal photographs motion pictures and decorative arts that belonged to George Eastman. Useful information for clients dealing with the George Eastman property.

The Strong Museum Library, Strong Museum, Rochester New York 14607
(585) 263-2700
The library archives has individual diaries, letters and personal records of individuals from Rochester and surrounding areas, including Margaret Woodbury Strong. Useful information and photographs of the Strong estate.
Appendix F

Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

Introduction

The Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes provide guidance to cultural landscape owners, stewards and managers, landscape architects, preservation planners, architects, contractors, and project reviewers prior to and during the planning and implementation of project work... In 1992, the Standards were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types... This new modified version addresses four treatments: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.  

The following definitions and Standards are taken from The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes, edited by Charles A. Birnbaum with Christine Capella Peters.

Standards for Preservation

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

---

1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and property documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration necessitates repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color and texture.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or 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.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such as manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstructions of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive
upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make
properties functional is appropriate within a restoration period.

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property’s
restoration period.

2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of
materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will
not be undertaken.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to
stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be
physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented
for future research.

4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be
documented prior to their alteration or removal.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship
that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the
severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match
the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary
and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features,
features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means
possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

9. Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such
resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

10. Designs that were never executed historically will be not be constructed.
Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.

2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features, and spatial relationships.

4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other distinct properties. A reconstructed property will recreate the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color and texture.

5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.

6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.
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