



Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware





Timothy William Layton

REHABILITATION TREATMENT PLAN FOR THE HISTORIC DESIGNED LANDSCAPE AT MAUCHLINE, WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

by

Timothy William Layton

A capstone studio submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Landscape Architecture Degree State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry Syracuse, New York May 2002

George W. Curry, Major Professor Distinguished Teaching Professor, Faculty of Landscape Architecture

Christine Capella-Peters, Committee Member Historic Site Restoration Coordinator, New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

S. Scott Shannon, Committee Member Associate Professor, Faculty of Landscape Architecture

Richard S. Hawks Chair, Faculty of Landscape Architecture

> Copyright © 2002 Timothy William Layton All rights reserved

Frontispiece



May I say that your garden is the most perfect garden in its coloring, the most exquisite in its reserve and refinement that I have as yet seen. I have been visiting gardens almost every week for the past three years, so that I do not speak unadvisedly.

Letter from Antoinette Perrett to Annie Dickie Tallman 28 May 1922

Hand-colored photograph of the Main Garden, 1922. Reprinted from the private collection of the descendents of Mr. & Mrs. Frank G. Tallman.

Acknowledgements

When I began investigating Mauchline's landscape, I never envisioned this capstone studio would introduce me to so many interesting people and yield so much relevant information.

I am grateful to all of those who have been involved with this project for assisting me with investigating, documenting, analyzing, and ultimately preparing the treatment plan, capstone presentation, and this document.

I would like to thank the Diocese of Wilmington, St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church, the Padua Academy, and the Sisters of the Order of Saint Francis who currently call Mauchline home. This project would not have been possible without their cooperation and stewardship of the property for the last thirty years. In particular I would like to thank Mary Beth Pryzwara who served as my initial liaison, and Sister Ann Michele for spending an afternoon answering questions about programming and the recent history of Mauchline.

An invaluable part of this project was my conversions with Mrs. Emalea Warner Trentman. Mrs. Trentman is the granddaughter of Mauchline's original owners and daughter of its second owners. She, along with her cousin Mrs. Georgina M. Bissell, entrusted me with photographs from their parents and grandparents and recounted details of Mauchline's history that enriched my work.

I was assisted throughout this project by the following research staff: Timothy Mullen and Ellen Rendle from the Historical Society of Delaware; William Whitaker from the Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania; Janet Parks from the Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library at Columbia University; Joyce Connolly from the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution, Jane Alling from the McLean Library of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society; Lynn Catanese from the Hagley Museum and Library; Dr. Jeffrey Cohen from Bryn Mawr College; Debra Martin, from the Department of Planning for the City of Wilmington; and Elizabeth Yasik, from Patterson-Schwartz & Associates Inc.

A special note of thanks goes to Markley Ligon who worked with me recording field measurements in August.

To my committee, George W. Curry, Christine Capella-Peters, and Scott Shannon, I am most appreciative for your guidance, insight, patience, and willingness to let me explore on my own.

Finally, I would like to thank my family—James and Betty Layton and Cindy and Glenn Falk—for their support and nurturing in all that I pursue.

Table of Contents

Frontispiece	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures and Tables	1V
List of Sheets	V
Abstract	V1
I. Introduction	1
The Capstone Studio and Cultural Landscape Preservation	2
Problem Definition	6
Goal	6
Objectives	6
II. Background	7
Property History	7
Existing Conditions	19
III. Statement of Significance	41
Criterion B	41
Criterion C	44
Further Potential under Criterion C	47
Period of Significance	51
IV. Period Plans	53
1918 Period Plan	
1918-22 Period Plan	
1941 Period Plan	57
1071 Daried Dian	- 7
V. Programming	
V. Programming	
V. Programming	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court Porch Garden	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court Porch Garden VII. Conclusion	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court Porch Garden VII. Conclusion Further Research Topics	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court Porch Garden VII. Conclusion Further Research Topics Conclusion	
V. Programming Compatible Use Programming VI. The Treatment Plan Perimeter Driveway and Carport Service Area Upper Terrace Main Garden Garden Path Entry North Court Porch Garden VII. Conclusion Further Research Topics Conclusion Bibliography	
 V. Programming	

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

1. Plan of Wilmington, 1736	8
2. Portions of Wilmington North and Wilmington South Quadrangles, 1997	9
3. Sanborn Insurance Maps, 1965	. 10
4. Baist Property Atlas, 1901	12
5. Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine to F. G. Tallman, 2 December 1915	15
6. Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine to F. G. Tallman, 15 February 1917	16
7. Wm. H. Moon Company to Mrs. F. G. Tallman, 12 October 1917	17
8. West Tenth Street Facade, 1918	18
9. View Looking East at the Driveway, 4 August 2001	. 23
10. View from the Upper Terrace Looking East at the Main Garden, 11 August 2001	. 24
11. View Looking Southeast at the Service Area, 4 August 2001	26
12. View Looking West at the Garden Path Stairs, 17 March 2000	27
13. View Looking West at the Entry Space, 20 October 2001	28
14. Main Entry Gate, 4 August 2001	30
15. The North Court, 1918	31
16. View Looking West at North Court, 20 October 2001	32
17. View Looking Southwest at the Porch Garden, 20 October 2001	34
18. Frank Gifford Tallman	42
19. Wilson Eyre Jr	. 45
20. Richard L. Ashurst House, 1885	. 48
21. Brookmead Farm, the home of Mr. and Mrs. Frank G. Thomsom, 1914	50
22. View from Second Floor Bedroom, circa 1919	55
23. View Looking Northeast in the Upper Terrace, circa 1920s	. 56
24. West Tenth Street Facade, 5 February 1942	58
25. Main Garden Facade, June 1973	. 60
26. Second Floor Plan for Mauchline	66

Tables

1. Listing of Deed Transactions for Mauchline	13
---	----

List of Sheets

Sheets

L-1. Existing Conditions Axial Organization	20
L-2. Existing Conditions Major Landscape Spaces	22
L-3. Existing Conditions Tree Inventory	35
L-4. Existing Conditions Shrub Inventory	36
L-5. Existing Conditions Hedge & Herbaceous Inventory	37
L-6. Existing Conditions Stump Inventory	38
L-7. Existing Conditions Small Scale Features	39
L-8. Existing Conditions Greenhouse	40
L-9. 1918 Period Plan	61
L-10. 1918-22 Period Plan	62
L-11. 1941 Period Plan	63
L-12. 1971 Period Plan	64
L-13. Treatment Plan	78
L-14. Pergola Plan	79
L-15. Pergola Views	80
L-16. Illustrative Planting Guide for the Main Garden Beds	81
L-17. Illustrative Guide for the Garden Path	82

<u>Abstract</u>

Layton, Timothy William. May 2002. Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware.

This capstone studio is an exploration in the discipline of cultural landscape preservation. Specifically, the goal is to produce a schematic treatment plan for the rehabilitation of the historic designed landscape at Mauchline in Wilmington, Delaware. Designed by the architectural firm of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine, Mauchline was constructed between 1916-17 for Mr. and Mrs. Frank Gifford Tallman. The property remained with Tallman family descendents until 1971 when it was sold to St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church. St. Anthony's has retained ownership of the property today and uses it as a convent.

Mauchline's landscape was designed through a collaboration of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine and Elizabeth Bootes Clark, a landscape architect practicing in Philadelphia. The spatial organization, topography, circulation, and small scale features that comprise the landscape have retained a high degree of integrity.

As a result of their leadership in the field of cultural landscape preservation, this capstone studio relies on the methodology that has been established by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service.

Of the four treatment types that have been defined by the National Park Service, rehabilitation has been selected for this project because it is the only treatment that allows for alterations to a property to accommodate a compatible use. Mauchline's current use—as a convent for St. Anthony's—was intended to be the compatible use for the rehabilitation treatment. Due to programming complications, the compatible use was changed to a hypothetical, single-family residential user.

The treatment plan resulted from an analysis of four period plans and approximately 60 historic photographs documenting the property from 1918 until 1973. Rehabilitation was selected as the treatment type for all of the major landscape spaces except the main garden. For the main garden, a restoration treatment was selected.

I. Introduction

The capstone studio is a student-initiated investigation of a research or professional problem in landscape architecture. As a component of the capstone studio, this document intends to highlight how my studio experience is part of the larger field of cultural landscape preservation. A synopsis of the development of cultural landscape preservation will be presented as well as an explanation of the terminology contained in the capstone studio goal. With this foundation established, the problem statement and objectives will be introduced for the rehabilitation of Mauchline's historic designed landscape.

Preparing a rehabilitation treatment plan for Mauchline—or any cultural landscape—is not an arbitrary process. Design decisions for the treatment plan are informed by a variety of factors including existing conditions, site context, and the cultural significance of the site. In the next section of the document, these factors will be discussed starting with the geographical and historical context for the site. This will be followed by a description and documentation of the existing conditions. Finally, biographical and historical information pertaining to the cultural significance of the site will be presented.

Based on the context and significance of the site, major periods in the site's history will be identified. To further facilitate design decisions for the treatment plan, it is necessary to produce period plans for these identified times. Developed from the existing conditions plan and a substantial collection of historic photographs, period plans representing the landscape in 1918, 1922, 1941, and 1971 will be presented. Major spatial areas that were identified in the existing conditions plan will be further analyzed according to the changes depicted in the periods plans.

Following the period plans, compatible use programming will be discussed. Programming, in addition to the previously mentioned factors, informs design decisions by specifying activities and spatial requirements for users. Due to complications in the existing use programming, the potential of this site as a single-family residence will be addressed. Additionally, items relating to a program for a generic, single-family user will be presented. The combination of existing conditions, site context, cultural significance, appearance at specific periods, and programming results in design decisions expressed in the treatment plan. In addition to supporting graphics like sections and large-scale plans, a description of the treatment in each of the major areas will be given. Following the treatment plan, this document will conclude with a discussion of further research and appendices detailing some of the research and recommendations from this capstone studio.

The Capstone Studio and Cultural Landscape Preservation

The goal of this capstone studio is to produce a schematic treatment plan for the rehabilitation of the historic designed landscape at Mauchline, in Wilmington, Delaware. Mauchline is the name of a property in the western section of the city of Wilmington. The house and a designed landscape were constructed between 1916-17 and currently, are owned by St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church. The name Mauchline comes from a town south of Glasgow, Scotland. To commemorate family connections to this town, the name "Mauchline" was assigned to the property during its first period of development.¹

This capstone studio is a specific exploration of one facet of cultural landscape preservation. The discipline of cultural landscape preservation has emerged during the past fifteen years as landscapes have been increasingly studied, documented, and interpreted as expressions of material culture. As such, they are resources of our nation's shared cultural heritage and deserve the same protection and management as natural and architectural resources. Cultural landscape preservation, therefore, seeks to protect and manage these resources by balancing the ethics of historic preservation with the dynamic character of natural systems.

In America, the development of cultural landscape preservation paralleled that of historic preservation. Early efforts in landscape preservation focused on the eighteenth century estates of nationally prominent leaders like George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. Additionally, there were efforts to commemorate battlefield sites from the Revolutionary and Civil wars. In 1926, the Reverend W. A. R. Goodwin persuaded John

¹ William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents*. (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 177.

D. Rockefeller, Jr. to finance the reconstruction of Virginia's colonial capital, Williamsburg. This endeavor extended preservation efforts from the focus of an individual building to the breadth of the total built environment. Although none of the work was formally called "cultural landscape preservation," researchers were studying the very elements of a landscape—street patterns, assemblages of buildings and structures, and gardens—for the reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg.

During the 1930s, the scope and scale of preservation continued to expand with the creation of historic districts. A district in Charleston, South Carolina was formed in 1931 followed in 1937 by the Vieux Carré in New Orleans, Louisiana. Unlike the reconstruction at Williamsburg that destroyed non-colonial period buildings and landscapes, these districts, "moved preservation from a museum mentality, in which each element is frozen in time, to a concern for dynamic, livable neighborhoods."²

Also during the 1930s, important legislation was passed that authorized the federal government to take a proactive role in the preservation of cultural resources. This legislation was the Historic Sites and Buildings Act of 1935. Although it does not specifically mention cultural landscapes, the Historic Sites and Buildings Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to secure data, conduct surveys and do research, acquire properties, enter into contracts, restore buildings, erect markers, and develop educational programs. All of these functions are to be carried out in order to preserve "historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of National significance."³

In the 1960s, a variety of factors including a public interest in resource conservation, reaction to post-World War II architecture, and the fiftieth anniversary of the National Park Service (NPS), led to the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Two important components of this legislation were: 1) the creation of matching grants-in-aid to states for projects preserving cultural resources, and; 2) the formation of the National Register of Historic Places (National Register).

These components are important to cultural landscape preservation because they necessitated guidelines and a methodological framework in order to qualify for the matching grants or listing on the National Register. Initially, cultural landscapes were

² Suzanne L. Turner, "Historic Landscapes," in *Designers and Places, American Landscape Architecture,* ed. William Tishler (Washington, DC: The Preservation Press, 1989), 143.

³ Historic Sites and Buildings Act of 1935, 21 August 1935.

not officially recognized as a type of cultural resource and there were no guidelines for cultural landscape projects. This oversight was corrected and a methodology for cultural landscape preservation was formalized in 1996 with the publication of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (The Secretary's Standards)*.

The methodology established by *The Secretary's Standards* focused on the process and procedures involved in the technical treatment of a cultural landscape. This methodology was expanded on with the 1998 publication of *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques*. A Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is the primary document used by the NPS for cultural landscape treatments and long-term management. This document clarified the methodology for analyzing and evaluating a cultural landscape.

The history of cultural landscape preservation is a topic that merits its own comprehensive study.⁴ The above synopsis highlights how recently cultural landscape preservation has become a formal discipline. Additionally, this review emphasizes the response of the Department of Interior and the NPS to the need for cultural resource protection and management. As a result, these agencies have taken a leadership role in the establishment of cultural landscape preservation terminology, methodology, and professional guidance. In order to understand the implications of the capstone studio goal, it is beneficial to review its terminology.

As initially stated, the goal of this capstone studio is to produce a rehabilitation treatment plan. "Rehabilitation" is one of four treatment options that have been defined in *The Secretary's Standards*. A rehabilitation treatment seeks to make "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 value."⁵ In the case of the Mauchline property, the intended use for which it was designed in the 1910s was as a single-family residence. The compatible use that the rehabilitation

⁴ For more information on the development of the Cultural Landscape Program within the NPS, please see: Robert R. Page et al. *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1998), 10-11.

⁵ Charles A. Birnbaum and Christine Capella Peters, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1996), 48.

treatment plan will address is also its current use—as a convent for St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church.

The other treatment options defined in *The Secretary's Standards* are:

Preservation – the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property **Restoration** – 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 **Reconstruction** – 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 location⁶

Of the four treatment types specified by *The Secretary's Standards*, rehabilitation has to be selected for the overall project treatment. This is because none of the other treatments address a new and compatible use and presently, this is the situation at Mauchline.

The goal of this capstone studio continues to be defined by specifying that the rehabilitation treatment plan will be for the historic designed landscape at Mauchline. An "historic designed landscape" is one of four general types of cultural landscapes. The definition of these types first appeared in *Cultural Resource Management Guideline, NPS-28, Release No. 3* published by the NPS in 1985. According to this and subsequent publications, an historic designed landscape is "a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition."⁷ Research into the history of the Mauchline's landscape indicates that its design resulted from a collaboration between an architect and landscape architect.

⁶ Charles A. Birnbaum and Christine Capella Peters, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1996).

⁷ Charles A. Birnbaum, *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1995), 2.

Problem Definition

Mauchline's cultural landscape is currently in a tenuous position. Normal wear and tear and a lack of professional maintenance have led to deterioration of some features and the removal of others in the landscape. Additionally, the site has a new, non-historic use that was never intended in its original design. As a result of these two factors, future neglect and implementation of incompatible programming may result in the loss of character-defining features.

Goal

The goal of this capstone studio is to produce a schematic treatment plan for the rehabilitation of Mauchline's historic designed landscape.

Objectives

The goal of this capstone studio can be broken down into the following components:

- 1. Complete a thorough investigation of readily accessible sources that pertain to the history of Mauchline's historic designed landscape
- 2. Identify the character-defining features of the period of significance and assess their historic integrity
- 3. Identify the program requirements of the compatible use
- 4. Explore design solutions that incorporate the compatible use and character-defining features
- 5. Graphically represent the treatment plan

II. Background

Property History

The Mauchline property is located in the city of Wilmington, New Castle County, Delaware. The city of Wilmington was founded in 1735 on land bounded by the Christina River to the south and west and the Brandywine Creek to the north and east. A grid was laid out across this land but not in a true north-south fashion. Beginning at the banks of the Christina River, streets were placed parallel to it running from northwest to southeast. The grid was completed by placing streets perpendicular to the river running from southwest to northeast (fig. 1).

Mauchline is located on a continuation of this original grid about fifteen blocks northwest from the center of the city. The property occupies the southwest third of a block and is bounded by: North Broom Street on the southeast; West Tenth Street on the southwest; North Rodney Street on the northwest and a neighboring property on the northeast. The property is approximately 0.8 acres in size (fig. 2).

During the nineteenth century, the Mauchline property and the immediately surrounding blocks were farmland owned by Thomas M. Rodney. In 1864, the Wilmington City Railway Company opened several horse-car lines including one that ran from "center city"⁸ northwest along Delaware Avenue. With this transportation advent, prosperous Wilmingtonians began to move from center city to the "avenue region."⁹ This migration away from center city continued in the 1880s when electric trolley cars replaced the horse. The trolley lines provided connections to center city and other areas where middle class and skilled laborers worked. As a result, real estate speculation developed throughout the western section of the city. Some of the farmlands were converted into blocks with tenement-style row houses. Other blocks, particularly those closest to Delaware Avenue, were developed with larger lots and structures (fig. 3).

These patterns of development in the western section of the city are evident in the built form and property boundaries documented in a 1901 property atlas produced by the Baist Company. A map from this atlas shows that the block bounded by North Broom,

⁸ Carol E. Hoffecker, *Corporate Capital: Wilmington in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), 18-19.

⁹ Ibid.



Fig.1. Plan of Wilmington, 1736. This plan illustrates the proximity and orientation of the original grid of the city along the Christian River (here labeled Christiania). Reprinted from John A. Munroe, *Colonial Delaware—A History* (New York, 1978), 157.



Fig. 2. Portions of the Wilmington North and Wilmington South Quadrangles, U.S. Geological Survey, 1997. This map highlights the relationship between Mauchline and the current center of business activity in the city of Wilmington. Like Mauchline, this business center was developing during the early twentieth century.



Fig. 3. Sanborn Insurance Maps, 1965. Last updated in 1984, these maps show the western section of the city of Wilmington from North Van Buren Street on the east to North DuPont Street on the west and south to West Seventh Street. The Mauchline property has been highlighted in the center of the figure. Late-nineteenth century land speculation resulted in a variety of building densities in this section of the city. Delaware Avenue has been highlighted to indicate that in general, building and lot sizes increased as you moved toward the "avenue region."

West Tenth, North Rodney, and West Eleventh was owned by Caesar A. Rodney and F. Taylor. The map shows neither owner had built a structure on his property (fig. 4).

Reviewing deed records for the Mauchline property provides specific evidence of transactions and contradicts some of the information documented on the Baist atlas (table 1). In his will dated April 20, 1872, Thomas M. Rodney directed that each of his sons— Caesar A. Rodney, Henry Rodney, and John M. C. Rodney—receive a quarter of his estate. The remaining quarter of the estate he left in trust to his daughter, Celeste O. Rodney. The trust was to be managed by Caesar and all profits made from the use or sale of the property were to be transferred to Celeste.

On June 23, 1884, Caesar A. Rodney died. His will instructed that half of his estate be divided between Henry Rodney and John M. C. Rodney. On August 13, 1884, the Chancellor of the State of Delaware appointed John M. C. Rodney trustee of Celeste's property. On October 20, 1884, John M. C. Rodney purchased all of Henry Rodney's property bequeathed to him by Thomas Rodney and Caesar Rodney.

As a result of these transactions and trusteeships, John M. C. Rodney legally owned the property identified as belonging to Caesar A. Rodney on the 1901 Baist property atlas. On November 26, 1886, John M. C. Rodney sold a 100 by 150 foot lot in the southern corner of the North Broom, West Tenth, North Rodney, and West Eleventh Street block to J. Ernest and Josephine Smith. On that same day, the Smiths sold their property to Franklin Taylor, presumably the same person identified as "F. Taylor" on the Baist atlas.

The Taylor parcel and an adjoining piece owned by Rodney were purchased in 1912 and 1913 respectively by Russell H. Dunham. On June 30, 1915, Annie Dickie Tallman, Frank Gifford Tallman's wife, purchased the property from Dunham. Mrs. Tallman's father, Henry Dickie, was born in Mauchline, Scotland and this name was bestowed upon the property as a new house and landscape were constructed.¹⁰

A letter dated December 2, 1915, from the firm of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine to Frank Gifford Tallman shows that design work was well under way for the Mauchline property. The architects concluded the letter by stating, "the drawings are progressing

¹⁰ William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents*. (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 177.



Fig. 4. Baist Property Atlas, 1901. The block bounded by North Broom, West Tenth, North Rodney, and West Eleventh has been highlighted. The map shows that Caesar A. Rodney and F. Taylor were the owners of the block and that neither owner had built a structure on his property.

Date	Purchaser	Seller	Amount	Reference
March 10, 1971	St. Anthony s Church	Warner Children	\$75,000	Q-84 845-46
July 7, 1941	Marian T. Warner	Wilmington Trust Company	\$26,000	R-42 432-33
June 30, 1915	Annie Dickie Tallman	Russell H. Dunham Mabel W. Dunham	\$19,000	T-25 47-50
[©] March 17, 1913	Russell H. Dunham	John M. C. Rodney	\$6,300	F-24 569-73
^① March 6, 1912	Russell H. Dunham	Mary Eliza Taylor Henry M. Taylor	\$7,000	S-23 160-64
^① November 26, 1886	Franklin Taylor	J. Ernest Smith Josephine Smith	\$4,500	T-13 219-21
^① November 26, 1886	J. Ernest Smith Josephine Smith	John M. C. Rodney	\$7,900	T-13 223-28

Table 1: Listing of Deed Transactions for Mauchline. All deed references are from the New Castle County Recorder of Deeds, Wilmington, Delaware. Prior to Russell H. Dunham's purchase, the current property was divided into two lots. The ① refers to the eastern lot and the ② the western lot. The nineteenth century property owner was Thomas M. Rodney who divided his land among his four children Caesar A., Henry, John M. C., and Celeste. A series of complex transactions and trusteeships result in John M. C. Rodney legally owning the property identified as belonging to Caesar A. Rodney on the 1901 Baist Property Map.

rapidly, and we expect to start the model this week" (fig. 5).¹¹ On March 29, 1916, a trade publication reported that a \$50,000 contract for the residence, garage, and garden of Frank G. Tallman was awarded to Edward Johnson & Son in Wilmington.¹² Receipts from the architects to Mr. Tallman show that work was still in progress in early 1917 (fig. 6). Additional receipts from the landscape architect show that plant materials were being purchased and shipped between April and October 1917 (fig. 7).

The exact date that construction of the house and landscape was completed is also uncertain. However, letters retained in a collection of Mr. Tallman's personal papers indicate that the general contractor completed work around June 3, 1917. In addition, the general contractor legally guaranteed his work for a period of one year starting on June 30, 1917.¹³

In August 1919, pictures of the recently completed property were published in *The Architectural Forum* (fig. 8). On July 28, 1922, Annie Dickie Tallman died and bequeathed the property to her husband. Seven years later, on June 25, 1929, Mr. Tallman married Mrs. Julia Hays Ashbrook in New York City.¹⁴ On April 1, 1938, Mr. Tallman died. His will named the Wilmington Trust Corporation as executor of this estate. It also established a provision permitting his second wife—referred to by the family as "Aunt Julia"—to remain at Mauchline for a period of three years.¹⁵ During this three-year period, Aunt Julia had a home constructed at the Westover Hills subdivision and moved into it in 1941.¹⁶

Following Aunt Julia's departure, Mr. Tallman's eldest daughter, Marian Tallman Warner, purchased the property from the Wilmington Trust Corporation in 1941. Mrs. Warner remained the owner of the property until her death on August 23, 1970. Her children are named the executors of her estate and in 1971, they sold the property to St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church.

¹¹ Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, DE.

 ¹² "Miscellaneous Contracts Awarded," *Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builder's Guide*, 29 March 1916, p. 223.
 ¹³ Frank Gifford Tallman Collection.

¹⁴ William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents*. (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 134.

¹⁵ Will #21097, New Castle County Register of Wills, Wilmington, DE.

¹⁶ Emalea Warner Trentman, interview by the author, Greenville, DE, 18 October 2001. Mrs. Trentman is the daughter of Irving and Marian Warner and granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank G. Tallman. Her assistance was an invaluable part of this project.

Wilson Eyre John Gilbert McIlvaine WILSON EYRE & MCILVAINE ARCHITECTS 1003 Spruce Street, Philadelphia 317 Lexington Ave., New York

ACK NOWLEDGED DEC 0 1915 F. G. T.

F. G. Tallman, Esq.,

Wilmington, Del.

Dear Mr. Tallman:

We are forwarding you today two blueprints of cur drawing No. 1075 - 5, indicating your house on the lot in block, and suggesting at a larger scale a treatment for thepaving of your sidewalks. We have shown brick for this purpose, and would suggest that you use any good, hard paving brick, of a dark color preferably. We would suggest that the curve in the curb stone at corners be made as indicated unless it conflicts with a City Ordinance. The bricks are shown on edge, laid herringbone, which, while a little more expensive than the flat herringbone, is, of course, very much more durable and better looking. The drive - way, -, too, might be very effectively laid in the same brick rather than in macadam. This would be very much more easily kept clean and would be less dusty.

Please advise us if we can be of any assistance in staking out the walks with the City Surveyor. The specification for the foundations of these pavements is probably taken care of by Ordinance; if not, we shall be very glad to advise you what would be best for the purpose.

The drawings are progressing rapidly, and we expect to start the model this week, and we are

Very truly yours,

Bueonlyne & W Devanie

Dečember 2nd, 1915.

JGM MAM

Fig. 5. Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine to F. G. Tallman, 2 December 1915. This letter indicates that less than five months after purchasing the property, a dialog was taking place between the architects and owners regarding the design of the property. Reprinted from Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware.

WILSON EYRE & MCILVAI	NE		X
ARCHITECTS			. (
1003 Spruce Street, Philadelph 41 E. 30th St., New York C	nia Phila., ity	Pa., Febru	ary 15th, 1917.
Mr. F. G. Tallma	ເກ,	20 	
DEAR SIR:			
We have this day	accepted in your nam	e an est	imate
from Messre, Edwa	rd Johnson and S	on,	
dated February 9th	. 1917 – An	nount \$ 210.	00
for Building hoc	d and wood gate	at service	end of house,
exclusive of	brickwork, found	istions, h	inges or catch,
as s hown on	our drawings.		
	Estimate	194.50	
	Commission-89	15,50	210.00
No. 45	Yours truly,		
NU.	1.0	n. 9	1194-
(s 210.00	0	SIS	v - 1 2 has a
NOURE)	C M	216743	Sup't.

Fig. 6. Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine to F. G. Tallman, 15 February 1917. This receipt indicates that construction decisions for the house were still being contemplated in early 1917. Reprinted from Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware.

JAMES M. MOON, PRESIDENT.			J. EDWARD MOON, SE	CRETARY.
HENRY W. COMFORT, VICE PRESIDENT.			HENRY T. MOON, TREA	SURER.
ESTABLISHED 1872	IE WM. H. MO	ON COM	PANY	
INCORPORATED 1890	GLENWOOD	NURSERIES	-411	
	11	512-514	PHILADELPHIA OFFI STEPHEN GIRARD 21 SOUTH TWELFTH	CE BUILDING ST.
LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE 4498 & 4499 - TRENTON	Morrisville	, Pa. Octobe	r 12, 1917	· it is the
JUPLICATE Jerms: Eliz. Bootes Clar	dd to Mrs. F. G. 10th & x. Wiln	Tallman, Broome Sts., nington, Del.		
8 Symphorican 10 Daphne Meze	pos Racemosus 2-3' rum Rubra 2-2½'	.20 1.25	1.60 12.50	\$14.10

Fig. 7. Wm. H. Moon Company Glenwood Nurseries to Mrs. F. G. Tallman, 12 October 1917. This receipt indicates that plant materials were purchased, and perhaps installed in the landscape, in October 1917. Note that the landscape architect's name appears above the items purchased. Reprinted from Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware.



Fig. 8. West Tenth Street Facade, 1918. At the request of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine, this photograph was taken by Mr. H. Fred Beidleman in June 1918 and published in the August 1919 edition of *The Architectural Forum*. Also included in this publication were four additional photographs of the exterior and four of the interior. Reprinted from "House, F. G. Tallman, Esq., Wilmington, Del.," *The Architectural Forum* 31 (August 1919): plate 19.

In addition to a church, rectory, senior home, and recreational hall, St. Anthony's operates two private schools. The St. Anthony's School provides instruction for children from kindergarten through the eighth grade and the Padua Academy serves as an all-women's high school. In 1965, construction began on the Padua Academy's current building which was located across West Tenth Street from Mauchline. Since the completion of the school in 1974, Mauchline has been used as a convent. Presently, it serves as the home for six Sisters of the Order of Saint Francis.

Existing Conditions

To facilitate a description of the existing conditions, all directions in this section refer to Plan North as illustrated in sheet L-1. With that orientation in mind, the Mauchline property can be defined by boundaries formed along: North Broom Street on the east; West Tenth Street on the south; North Rodney Street on the west; and a neighboring property on the north. The footprint of the house is approximately 5,000 square feet and is roughly L-shaped in plan. The longer leg parallels West Tenth Street and is setback about 30 feet from the street edge. To better understand their arrangement and organization, the house and landscape features on the property can be analyzed according to a series of axes (sheet L-1).

There is a major axis that runs the entire length of the property from west to east. This axis is intersected by at least three minor axes. Two of these minor axes, in the western most section of the property, help organize distinct landscape spaces. The third minor axis provides an organizational connection between two outdoor spaces and the house. A tertiary axis bisects this minor axis and further defines the southern outdoor space between West Tenth Street and the house.

In addition to being bounded by streets on three sides, the perimeter of the property is further defined by a six-foot wide brick sidewalk. The bricks are laid in a basket weave pattern and have a solider course on either side. The walks are set back about 3.5 feet from the street edges. The strips defined between the walks and the streets are primarily planted with grass. A Norway maple (*Acer platanoides*) and a pin oak (*Quercus palustris*) are in the strip along North Broom Street and a large ginkgo (*Ginkgo*)



biloba) is near the corner of the property on North Rodney Street. There are no street trees along West Tenth Street.

About three feet from the inner edge of the sidewalks is a privet (*Ligustrum obtusifolium*) hedge that varies in width from eighteen inches to four feet. This hedge is nearly continuous around the property and creates a separation between the more public sidewalk and the private, interior areas of the property. At several points, the hedge is punctuated by brick piers and gates.

The interior spaces of the landscape can be divided into eight areas. Starting in the northwest corner and moving east across the property the areas are: the driveway and carport; the upper terrace; the main garden; the service area; the garden path; the entry; the north court; and the porch garden (sheet L-2).

The first space in this sequence is the driveway and carport. The connection between the driveway and the perimeter of the property is marked by a set of brick piers. The northern boundary of this area is defined by a chain link fence. A brick wall forms the southern boundary and separates the driveway and carport from the upper terrace and main garden. The driveway surface is composed of asphalt and edged with brick in a dentil pattern (fig. 9). The carport surface is finished with concrete. The carport structure is supported on a series of metal columns and creates a sheltered space for four cars.

South of the driveway is the upper terrace. This space is organized around the major east-west axis of the entire property and a minor axis. The intersection of these axes is marked by a sundial (fig. 10). The upper terrace is bounded by hedge on the south, hedge and a retaining wall on the west, a retaining wall on the north, and hedge and two sets of stairs on the east.

Roughly flat in its topography, this space is elevated compared to the main garden and garden path and the stairs are used to negotiate this change in elevation. There is a greenhouse at the northern end of the upper terrace on the east side of the minor axis. There is a fenced-in area and doghouse that extends south from the greenhouse. On the west side of the minor axis is a brick wall whose composition and appearance suggest it was constructed at the same time as the greenhouse. The minor axis leads north to a set of stairs that connect with the driveway. The plant material in the upper terrace includes





Fig. 9. View Looking East at the Driveway, 4 August 2001. The widest and tallest brick piers on the property mark the entrance from North Rodney Street to the driveway. Note the brick wall (*right*) and back wall of the greenhouse (*middle right*) that separate this space from the upper terrace. Also present is a large ginkgo (*Ginkgo biloba*) that has heaved and damaged the sidewalk (*left*). Photograph by the author.



Fig. 10. View from the Upper Terrace Looking East at the Main Garden, 11 August 2001. These two spaces are organized by the property's major east-west axis that extends through the double-doors on the facade *(center)*. The axis bisects an elliptical pool and fountain in the main garden and a sundial in the upper terrace. Privet (*Ligustrum obtusifolium*) hedge and brick piers and stairs mark the transition between these two spaces. Photograph by the author.

Canadian hemlocks (*Tsuga canadensis*), magnolias (*Magnolia* spp.), yews (*Taxus* x *media*), and other shrub material.

East of the upper terrace is the main garden. The main garden is a bilaterally symmetric space defined by the property's major east-west axis and a minor axis. The boundaries for this space are formed by: hedge on the south; stairs and hedge on the west; a brick wall on the north; and the house itself on the east (fig. 10).

At the intersection of the major and minor axes, there is an elliptical feature constructed of brick on the ground plane. The brick had served as the top coping for a pool. At the center of this feature is a statue that had once functioned as a fountain. During the mid-1980s, the line supplying water to the pool and fountain ruptured. Due to the prohibitive costs of repairing the line, the water was turned off and the pool filled in.¹⁷

Four beds surround the pool and are mainly filled with Japanese hollies (*Ilex crenata*) and boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*). At the eastern end of the main garden, a brick porch provides a transition from the house into the garden. Like the perimeter sidewalks, the bricks for the porch are laid in a basket weave pattern.

A brick walk leads north from the main garden's porch to a wooden gate. This gate is between the house and the brick wall that separates the main garden from the carport. Beyond the gate, a set of stairs leads down into a service area that corresponds to the kitchen and service wing of the house. A sidewalk leads east along the north facade of the house to a hooded gate. This gate marks the end of the service area (fig. 11).

South of the main garden is the garden path. The garden path is a corridor space that provides a connection between the upper terrace and the entry. This space is defined by the front facade of the house and a near-linear planting of American hollies (*Ilex opaca*). The space terminates on the western end in a set of stairs that leads to the upper terrace (fig. 12). On the eastern end, the space ends at a low black metal gate framed by hedges.

This hedge material and gate mark the western boundary for the entry space. The other boundaries for this space are the front facade of the house on the north, another low black metal gate framed by hedges on the east, and a main gate and hedges on the south (fig. 13). The main gate is attached to brick piers on either side and opens from the

¹⁷ Sister Ann Michele, interview by the author, Wilmington, DE, 18 February 2002.



Fig. 11. View Looking Southeast at the Service Area, 4 August 2001. Stairs lead from the main garden and a screened porch down to the service area. A ramp, to the immediate left of the stairs, and a set of stairs beyond the porch provide access down to the basement. The hooded gate can be seen in the middle left of the picture. Photograph by the author.



Fig. 12. View Looking West at the Garden Path Stairs, 17 March 2000. The western terminus of the garden path is a set of brick piers and stairs leading to the upper terrace. The definition of this corridor space is achieved by privet (*Ligustrum obtusifolium*) hedge seen on the right and American hollies (*Ilex opaca*) whose lower branches can be seen on the left. Photograph by the author.



Fig. 13. View Looking East at the Entry Space, 20 October 2001. The transitions from the entry space to the garden path and porch garden are marked by hedges and two, low black metal gates. Photograph by the author.
center. Like the other gates it is constructed of metal and finished with black paint. The gate distinguishes itself as the main entrance to the property with scrollwork and floral motifs above its rails (fig. 14). It is also twice as high as the low gates in the entry space. On either side of the main gate, offset about eight feet from the brick piers, is another brick pier. The four piers in this space are partially or completely concealed by the growth of the hedges. The low gates on the west and east boundaries of this space are along a tertiary axis. This axis intersects a minor axis running from north to south through the north court, house, and entry.

On the opposite side of the house from the entry is a space called the north court. The name "north court" is derived from a caption for a picture of this space in the August 1919 edition of *The Architectural Forum* (fig. 15). The southern and western boundaries of this space are defined by the house. The northern boundary is defined by hedge and reinforced by a house on the adjacent property. In the eastern section of this space, a substantial weeping cherry tree (*Prunus subhirtella* var. *pendula*) creates a separation between the north court and porch garden (fig. 16).

Towards the northern boundary of the north court is a sidewalk that runs from east to west and connects the perimeter walk on North Broom Street to the hooded gate and service area. Like the other walks on the property, this one is composed of brick. It is about four-feet wide and the bricks are laid in a basket weave pattern with a solider course on either side.

Perpendicular to this walk, a north-south running walk leads to a secondary entrance to the house. This walk is in line with the minor axis that connects the north court, house, and entry. The walk negotiates two changes in elevation and accomplishes this with stairs adorned on either side by brick piers. The north court is heavily shaded by the house in the afternoon and by a large yew (*Taxus x media*) that has grown as a conical tree. Japanese pachysandra (*Pachysandra terminalis*) predominates throughout this area as a groundcover.

East of the north court is the porch garden. The porch garden is defined by nearly continuous hedge on its north, east, and south borders. The western boundary of this space is defined by the east facade of the house. This facade is set back about 65 feet



Fig. 14. Main Entry Gate, 4 August 2001. The main gate is taller than the other gates in the entry space and features scrollwork and floral motifs above its rails. The piers associated with this gate are highlighted with recessed brick courses on the columns and a spherical finial circumscribed by a square. Note that the hedge is encroaching on the pier. Photograph by the author.



Fig. 15. The North Court, 1918. The published caption designates this area as "court on north side." Reprinted from "House, F. G. Tallman, Esq., Wilmington, Del.," *The Architectural Forum* 31 (August 1919): plate 21.



Fig. 16. View Looking West at the North Court, 20 October 2001. A substantial weeping cherry (*Prunus subhirtella* var. *pendula*) creates a separation between the north court and porch garden. A brick walk on the right of the photograph leads to the hooded gate. There is a rise in elevation from this walk to the house. Note also the amount of shade this area receives. Photograph by the author.

from North Broom Street and transitions into the landscape with a 36-foot wide by 11foot deep porch (fig. 17).

The porch is enclosed by an eighteen-inch high wall. There is an 8.5-foot wide opening in this wall on center with the property's major east-west axis. This opening is marked on either side by scarlet firethorns (*Pyracantha coccinea*) and some hostas (*Hosta* spp.). An American holly (*Ilex opaca*) flanks the north side of the porch while a Southern magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*) is less than two feet away from the porch's southern wall. The porch garden features a clearly defined bed edge that since the mid-1970s, had been filled with English ivy (*Hedera helix*). The bed also contains evidence of several stumps. Through herbicide applications, the ivy was recently removed and by mid-October 2001, the bed had been filled with sod. The bed edge, however, is still clearly visible.¹⁸ More information on existing plant materials and small scale features can be reviewed in sheets L-3 thru L-8.¹⁹

¹⁸ Sister Ann Michele, interview by the author, Wilmington, DE, 18 February 2002.

¹⁹ For more detailed information on the existing conditions vegetation, please see Appendix A.



Fig. 17. View Looking Southwest at the Porch Garden, 20 October 2001. This photograph shows the privet (*Ligustrum obtusifolium*) hedge (*left and center*) that defines the southern and eastern boundaries of the porch garden. Note the close proximity of an America holly (*Ilex opaca*) and Southern magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*) to the brick wall of the porch (*middle right*). Also notice that an irregular shaped bed edge, shown on sheets L-3 thru L-6, has been replaced by rows of sod. Photograph by the author.

Designation	Scientific Name				
А	Ginkgo biloba	L	llex opaca	W	llex opaca
В	Salix caprea	М	Magnolia x soulangiana	Х	llex opaca
С	Tsuga canadensis	Ν	llex opaca	Y	Picea abies
D	Tsuga canadensis	0	llex opaca	Z	Taxus x media
Е	Tsuga canadensis	Р	llex opaca	AA	Prunus subhirtella var. pendula
F	Tsuga canadensis	Q	llex opaca	BB	llex opaca
G	Tsuga canadensis	R	llex opaca	CC	Magnolia grandiflora
Н	<i>Magnolia</i> sp.	S	llex opaca	DD	Acer platanoides
I	Tsuga canadensis	Т	llex opaca	EE	Quercus palustris
J	Tsuga canadensis	U	llex opaca	FF	llex opaca
K	llex opaca	V	llex opaca	GG	llex opaca



North Rodney Street

Scientific Name						
Taxus x media	S-12	Buxus sempervirens	S-23	Buxus microphylla	S-34	Viburnum carlesii
Taxus x media	S-13	Buxus sempervirens	S-24	Buxus microphylla	S-35	Viburnum carlesii
Pyracantha coccinea	S-14	Buxus sempervirens	S-25	Buxus microphylla	S-36	llex crenata
Rhododendron sp.	S-15	Buxus sempervirens	S-26	Buxus microphylla	S-37	llex crenata
Buxus sempervirens	S-16	Buxus microphylla	S-27	Buxus microphylla	S-38	llex crenata
Buxus sempervirens	S-17	Buxus microphylla	S-28	Buxus microphylla	S-39	Taxus x media
Buxus sempervirens	S-18	Buxus microphylla	S-29	Buxus microphylla	S-40	Taxus x media
Buxus sempervirens	S-19	Buxus microphylla	S-30	Buxus microphylla	S-41	llex crenata
Buxus sempervirens	S-20	Buxus microphylla	S-31	Buxus microphylla	S-42	Berberis vulgaris
Buxus sempervirens	S-21	Buxus microphylla	S-32	Buxus microphylla	S-43	Berberis vulgaris
Buxus sempervirens	S-22	Buxus microphylla	S-33	Buxus microphylla	S-44	Pyracantha coccine
	Scientific Name Taxus x media Taxus x media Pyracantha coccinea Rhododendron sp. Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens Buxus sempervirens	Scientific NameTaxus x mediaS-12Taxus x mediaS-13Pyracantha coccineaS-14Rhododendron sp.S-15Buxus sempervirensS-16Buxus sempervirensS-17Buxus sempervirensS-18Buxus sempervirensS-19Buxus sempervirensS-20Buxus sempervirensS-21Buxus sempervirensS-22	Scientific NameTaxus x mediaS-12Buxus sempervirensTaxus x mediaS-13Buxus sempervirensPyracantha coccineaS-14Buxus sempervirensRhododendron sp.S-15Buxus sempervirensBuxus sempervirensS-16Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-17Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-18Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-19Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-20Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-22Buxus microphylla	Scientific NameTaxus x mediaS-12Buxus sempervirensS-23Taxus x mediaS-13Buxus sempervirensS-24Pyracantha coccineaS-14Buxus sempervirensS-25Rhododendron sp.S-15Buxus sempervirensS-26Buxus sempervirensS-16Buxus microphyllaS-27Buxus sempervirensS-17Buxus microphyllaS-28Buxus sempervirensS-18Buxus microphyllaS-29Buxus sempervirensS-19Buxus microphyllaS-30Buxus sempervirensS-20Buxus microphyllaS-31Buxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaS-32Buxus sempervirensS-22Buxus microphyllaS-33	Scientific NameTaxus x mediaS-12Buxus sempervirensS-23Buxus microphyllaTaxus x mediaS-13Buxus sempervirensS-24Buxus microphyllaPyracantha coccineaS-14Buxus sempervirensS-25Buxus microphyllaRhododendron sp.S-15Buxus sempervirensS-26Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-16Buxus microphyllaS-27Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-16Buxus microphyllaS-28Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-17Buxus microphyllaS-29Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-18Buxus microphyllaS-29Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-19Buxus microphyllaS-30Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-20Buxus microphyllaS-31Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaS-32Buxus microphyllaBuxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaS-33Buxus microphylla	Scientific NameTaxus x mediaS-12Buxus sempervirensS-23Buxus microphyllaS-34Taxus x mediaS-13Buxus sempervirensS-24Buxus microphyllaS-35Pyracantha coccineaS-14Buxus sempervirensS-25Buxus microphyllaS-36Rhododendron sp.S-15Buxus sempervirensS-26Buxus microphyllaS-37Buxus sempervirensS-16Buxus microphyllaS-27Buxus microphyllaS-38Buxus sempervirensS-17Buxus microphyllaS-28Buxus microphyllaS-39Buxus sempervirensS-18Buxus microphyllaS-29Buxus microphyllaS-40Buxus sempervirensS-19Buxus microphyllaS-30Buxus microphyllaS-41Buxus sempervirensS-20Buxus microphyllaS-31Buxus microphyllaS-42Buxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaS-32Buxus microphyllaS-43Buxus sempervirensS-21Buxus microphyllaS-33Buxus microphyllaS-43



Hedges

Designation Scientific Name

H-1	Ligustrum obtusifolium	ŀ
H-2	Ligustrum obtusifolium	H
H-3	Ligustrum obtusifolium	H
H-4	Ligustrum obtusifolium	H
H-5	llex crenata	ŀ
H-6	llex crenata	ŀ
H-7	llex crenata	ŀ
H-8	llex crenata	
H-9	llex crenata	
H-10	llex crenata	
H-11	Ligustrum obtusifolium	

H-12	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-13	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-14	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-15	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-16	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-17	Ligustrum obtusifolium
H-18	Ligustrum obtusifolium

Herbaceous

Designation	Scientific Name
HB-1	Hyacinthus sp.
HB-2	Hosta sp.
HB-3	<i>Hosta</i> sp.
HB-4	Hosta sp. (variegated)

J West 10th Stre	J

Notes: Nomenclature and identification based on:

Dirr, Michael A. Manual of Woody Landscape Plants: Their Identification, Ornamental Characteristics, Culture, Propagation and Uses. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1990.

Rodney Street

North



North Rodney Street

Designation	Scientific Name		
T-1	Taxus x media	T-12	Gleditsia tricantho
T-2	Taxus x media	T-13	llex opaca
Т-3	Taxus x media	T-14	llex opaca
T-4	Taxus x media	T-15	Unknown
T-5	<i>Forsythia</i> sp.	T-16	Unknown
T-6	Unknown	T-17	Unknown
T-7	Magnolia x soulangiana	T-18	Unknown
T-8	llex opaca	T-19	Unknown
Т-9	Magnolia x soulangiana	T-20	Unknown
T-10	Unknown	T-21	Unknown
T-11	Magnolia x soulangiana	T-22	Unknown







WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
Existing Conditions Greenhouse
Capstone Studio Project: Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware Faculty of Landscape Architecture State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry Svracuse. New York
Sources: Field measurements, Fall 2001 Drawn By: TWL Sheet: L-8
Plan North: Scale: 3/ ₁₆ " = 1'-0" Date: May 2002

III. Statement of Significance

As outlined in *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports*, a treatment plan should not be attempted until the site history and existing conditions have been documented.²⁰ This standard is also expressed in the first objective of the capstone studio, which sought to complete a thorough investigation of sources pertaining to the history of Mauchline's historic designed landscape. The previous sections of this report have presented information on context and existing conditions. In order to fulfill the next objective identifying the character-defining features of the period of significance—it is necessary to define a period of significance and analyze site history and existing conditions.

The period of significance is determined by criteria that were established in the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act for the nomination process and listing under the National Register. The criteria for National Register nomination and listing are cited by category as criterion A, B, C, or D. These criteria may correspond to a specific date or may have developed over a range of time. It is the time frame associated with these criteria that establishes the period of significance.

The four criteria evaluate significance based on association with events, people, artistic value, and archaeological potential. Criterion A deals with a property's association to events or broad patterns of history. Criterion B addresses association with a person significant to national, regional, or local history. Criterion C recognizes artistic value and properties that represent characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Finally, criterion D focuses on properties that possess or have the potential to reveal information through archaeological resources.²¹

Criterion B

Mauchline is eligible for listing on the National Register under criterion B because of its association with Frank Gifford Tallman, a locally significant person in the city of Wilmington, Delaware (fig. 18).

²⁰ Robert R. Page et al. *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1998), 41.

²¹ For more information on the criteria and their use in evaluating significance, refer to *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1998).



Fig. 18. Frank Gifford Tallman. Mr. Tallman commissioned the design of Mauchline while a vice president in charge of purchasing for the DuPont Company. Due to his involvement with DuPont and a variety of civic organizations, Mr. Tallman was a locally significant person. His association with Mauchline qualifies it for listing on the National Register under criterion B. Reprinted from William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents* (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 134.

Tallman was born January 26, 1860 in Dubuque, Iowa. Three years later, his father Peleg died while serving as a correspondent for the Union Army in the Civil War. On December 26, 1865, his mother Maria married William Avery Sweet of Syracuse, New York. Following their marriage, she moved the family to Syracuse where Mr. Sweet had established himself in the steel making industry and manufacturing.²² In 1876, Mr. Tallman began studies in civil and mechanical engineering at Cornell University. He remained there for one year before embarking on a variety of jobs in manufacturing.²³

On February 16, 1881, Mr. Tallman married Annie May Dickie in Syracuse. He proceeded to work through the ranks of foreman and superintendent and at the age of 35 obtained a sales position with Brown Hoisting Machinery Company. After ten years with this company, he accepted a position as Director of Purchases with the DuPont Company in Wilmington, Delaware (131-2).

During the early twentieth century, the DuPont Company was a black powder manufacturer controlled by three cousins—Alfred I., T. Coleman, and Pierre S. du Pont. In 1915, T. Coleman du Pont sold his share of the company to a syndicate organized by Pierre S. du Pont.²⁴ Tallman, along with four other department directors, was included in this syndicate and in 1916 he was elected a director, member of the executive committee, and vice president in charge of purchasing for the company.²⁵

Frank Gifford Tallman was involved with the DuPont Company at a time when it was transforming into an international leader in the chemical industry. He served on the executive committee, finance committee, and retained his position as vice president until his retirement in 1925. His involvement with the company was manifested in other organizations in Wilmington. From 1919 until 1925, he served as president of the DuPont Building Corporation, the Hotel DuPont Company, and the DuPont Playhouse Company (132-3).

Additionally, Tallman was active in numerous civic and professional organizations in the city of Wilmington. He served as chairman of the Delaware Chapter

²² William Avery Sweet, Maria Tallman, and other Sweet and Tallman family members are buried in Lot 17, Section 10 at Oakwood Cemetery, Syracuse, New York.

²³ William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents*. (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 130-1.

²⁴ Carol E. Hoffecker, *Corporate Capital: Wilmington in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), 63-5.

²⁵ Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman*, 132.

of the American Red Cross, member of the Board of City Park Commissioners, director of the Wilmington Trust Company, and chairman of the Advisory Board of the Salvation Army, Wilmington Corps.²⁶

Tallman's involvement with the DuPont Company and the company's influence on the city of Wilmington should not be underestimated. In fact, Delaware historian Carol Hoffecker notes that the decision by the company "to retain its corporate offices in Wilmington rather than follow other large companies to New York City is the key to Wilmington's subsequent [twentieth century] development."²⁷ Arguably, Frank Gifford Tallman was a locally significant person and his association with Mauchline would qualify the property for listing on the National Register under criterion B.

Criterion C

Mauchline is eligible for listing on the National Register under criterion C because it was designed by the firm of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine. Due to his recognized designs in the Shingle Style, the duration and proliferation of his activity in the profession, his contributions to academics and publishing, and the geographic distribution of his work, it can be argued that Wilson Eyre was a nationally significant architect (fig. 19). Although Mauchline does not represent the pinnacle of Eyre's career it contains characteristic elements found throughout his work. In addition, Mauchline is the only example of Eyre's work still extant in Delaware.

Wilson Eyre Jr. was born October 30, 1858 in Florence, Italy. His parents hailed from Philadelphia but were stationed with the U.S. Foreign Service in Florence. When he was 11, Eyre returned to the United States. He had ambitions to become a painter but in 1876, enrolled at MIT to study architecture. He remained in the program for one year and then started as a draftsman with Philadelphia architect James Peacock Sims.²⁸

²⁶ William M. Emery, *Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents*. (Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935), 137.

²⁷ Carol E. Hoffecker, *Corporate Capital: Wilmington in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), 5.

²⁸ Tony P. Wrenn, "The Essential Eyre," *Old House Journal* 26 (October 1998): 47.



Fig. 19. Wilson Eyre Jr. Eyre was a nationally significant architect and as a representative example of his work, Mauchline is eligible for listing on the National Register under criterion C. Reprinted from Roger Caye, "The Office and Apartments of a Philadelphia Architect, Mr. Wilson Eyre at 1003 Spruce Street," *The Architectural Record* 34 (July 1913): 88.

Sims died suddenly in 1882 and that same year, Eyre completed his first independent commission for the George Vaux House in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.²⁹ Early in his career, Eyre received contemporary recognition when three of his completed designs appeared in George William Sheldon's *Artistic Country-Seats* published in 1887. During the 1890s, Eyre was recognized further when his designs appeared in publications like *American Architect and Building News, Architectural Review*, and *The Craftsman*.

In addition to recognized designs, Eyre influenced later architects through teaching and publishing. From 1890-94, Eyre taught in the architecture program at the University of Pennsylvania. He was first hired as a visiting lecturer and later was a professor of pen and ink drawing.³⁰ In 1901, Eyre, along with Frank Miles Day and Herbert C. Wise, were founding editors of *House & Garden* magazine. Eyre remained an editor for four years after which the magazine switched to a New York-based publisher.³¹

In 1911, Wilson Eyre established a partnership with John Gilbert McIlvaine. Under the name Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine, the two maintained offices in Philadelphia and New York City. The partnership lasted until McIlvaine's death in 1939 but produced little work after 1930. The firm's name suggests an imbalance in the partnership that resulted from Eyre's notoriety and McIlvaine's youth—he was 22 years younger than Eyre. In this partnership Eyre served as the principal designer while McIlvaine was more the businessman and manager.³²

More recent scholarship, in addition to his contemporary recognition, has acknowledged Wilson Eyre's contributions to architecture. In his book *The Shingle Style and the Stick Style*, architectural historian Vincent J. Scully recognizes Eyre's designs for the Charles A. Potter house (1883), the Charles A. Newhall house (1885), and the Richard L. Ashurst house (1885). Scully considers the Ashurst house Eyre's masterpiece and specifically cites that "the plan of the living area extends along one axis and flows

²⁹ "Graced Places: The Architecture of Wilson Eyre," in Apple HyperCard 2.2 file [electronic database] (Philadelphia: The Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania, 1994).

³⁰ Sandra L. Tatman and Roger W. Moss, *Biographical Directory of Philadelphia Architects: 1700-1930*, (Boston: G. K. Hall & Company, 1985), 254.

³¹ Tony P. Wrenn, "The Essential Eyre," *Old House Journal* 26 (October 1998): 48.

³² Dr. Jeffrey Cohen, telephone conversation with the author, Bryn Mawr, PA, 23 January 2002.

out to the sheltered and contained space of a piazza, which is made an integral visual extension of the interior living space itself" (fig. 20).³³

Although the setting and time period for the designs is different, similar elements can be seen in Mauchline and the Ashurst house. Both houses have second stories clad in half timber and plaster that overhang a recessed first story. Wooden cornices wrap around the bottom of the second story in both designs and provide a unifying effect. Both designs are structured on a strong axial relationship. The Ashurst house mediates interior and exterior spaces with a substantial piazza. Mauchline does not have anything at this scale, however, the house transitions into the landscape with a patio off of the living room and a pergola and patio off of the dining room.

Mauchline is representative of Wilson Eyre's work and demonstrates his ability to meld contemporary estate style architecture with the limited area of an urban site. Eyre is a nationally significant architect based on the duration, proliferation, and geographic distribution of his work. He contributed to the profession by teaching and publishing and has received recognition from his contemporaries and more recent scholars. Therefore, Mauchline is eligible for listing on the National Register under criterion C.

Further Potential under Criterion C

Mauchline may also be eligible for listing under criterion C because of its designed landscape and landscape architect. Secondary sources and receipts identify the landscape architect as Elizabeth Bootes Clark. Clark's name was first discovered in a pamphlet for the 1956 Wilmington Garden Day. Mauchline was the first stop on this Garden Day tour and the pamphlet attributes its landscape design to Mr. and Mrs. Tallman, Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine, and Elizabeth Bootes Clark.

Clark's involvement in the landscape design has been corroborated by receipts and correspondences in the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection at the Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware. In a letter dated November 6, 1916, Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine write to Mr. Tallman and state, "We note what you say with regard to the greenhouse, walls, etc. We have been in consultation with Miss Clark, and are getting up

³³ Vincent J. Scully, *The Shingle Style and the Stick Style: Architectural Theory and Design from Richardson to the Origins of Wright*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 123-4.



Fig. 20. Richard L. Ashurst House, 1885. An early residential design by Wilson Eyre, Ashurst was recognized in publications by George William Sheldon and Vincent Scully. Throughout his career, Eyre sought to create transitions between interior and exterior spaces. At Ashurst, this was accomplished with a substantial piazza (labeled veranda on the drawing) that paralleled the main block of the house. Reprinted from Arnold Lewis, *American Country Houses of the Gilded Age (Sheldon's "Artistic Country-Seats")* (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1982), plate 22.

another scheme, embodying your ideas." Additionally, eight receipts document that Clark ordered plant materials on behalf of the Tallmans from April to October 1917.³⁴

Unfortunately, little is known personally or professionally about Elizabeth Bootes Clark.³⁵ In addition to Mauchline, two other designs can be attributed to her because these designs were published. The first design appeared in Elsa Rehmann's *Garden-Making* and was a garden for Mr. and Mrs. John Hampton Barnes in Devon, Pennsylvania. Completed in 1924, the architect for this project was the same as Mauchline's—Wilson Eyre. It is possible that Eyre and Clark, both based in Philadelphia, collaborated on other projects; however, research on Wilson Eyre does not support this claim.

Clark's other published design was for Brookmead Farm, the home of Mr. and Mrs. Frank G. Thomsom in Devon, Pennsylvania. This design was completed in 1914 and was published in 1918 in Elsa Rehmann's *The Small Place; Its Landscape Architecture* and again in 1929 in Louise and James Bush-Brown's, *Portraits of Philadelphia Gardens* (fig. 21).

Brookmead Farm features some of the same design elements that are seen at Mauchline; for example, the use of walls and hedges to define and enclose distinct landscape spaces. Additionally, the ground plane in both designs is marked by a central oval of lawn surrounded by four symmetrical planting beds. Finally, points of entry and transitions like stairs, piers, and gates were reinforced with shrubs or small trees on either side.

Further research may demonstrate that Elizabeth Bootes Clark is a locally, regionally, or nationally significant landscape architect. Her design at Mauchline may be singularly important or one example of many works. Her collaboration with Wilson Eyre that has been documented for two projects may have been part of a significant professional relationship. These and other potential aspects of Clark's life and career need to be investigated. At the conclusion of these investigations, Mauchline's eligibility for listing on the National Register under criterion C could become stronger.

³⁴ For a summary of materials copied from the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, please see Appendix B.

³⁵ For a summary of research pertaining to Elizabeth Bootes Clark, please see Appendix C.



Fig. 21. Brookmead Farm, the home of Mr. and Mrs. Frank G. Thomsom, 1914. This Elizabeth Bootes Clark design appeared in both Elsa Rehmann's *The Small Place; Its Landscape Architecture* and Louise and James Bush-Brown's *Portraits of Philadelphia Gardens*. Similar to Mauchline, this design featured a central oval of lawn surrounded by four symmetrical planting beds. Reprinted from Louise Bush-Brown and James Bush Brown, *Portraits of Philadelphia Gardens*. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company 1929), 108.

Period of Significance

Based on Mauchline's eligibility for listing on the National Register, a period of significance must be defined that informs design decisions in the treatment plan. Mauchline is a significant property because of its original owner, Frank Gifford Tallman, and its architect, Wilson Eyre. These criteria are associated with the property's first period of ownership. This period of ownership can be defined as the Tallman period that begins with the property's purchase in 1915 and continues until its sale in 1941. From 1941 until 1971, Mauchline is in its second period of ownership under the Warner family. Therefore, this period will be referred to as the Warner period. The final period, under the ownership of St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church, begins in 1971 and is continuing today. This will be referred to as the St. Anthony's period.

The rehabilitation treatment plan must address a period of significance that spans from 1917 to the 1950s and includes the Tallman and Warner periods. While the Warner period represents new ownership of the property, it does not remove the property from the Tallman family. Marian Warner, the second owner, was the Tallman's oldest daughter. During the Warner period, no major changes were made to the spatial organization, topography, or circulation; however, two structures were added. First, a greenhouse was place in the northeast corner of the upper terrace. Second, a carport was added to the north side of the garden wall that separated the driveway from the main garden. Both of these changes were made sometime after 1945 but before 1956.³⁶

The addition of these structures is not a deviation from the original design intent for the property. During Mauchline's initial construction, the Tallmans had conversations with Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine about the placement of a garage and greenhouse in similar locations. In a letter dated November 6, 1916, Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine reported that they were preparing a sketch for the greenhouse. It is later unclear why the decision was made, but in a letter dated May 1, 1917, Mr. Tallman stated that he did not "intend to do anything about the greenhouse this year."³⁷ Two years later, on May 6, Mr. Tallman wrote Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine to request preliminary sketches

³⁶ Emalea Warner Trentman, interview by the author, Greenville, DE, 18 October 2001.

³⁷ Frank Gifford Tallman Collection.

for the library, pergola, garage, and greenhouse. However, by August, Mr. Tallman again decided not to have the greenhouse and garage built.

Current research has revealed no additional correspondences concerning the greenhouse and garage in the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection. One reason for this may be that Mrs. Tallman was reported being ill in early 1920 and later died on July 28, 1922.³⁸ Mrs. Tallman could have been influential in decisions regarding these structures and the intended primary user. This would explain why Mr. Tallman did not further pursue the design and construction of these structures in the 1920s and 30s.

Although the exact scenario is not known, the fact remains that the original owners and architects were discussing the placement and design of a greenhouse and garage in the upper terrace and driveway areas. Therefore, the construction of these structures by 1956 is compatible with the original design intent of the property. The addition of the greenhouse and carport represents the last major changes to the landscape. It is for this reason that the period of significance selected for the treatment plan is 1917 to the 1950s.

³⁸ F. G. Tallman to Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine, 10 February 1920, Frank Gifford Tallman Collection.

IV. Period Plans

One of the major analytical tools in preparing the treatment plan is the preparation of period plans. Period plans can represent a landscape during single or multiple periods of significance, or at different stages of a landscape's development. For this capstone studio, period plans were prepared for the end of the periods of ownership at Mauchline. Thus, plans were prepared for 1941 and 1971.

Based on a wealth of photographic information from 1918, a period plan was prepared for that year. This plan represents the landscape near the completion of construction and installation and was deemed valuable for establishing a baseline of information. Additional research revealed that the 1918 photographs were taken on a single day and that more photographs existed representing the early history of the property. Consequently, a final period plan was created representing the time frame of 1918-22. The four period plans can be reviewed in sheets L-9 thru L-12.

An historic plan can be one of the most helpful documents in preparing a period plan. Other documents typically produced by a landscape architect, such as planting plans, elevations, and perspectives, can also be very beneficial. The Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania and the Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library at Columbia University contain collections of Wilson Eyre's work. Neither repository had historic plans for Mauchline's landscape. The Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania did have one section elevation for the pergola in the main garden. As a result, all of the period plans were composed on base information collected for the existing conditions plan. The approximate size and position of vegetation, structures, and small scale features were determined by examining historic photographs and the existing conditions. Certain areas of the landscape unfortunately were not well documented by the historic photographs and will appear incomplete on some of the period plans.

1918 Period Plan

In the August 1919 edition of *The Architectural Forum*, nine pictures appear displaying the recently completed Mauchline property. According to correspondences in the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, these pictures were taken one week prior to June 26, 1918 by H. Fred Beidelman of West Philadelphia. This set of photographs, along with unpublished prints from a set in the possession of Tallman family descendents, were used to construct the 1918 period plan.

1918-22 Period Plan

In addition to the 1918 photographs, Tallman family descendents had a set of nine photographs from 1921, a set of seven photographs from 1922, and a set of five photographs from the 1920s. Two of the seven 1922 photographs were published in the September 1922 issue of *House and Garden*. Therefore, this set of pictures had to be taken before September 1922. There was no independent way to verify the dates of the other sets of photographs. It is possible that some, or all of them, do not correspond to their assigned dates.

Comparing the 1918 photographs to the photographs from the 1920s revealed dramatic changes in landscape. One of the most striking changes appeared in the upper terrace. Edges and boundaries that were interpreted as planting bed outlines and paths in the 1918 photographs did not appear in any subsequent photographs (fig. 22). In fact, the 1920s photographs show the planting beds in the upper terrace were relatively small and filled with roses. Also worth noting in this set of photographs is a rustic fence and rose arbor at the northern end of the upper terrace (fig. 23).

The 1918 photographs are informative, but only represent one day in the infancy of this landscape. The three sets of pictures from the 1920s represent a maturation of the designers' intent for the landscape. Supporting this assertion are the activities of the owners and correspondences from the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection. The Tallmans were very active in the initial years following the property's completion. Changes, and consideration of changes, are being made for the library, loggia, porch, upper terrace, and main garden. By October 2, 1919, work was progressing on the construction of a pergola



Fig. 22. View from Second Floor Bedroom, circa 1919. In this photograph, the upper terrace is divided into four large planting beds and this configuration is represented on the 1918 Period Plan (sheet L-9). There is no subsequent evidence of this design configuration in the upper terrace. Reprinted from the private collection of the descendents of Mr. & Mrs. Frank G. Tallman.



Fig. 23. View Looking Northeast in the Upper Terrace, circa 1920s. Photographs from the 1920s show that the upper terrace was primarily lawn with smaller planting beds filled with roses. Note that the sundial is covered with ivy and the rustic arbor and fence in the middle left of the image. These changes to the landscape are reflected in the 1918-22 Period Plan (sheet L-10). Reprinted from the private collection of the descendents of Mr. & Mrs. Frank G. Tallman.

to shelter the patio in the eastern end of the main garden.³⁹ A sense of closure to the early changes at Mauchline can be seen in a June 5, 1922 letter from Mr. Tallman to Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine. Mr. Tallman wrote:

The garden and shrubbery which you so skillfully laid out, have after five years grown very beautiful and luxuriant, and Mrs. Tallman and I would be very pleased if Messrs. Eyre and McIlvaine would come down and see them. It will please you both I know to hear that our home is very much admired both inside and out, and it is a credit to you.⁴⁰

In the early history of Mauchline's designed landscape, it is important to look beyond the earliest photographs for insight into the forms, composition, and elements in the landscape. As a result, a second period plan representing the landscape from 1918-22 was prepared (sheet L-10). All of the vegetation graphics in gray on this plan represent elements seen in the 1918 photographs. All of the vegetation graphics in black represent changes based on the three sets of 1920s photographs.

1941 Period Plan

The 1941 period plan is primarily based on ten photographs taken February 5, 1942. These photographs are from the Sanborn Collection at the Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington, Delaware. Mr. Sanborn was a photographer based in Wilmington and was probably commissioned by the Warners to photograph their property following a snow storm. While the snow does conceal some information about the landscape it highlights the evergreen material that was present (fig. 24). Specifically, these photographs show rhododendrons along the southern boundary of the garden path and eastern boundary of the porch garden.

1971 Period Plan

Two pictures taken in June 1973 and the existing conditions plan were primarily used to develop the 1971 period plan. The two pictures were obtained from the Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution. Unfortunately, these two images provide little information beyond the main garden and upper terrace areas. The most

³⁹ Frank Gifford Tallman Collection.

⁴⁰ Ibid.



Fig. 24. West Tenth Street Facade, 5 February 1942. Clearly visible in this photograph are the evergreen plant materials that are located between the privet hedge and house facade. Reprinted from the Sanborn Collection, Historical Society of Delaware.

notable change seen in these images concerns the planting beds in the main garden. Previously, the outer boundary and shape of these beds was defined by edging cut into the lawn and a low, herbaceous ornamental planting. These two pictures show a hedge material defining the beds' outer edge (fig. 25).



Fig. 25. Main Garden Facade, June 1973. In contrast to earlier photographs of the main garden, this image shows the outer boundary and shape of the planting beds defined by a hedge material. Note too that the pergola has been removed, a honey locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos*) is still present in the northeast bed, and magnolia leaves are visible in the top foreground. Reprinted from Smithsonian Institution, Archives of American Gardens.








V. Programming

Of the four treatment types defined by the NPS, rehabilitation is the only treatment that allows for alterations to a property to accommodate a compatible use. Therefore, it is important to specify the compatible use as well as where and in what form proposed alterations may occur. These alterations can be identified by creating a program for the compatible use. It is through the process of programming that one defines location, spatial requirements, characteristics, and resources that support a specific behavior.⁴¹ Specifying the compatible use and establishing its program, informs the design decisions expressed in the rehabilitation treatment plan.

Compatible Use

The rehabilitation treatment plan must address a use that is compatible with Mauchline's use during its period of significance, 1917-50s. Both the architecture and landscape architecture at Mauchline were originally designed for a single-family residence. Specifically, the designs were intended for the Tallman family.⁴² It is possible that the design considered, in addition to the family, a household staff that included a secretary, caretaker, and chauffeur, and potentially more members such as a maid and a cook. It is unclear whether these staff members were permanent residents at Mauchline. It has been documented, however, that on the second floor there were nine bedrooms and five bathrooms (fig. 26). Five of these bedrooms are relatively large, an average of 267 square feet, and located in the main block of the house. The other four bedrooms are smaller, approximately 60 square feet, and located above the kitchen in the service wing of the house. Therefore, it can be concluded, that the original design sought to provide space for several family members, their staff, and possible guests.

Mauchline was purchased by Marian Tallman Warner in 1941 and during her thirty-year tenure, the property did not deviate from its originally designed use. In 1971, Mrs. Warner's heirs sold the property to St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church. By 1975, Mauchline was the home for 14 Sisters of the Order of Saint Francis, who

⁴¹ John L. Motloch, "Design as Creative Problem-Solving," in *Introduction to Landscape Design* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991), 243.

⁴² The Tallman's youngest child, Frank Gifford, Jr. was married June 1, 1918. It is unlikely that any of the Tallman's five children were specifically considered in the design of the house.



Fig. 26. Second Floor Plan for Mauchline. This plan shows that the original design provided five larger bedrooms in the main block of the house and four smaller bedrooms above the service wing. In addition to the bedrooms, the plan shows five bathrooms. Reprinted from "House, F. G. Tallman, Esq., Wilmington, Del.," *The Architectural Forum* 31 (August 1919): plate 19.

taught across West Tenth Street at the Padua Academy.⁴³ Currently, Mauchline stills serves as a convent for six Sisters involved in teaching and other social service ministries. A convent represents a change from Mauchline's intended and actual use during the period of significance. This change, however, is still compatible with a single-family residential use.

The primary reason for this compatibility is that a convent is intended to house members of a religious group and not serve a commercial, institutional, or other type of use. Specifically, the current population of the convent does not differ in size from that of a large family and both can be accommodated by Mauchline's original room configuration. Furthermore, the daily schedule and activities of convent members does not diverge from those of a family. This similarity can be seen in an every day activity like preparing dinner. Both convent members and family members would use the same rooms and at approximately the same time to prepare and serve dinner. Finally, the convent operates and interacts similarly to a family. This is drastically different than a residential arrangement with unrelated occupants like a boarding house or apartment complex. Therefore, using Mauchline as a convent is compatible with its originally designed use as well as its use during the period of significance, 1917-50s.

Programming

An objective of the capstone studio was to identify the program requirements of the compatible use. Since the convent is a compatible use, it was the intent of the capstone studio to discuss programming for Mauchline with current residents, faculty and staff from the Padua Academy, and officials from St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church. All three of these groups have immediate ties to the property or a vested interest in it. All of these groups are, or potentially could be, users of the property and their input to the development of programming was deemed valuable.

Unfortunately, there were difficulties communicating with all of the interested parties and coordinating the logistics for a meeting. Consequently, a meeting was held on February 18, 2002 and programming was discussed with Sister Ann Michele. Sister Ann is currently the principal of the Padua Academy and has been a resident at Mauchline

⁴³ Sister Ann Michele, interview by the author, Wilmington, DE, 18 February 2002.

since 1975. Through discussions with Sister Ann, it was determined that continuing to prepare a treatment plan based on the convent's programming would be inappropriate.

This conclusion was reached because there are currently six residents at Mauchline and no new residents have joined the convent since Sister Ann. With the exception of Sister Ann, the current residents are all 70 years old and older. There is minimal active or passive use of the landscape. One of the Sisters enjoys gardening and has developed a 21-foot long by 3-foot wide strip for vegetables along the brick wall at the north end of the main garden. Other than that activity, "no one really goes outdoors. It's pretty much unused by the residents of the house. They're older, they prefer air conditioning in the summertime to sitting out in the yard."⁴⁴

Complicating programming for the convent is the fact that the Padua Academy is financially responsible for the property. Utility bills, maintenance bills, and other miscellaneous expenses are paid out of the school's budget. Since the Padua Academy is a private school, its primary revenue is generated from students' tuition. Based on the financial situation and composition of the current residents, it did not seem appropriate to create a program for the convent. The responsible preservation professional would instead focus a discussion on compatible uses the school and church could implement in the next five to ten years. It is during this time that it could become unfeasible to use the property for a convent and a new, improperly conceived use could alter defining features and the integrity of the property.

Additionally, it is necessary to discuss and begin investigating sources of funding. Possible sources could include Delaware's State Historic Preservation Office and the opportunities offered by Delaware's new State Historic Preservation Tax Credit. However, focusing on potential sources of funding and short-term planning were not objectives for this capstone studio. In order to remain focused on the specified objectives and obtain the goal of producing a rehabilitation treatment plan, it was decided that a generic, single-family residential user would be assumed for programming. This assumption is justified by Mauchline's current zoning and its potential to be sold as a single-family residence.

⁴⁴ Sister Ann Michele, interview by the author, Wilmington, DE, 18 February 2002.

Currently, Mauchline is zoned R1, which in the city of Wilmington corresponds to single-family detached dwellings. In accordance with zoning, a generic, single-family residential user would be possible. Conversations with Elizabeth Yasik, a senior real estate agent with Patterson-Schwartz & Associates Inc., revealed that properties similar to Mauchline are being purchased by single-family buyers in the city of Wilmington. It is plausible, therefore, that there would be a buyer for this house. Further discussions with Mrs. Yasik explored the age and family size of buyers that have purchased properties similar to Mauchline in the city of Wilmington. Mrs. Yasik concluded that a variety of family types—young, old, both with children and without—have purchased properties similar to Mauchline.⁴⁵

Different family types will have different components to be addressed in programming. Due to the difficulty of determining a specific program for uncertain users, a general program has been developed for a generic, single-family residential user. This program addresses the need for multiple seasons of outdoor interests, leisure, entertainment, structured and unstructured recreation, gardening, parking, and maintenance. The details of this program will be discussed in conjunction with the presentation of the treatment plan.

⁴⁵ Elizabeth Yasik, telephone conversation with the author, Wilmington, DE, 15 March 2002.

VI. The Treatment Plan

The treatment plan seeks to balance the program of a generic, single-family residential user with the character-defining features of the period of significance, 1917-50s. Throughout the landscape, the use of hedges, gates, walls, and changes in topography defines distinct spaces. These spaces were identified in the description of existing conditions and are illustrated in sheet L-2.

Mauchline's major landscape spaces are essentially outdoor rooms and maintaining their spatial organization is the primary goal of the treatment plan. Focusing on maintaining spatial organization allows the distinctiveness and separation of these spaces to be used for different program requirements. A description of the program and specific treatment actions will be presented for each major landscape space. The graphical representation of the treatment plan can be reviewed in sheet L-13.

Perimeter

The perimeter of the property is a public space delineated from the interior of the property by a nearly continuous privet hedge. This area provides circulation around the property and features materials like the brick sidewalk that identify and unify this space with the rest of the property. Specific actions for the perimeter area include:

- Remove galvanized wire fence along the Garden Path and Porch Garden
- Restore pin oak (Quercus palustris) street tree planting
- Restore brick sidewalk where necessary, replacing bricks and mortar mix in kind
- Restore privet (Ligustrum obtusifolium) hedge along the Garden Path and Porch Garden
- Restore existing privet hedge by pruning to approximately 2' wide by 3' tall and keeping the hedge in line with the brick piers

Driveway and Carport

Specific treatment actions for the driveway and carport have to be tempered by the fact that this area was one of the least documented in the historic photographs. Another factor to consider is that it is unclear how the construction of the carport—sometime between 1945 and 1956—disrupted and modified this space. In terms of programming, the carport does provide sheltered parking for four cars. This should be sufficient to meet the needs of a generic, single-family residential user. Users with different programming requirements could potentially enclose a single bay or all of the carport and not drastically alter this space. There is a possibility too for the carport to be removed and a new structure with the same or a smaller surface area put in its place. This new structure's height would have to be below the 10.5 foot height of the garden wall. Specific actions for the driveway and carport area include:

- Preserve brick piers
- Preserve brick dentil pattern edge

Service Area

Similar to the driveway and carport, the service area was not well documented in the historic photographs, but in the treatment plan this area is intended to address vehicular circulation, access to the house, utilitarian storage, and possibly recreation. All of these program uses can be better achieved by removing a large Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) that is immediately east of the carport. This area could be used for a fifth parking place and still have enough room to store trash bins. Another option to consider would be erecting a post and basketball backboard or placing a hockey goal against the north side of the garden wall. This would provide a recreation opportunity that would be attractive to a family with older children. The only restriction would be that any added object remains below the 10.5 foot height of the garden wall. The service area also provides access to the kitchen by the stairs along the north side of the garden wall and the porch entrance. Below the porch are stairs and a ramp to access the basement. These means of access should not be modified or obstructed by new program requirements. Specific actions for the service area include:

- Remove Norway spruce (*Picea abies*)
- Restore arborvitaes (*Thuja occidentalis*) on either side of hooded gate
- Preserve brick dentil pattern edge
- Preserve brick walkways
- Preserve wooden gate

Upper Terrace

The arrangement and layout of elements in the upper terrace have been defined by the property's major east-west axis and a minor cross axis. Respecting the lines in the landscape created by these axes is integral to the treatment plan. Of equal importance is restoring the terminus for the major east-west axis with a formal seating area and taller plant materials. On the south, west, and north sides, a feeling of enclosure is enhanced in this space by restoring a perimeter planting of arborvitae (*Thuja occidentalis*). Narrow planting beds with herbaceous material extend in line with the brick piers on either side of the main garden and garden path stairs. These planting beds reinforce the minor axis and create pockets where informal seating and gatherings can take place.

The northern area of the upper terrace was modified with the construction of the greenhouse and it seems appropriate to use the adjacent areas for gardening. Gardening is a popular hobby and recreation activity in America and something a generic, single-family residential user could look for in a landscape design. The garden would be delineated from the rest of the terrace with a flat black finish, strap metal fence. West of the stairs leading to the driveway and behind an existing brick wall is adequate room for composting or storing other materials. Specific actions for the upper terrace include:

- Remove existing magnolia (*Magnolia* x *soulangiana*), yews, (*Taxus* x *media*), willow (*Salix caprea*), azalea (*Rhododendron* sp.), and Canadian hemlocks (*Tsuga canadensis*)
- Remove existing dog house and pen
- Restore perimeter arborvitae (Thuja occidentalis) planting
- Restore terminus of major axis with cluster of red cedar (Juniperus virginiana) planting
- Rehabilitate large deciduous flowering shrubs
- Rehabilitate concrete bench
- Rehabilitate vegetable garden in northern section of terrace
- Rehabilitate composting or storage space in northwest corner of terrace
- Preserve greenhouse

Main Garden

For the main garden, there were no programming requirements identified for a generic, single-family residential user that would necessitate a rehabilitation treatment of this space. In addition, the main garden has an important relation and connection as an outdoor room to the architecture of the house. Finally, there was quality photographic documentation of this space when the original design had reached a level of maturity in 1922. Based on this evidence, restoration was chosen as the treatment for the main garden. Since restoration treatments must be based on a particular period of time, 1922 was selected for the restoration of this space.

The main garden extends from the house along the property's major east-west axis and its symmetry, geometry, and connection to the dining room creates a formal atmosphere that can be used for leisure and entertainment. Restoring the pergola off of the dining room provides some shelter in the main garden and further unifies indoor and outdoor spaces with a structural element (sheets L-14 and L-15). Creating a connection between indoor and outdoor spaces was a component Wilson Eyre tried to achieve in his designs.⁴⁶

Finally, the four planting beds in this space allow for a planting scheme that provides multiple seasons of interests. Trying to restore specific plants can be especially difficult due to the variations in common names, changes in the scientific names, and the increased propagation of cultivated varieties of the same plant. Consequently, the beds should receive a rehabilitation planting treatment. The plants selected and their placement should respect the form, texture, and arrangement illustrated in sheet L-16.⁴⁷ Specific actions for the main garden include:

- Remove Japanese holly (Ilex crenata) hedges
- Remove brick addition to the patio
- Remove vegetable bed along south side of garden wall
- Restore pergola
- Restore fountain and pool
- Restore 1922 planting beds and define outer boundaries with edging cut into lawn

⁴⁶ See pages 46-47 for a discussion.

⁴⁷ For a detailed list of appropriate plants, please see Appendix D.

- Restore honey locusts (*Gleditsia triacanthos* var. *inermis*) in northwest and northeast planting beds
- Restore mixture of miscanthus (*Miscanthus sinensis*) and irises (*Iris* sp.) at corners of fountain pool
- Restore privet (Ligustrum obtusifolium) hedge along southeast bed
- Restore boxwood (Buxus sempervirens) in all planting beds
- Restore existing privet hedge by pruning to approximately 2' wide by 4' tall and keeping the hedge in line with the brick piers
- Restore urns on brick piers
- Rehabilitate concrete bench
- Preserve main stairs and brick piers

Garden Path

The garden path is an important corridor space providing a connection between the entry space and upper terrace. The definition of this corridor is created by the house facade, privet hedges, and shrub and conifer planting. The path itself is an approximately 6-foot wide swath of lawn (sheet L-17). In addition, the minor north-south axis of the main garden terminates in a bench set along the south edge of the path. This bench is set against a backdrop of taller plantings. Specific actions for the garden path include:

- Remove littleleaf boxwoods (*Buxus microphylla*)
- Remove American hollies (*Ilex opaca*)
- Restore urns on brick piers
- Restore terminus of minor axis with red cedar (Juniperus virginiana) plantings
- Rehabilitate concrete bench
- Rehabilitate shrub and conifer plantings
- Rehabilitate groundcover planting with species like creeping phlox (*Phlox stolonifera*), sweet woodruff (*Galium odoratum*), and Allegheny spurge (*Pachysandra procumbens*)
- Preserve path stairs and brick piers

Entry

The existing conditions of the entry space show a rectilinear area that is clearly defined by shrubs and marked by low gates on the west and east sides to transition to other areas of the landscape. In contrast, the period plans show an area that was relatively open and permitted an axial connection from the upper terrace through this space to the porch garden. The treatment plan intends to remove the vegetation from this area, and expose the facade and window treatment of the loggia. Specific actions in the entry space include:

- Remove yews (Taxus x media) and Japanese hollies (Ilex crenata)
- Remove brick pavers shown on Existing Conditions and 1971 Period Plan
- Remove low gates
- Restore privet (Ligustrum obtusifolium) hedge by entry piers
- Restore existing privet hedge by pruning to approximately 2' wide by 4' tall and keeping the hedge in line with the brick piers
- Preserve entry brick piers and main gate
- Preserve brick walkway

North Court

In addition to the service area and entry, the north court provides a third entrance into the house. It is interesting to note that in the interview conducted with Mrs. Trentman, she does not remember anyone using this entrance. Additionally, the Sisters currently residing at Mauchline do not use it either. It is possible that this area was functionally intended as another service or delivery entrance. Complicating the treatment of this area is the fact that programming opportunities are potentially constrained by two slopes that extend from west to east and taper out as one approaches the porch garden. As a result, plant materials are to be generally rehabilitated in this area emphasizing the reinforcement of elements like brick piers and window wells. Specific actions in the north court include:

- Remove yew (*Taxus* x *media*)
- Restore arborvitaes (Thuja occidentalis) on either side of hooded gate
- Restore urns on southern set of brick piers

- Rehabilitate columnar deciduous planting
- Rehabilitate conifer plantings along walkway and on either side of east window well
- Rehabilitate arborvitae planting on either side of south window well
- Rehabilitate herbaceous planting bed
- Preserve brick walkway
- Preserve stairs and brick piers

Porch Garden

Extending from the living room, the porch can be entered and exited through double doors on either side of a chimney. The porch can be used for seating and formal or informal gathering. The entry and exit from the porch itself into the porch garden occur in line with the property's major east-west axis. There are opportunities for structured and unstructured activities once in the porch garden. Sufficient space exists for structured activities like badminton or horseshoes. This space can also be utilized for unstructured activities, particularly children's play. The main consideration for these activities is not to permanently disrupt the line of the property's major east-west axis. A child's play set, for example, could be installed and later removed when the child had outgrown it. However, placing the play set directly in line with the major east-west axis would be inappropriate. In addition, activities and equipment should not permanently interfere with the line of sight from the garden path or entry into the porch garden. Specific actions in the porch garden include:

- Remove American holly (*Ilex opaca*)
- Remove southern magnolia (Magnolia grandiflora)
- Restore terminus of major axis with pair of red cedar (Juniperus virginiana) planting
- Rehabilitate medium deciduous flowering tree planting
- Rehabilitate rhododendron (Rhododendron sp.) planting
- Rehabilitate small deciduous shrub planting
- Rehabilitate groundcover planting with species like creeping phlox (*Phlox stolonifera*), sweet woodruff (*Galium odoratum*), and Allegheny spurge (*Pachysandra procumbens*)
- Preserve weeping cherry (*Prunus subhirtella* var. *pendula*)
- Preserve scarlet firethorns (*Pyracantha coccinea*)

The recommendations that have been presented would rehabilitate Mauchline's historic designed landscape and balance the program of a generic, single-family residential user with the character-defining features of the period of significance, 1917-50s. Since this plan was based on a hypothetical and generic program, specific design solutions should not be implemented but instead used as a framework for a future design. Once a specific user and program have been defined, this treatment plan would need to be carefully reviewed and revised. The revised plan should then go through the processes of design development and construction documentation before major changes to the landscape commence. In regard to implementing a future design, it is recommended that priority be given to maintenance tasks ahead of specific removals, restorations, and rehabilitations. Maintenance tasks like pruning and repointing would greatly assist with the preservation of features in the landscape.



Maithline Wilmington, Delaware
Treatment Plan
Capstone Studio Project: Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware Faculty of Landscape
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry Syracuse, New York
Base Sources: Plan constructed from field measurements, Fall 2001 Drawn By:
TWL Sheet:
L-13
Plan North:
Scale: 0 15 30 ft
^{Date:} May 2002





WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
Pergola Views
Capstone Studio Project: Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware Faculty of Landscape Architecture State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry Syracuse, New York
Sources: Field measurements, Fall 2001 Drawn By: TWL Sheet:
L-15 Plan North:
Scale: As Noted
May 2002



Section through the West 10th Street Sidewalk and Garden Path



Existing Conditions



Recommended Treatment

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
Illustrative Guide for the Garden Path
Capstone Studio Project: Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware Faculty of Landscape Architecture State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry Syracuse, New York Sources:
Field measurements, Fall 2001 Drawn By: TWL Sheet: L-17 Plan North:
Scale: 1/ ₈ " = 1'-0" Date: May 2002

VII. <u>Conclusion</u>

Further Research Topics

An objective of this capstone studio was to complete a thorough investigation of readily accessible sources that pertain to the history of Mauchline's historic designed landscape. Research concerning the property's history, its owners, architect, and landscape architect was thorough and the scope of this project did not require an exhaustive search. Additional research, however, would aid in properly evaluating Mauchline as a cultural resource especially when its typology and context are considered.

In terms of typology, Mauchline is less than an acre in size and, therefore, can be classified as small. The property is situated in a fairly dense urban fabric that for the most part contains residential structures. Additionally, the property was constructed between 1916-17 with a landscape that can be categorized as historic designed. Arguably, Mauchline can be described as a small, early twentieth-century, urban estate with an historic designed landscape.

There has not been substantial cultural landscape research for small, early twentieth-century, urban estates. The same may be true for other fields investigating design, material culture, and social history, especially when Mauchline is evaluated with other cultural resources in the state of Delaware. If a review of other projects indicates there have not been studies on small, early twentieth-century, urban estates, then the potential for more information on Mauchline necessitates exhaustive research.

Further research opportunities exist pertaining to Mauchline's landscape and to other areas of design, material culture, and cultural history. Most important to evaluating Mauchline's significance is research on the life and career of the property's landscape architect, Elizabeth Bootes Clark. Appendix C contains a summary of research pertaining to Clark that was conducted for this capstone studio. Further research should check internet-based, public records for death certificates and then cross reference these dates with obituary listings in local newspapers. Obituaries often contain details that answer questions and lead to other avenues of investigation.

Historic photographs were a most valuable source of information for this project. Not all of the repositories known to have Mauchline photographs were checked and investigating these collections in the future could reveal valuable information. The Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library at Columbia University houses a collection of Wilson Eyre materials that includes nine photographs of Mauchline. These photographs were never viewed but correspondences suggest they are additional copies of photographs borrowed for this project from Tallman family descendents.

The Hagley Museum and Library houses a collection of Frank Gifford Tallman photographs. This collection is substantial, containing 582 prints and 106 negatives. A summary of the collection indicates that the majority of photographs are portraits and candid images of family activities. As a result, this collection was not investigated. The summary, however, did indicate that the collection contains some photographs of the Tallman's homes and gardens and additional research should investigate this source.

Another rich source of information for this project came from the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, also at the Hagley Museum and Library. This collection comprises 95 boxes containing Mr. Tallman's business and personal correspondences. Only three boxes labeled as the "House Files" were examined. A log of materials copied from these boxes for this project can be reviewed in Appendix B. Correspondences to Arthur Parker, the Tallman's gardener, were briefly reviewed. None of the other boxes containing personal or business correspondences and none of the Tallman diaries were examined. Although it would be a time-consuming task, the potential information contained in these sources could be invaluable to landscape and other research endeavors.

One piece of information reviewed in the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection illustrates this potential. Contained in the "House Files" are itemized receipts and correspondences between Mrs. Tallman and the Philadelphia-based Woodville & Company, which supplied the interior decorations. The items purchased in these receipts could be compared to the interior photographs taken in June 1918. These items could also be compared to Mr. Tallman's will from 1938 that included a full room-by-room appraisal. This type of research can reveal what the interior of Mauchline looked like and how it responded to possible changes in style and functional use.

This same subject matter could be the foundation for research exploring the cultural implications associated with material objects. In terms of the interior decoration, it was Mrs. Tallman who was responsible for corresponding and making decisions. Her

decisions and the objects themselves contain layers of meaning concerning her sense of aesthetics, status in Wilmington, and role within the Tallman family. The role each family member played in determining the physical form, use, and meaning of their home could be analyzed in terms of landscape architecture, architecture, and interior design.

This example demonstrates the breadth of topics that further research could investigate. There are opportunities to continue researching the historic designed landscape as well as other areas of design and cultural history. If Mauchline is deemed a valuable, cultural resource based on its significance criteria, typology, and context, then it is recommended that exhaustive-level research be conducted.

Conclusion

The problem currently confronting Mauchline is one faced by many cultural landscapes in both private and public ownership. Normal wear and tear, a lack of professional maintenance, and a new, non-historic use have placed this landscape in a tenuous position. Some features have been removed and others are deteriorating. In addition, the future implementation of incompatible programming threatens more features.

To address this problem, the goal of this capstone studio was to produce a schematic treatment plan for the rehabilitation of Mauchline's historic designed landscape. This plan sought to balance the character-defining features of the landscape with programming for a compatible use. Rehabilitation was selected as the treatment type because it is the only type that allows for alterations to a property to accommodate a compatible use.

Research, analysis, decision-making, and the physical creation of form and space are all components of preparing a treatment plan. These components—not exclusively the physical creation of form and space—are the core of design in cultural landscape preservation.

To that end, this document presents research pertinent to Mauchline's geographical and historical context, a documentation of its existing conditions, and an argument for its cultural significance according to National Register criteria.

85

Prior to Mauchline's construction, the property was part of agricultural land in the western section of the city of Wilmington. As transportation improvements connected this part of the city to its core in the late nineteenth century, real estate speculation and a variety of residential development ensued. In 1915, Annie Dickie Tallman, the wife of Frank Gifford Tallman, purchased the property and within a year construction began on the house and landscape. The property remained with Tallman family descendents until 1971 when it was sold to St. Anthony's of Padua Roman Catholic Church. St. Anthony's retains ownership of the property today and uses it as a convent.

The layout and organization of Mauchline's existing conditions can be understood according to a series of axes and distinct landscape spaces that are defined by the use of hedges, gates, walls, and changes in topography. A major axis runs the entire length of the property from west to east and provides a connection between the major spaces and the house. In addition to a perimeter area, the major spaces are the driveway and carport, service area, upper terrace, main garden, garden path, entry, north court, and porch garden. The dominant vegetation species throughout the landscape are American holly (*Ilex opaca*), Canadian hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), boxwood (*Buxus* spp.), Japanese holly (*Ilex crenata*), and privet (*Ligustrum obtusifolium*). Constructed from brick and stone, small scale features are located in the landscape at the intersections of axes and at entrances and transitions between the major spaces.

In regard to cultural significance, Mauchline is eligible for listing on the National Register under criteria B and C. It is eligible under criterion B because of its association with Frank Gifford Tallman. Mr. Tallman was vice president in charge of purchasing for the Dupont Company and participated in the company's transformation into an international leader in the chemical industry. His involvement with Dupont and activities with civic organizations demonstrate he was a locally significant person in the city of Wilmington.

Mauchline is eligible under criterion C because it was designed by the firm of Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine. Due to his recognized designs in the Shingle Style, the duration and proliferation of his activity in the profession, his contributions to academics and publishing, and the geographic distribution of his work, Wilson Eyre was a nationally significant architect. Further research may demonstrate that Mauchline is also eligible under criterion C because of its landscape architect, Elizabeth Bootes Clark. The arguments for cultural significance are necessary to identify a period of significance for the property. The treatment plan focuses on the character-defining features of the landscape during this period of significance. Since ownership remained with Tallman family descendents until 1971 and the last major changes to the landscape occurred during the 1950s, the period of significance was defined as 1917 to 1950s.

As an analytical tool, period plans were prepared for 1918, 1922, 1941, and 1971. These dates were chosen based on changes in Mauchline's ownership and because of a wealth of photographic information from the early installation and maturation of the landscape. The period plans demonstrate that during the period of significance, there were no major changes made to the character-defining features of the landscape, namely the spatial organization, topography, and circulation.

With the character-defining features identified, programming for the compatible use had to be defined so that the treatment plan could address potentially competing locations, spatial requirements, and resources. The intended program for the treatment plan was Mauchline's current use as a convent because this use is compatible with the actual use during the period of significance. However, a program was not developed for the convent due to scheduling conflicts, financial limitations, and the composition of Mauchline's current residents. Consequently, a hypothetical program was created for a generic, single-family residential user. This program addresses the need for multiple seasons of outdoor interests, leisure, entertainment, structured and unstructured recreation, gardening, parking, and maintenance.

The treatment plan details programming and specific actions for each of the major landscape spaces. An emphasis was placed on restoration and preservation actions that would reinforce the character-defining features of spatial organization, topography, and circulation.

Additionally, the plan discusses how compatible alterations could be incorporated in the landscape. The possibility of changes was reviewed for: parking in the driveway and carport; active recreation in the service area; gardening and storage in the upper terrace; and active and passive recreation in the porch garden. For all of the major spaces, expect the main garden, rehabilitation was selected as the overall treatment type. In the case of the main garden, restoration was chosen. This decision was based on three factors. First, there were no programming requirements identified that would necessitate a rehabilitation treatment. Second, the main garden had an important relationship to the architecture of the house. In fact, creating a connection between indoor and outdoor spaces was an element Wilson Eyre tried to achieve in his designs. Finally, there was a high level of photographic documentation from 1922 when the original design had reached a level of maturity.

For now, the preparation and implementation of a rehabilitation treatment plan for Mauchline's historic designed landscape has only been an academic exercise. I trust this document demonstrates that proper research, analysis, programming, and design can transform properties like Mauchline into dynamic components of their neighborhoods. Our shared cultural heritage is not exclusively confined to museums but can be experienced locally through the richness offered by a variety of landscapes and architecture.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Dorothy May. *Women, Design, and the Cambridge School*. West Lafayette, Indiana: PDA Publishers Corporation, 1980.
- Archives of American Gardens. Collection. Smithsonian Institution Horticulture Services Division, Washington, DC.
- Armitage, Allan M. Herbaceous Perennial Plants: A Treatise on their Identification, Culture and Garden Attributes. Athens, Georgia: Varsity Press, Inc., 1989.
- Birnbaum, Charles A. Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes. Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1995.
- Birnbaum, Charles A., and Christine Capella Peters. *The Secretary of the Interior's* Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1996.
- Birnbaum, Charles A., and Rachel Karson eds. *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2000.
- Bissell, Georgina M., and Emalea Warner Trentman. *Descendants of Frank Gifford Tallman and Annie Dickie Tallman*. Wilmington, Delaware: Publishers Ink, 1991.
- *Boyd's Street and Avenue Directory of the City of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: C. E. Howe Company, 1910-15.
- Bush-Brown, Louise, and James Bush Brown. *Portraits of Philadelphia Gardens*. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1929.
- Caye, Roger. "The Office and Apartments of a Philadelphia Architect, Mr. Wilson Eyre at 1003 Spruce Street." *The Architectural Record* 34 (July 1913): 78-88.
- Clark, Elizabeth Bootes. "Sansom Gardens,' A Unique Living Quarter in Philadelphia." *The American Architect* 128 (July 1925): 27-30.
- Cohen, Dr. Jeffrey. Telephone conversation with the author. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 23 January 2002.
- Dirr, Michael A. Manual of Woody Landscape Plants: Their Identification, Ornamental Characteristics, Culture, Propagation and Uses. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1990.

- Emery, William M. Honorable Peleg Tallman (1764-1841) His Ancestors and Descendents. Boston: Thomas Todd & Company, 1935.
- Errigo, Joseph A. L. *History of St. Anthony's Church Wilmington, Delaware.* Wilmington, Delaware: Hambleton Company, Inc., 1949.
- Eyre, Wilson. Collection. The Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Fahlman, Betsy Lee. *A Philadelphian in Detroit, Wilson Eyre's house for Charles Lang Freer.* Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware, 1977.
- Graced Places: The Architecture of Wilson Eyre. Curator, Dr. Jeffrey A. Cohen. 18 March 1994. University of Pennsylvania. 14 September 2001. http://www.upenn.edu/GSFA/Eyre/Eyreintro.htm.
- Hawk, Alan. St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Wilmington, Delaware: Office of Planning, 1983.

Historic Sites and Buildings Act of 1935. 21 August 1935.

- Hoffecker, Carol E. *Corporate Capital: Wilmington in the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983.
- "House, F. G. Tallman, Esq., Wilmington, Del." *The Architectural Forum* 31 (August 1919): 19-23.
- Howett, Catherine M. "Landscape Research: Keeping Faith with Today and Tomorrow." In *The Yearbook of Landscape Architecture*, edited by Richard L. Austin et al., 3-7. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1983.
- Lewis, Arnold. American Country Houses of the Gilded Age (Sheldon's "Artistic Country-Seats"). New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1982.
- Maley, Patricia A. Cultural Resources Survey of Wilmington, Delaware: Evaluation of Cultural Resources in the West Side. Wilmington, Delaware: Office of Planning, 1984.

Michele, Sister Ann. Interview by the author. Wilmington, Delaware, 18 February 2002.

Motloch, John L. "Design as Creative Problem-Solving." In *Introduction to Landscape Design*, 239-56. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991.

Munroe, John A. *Colonial Delaware—A History*. Millwood, New York: KTO Press, 1978.
Murtagh, William J. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America*. New York: Sterling Publishing Company, Inc., 1990. National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1998.

New Castle County Recorder of Deeds, Wilmington, Delaware.

New Castle County Register of Wills, Wilmington, Delaware.

- Page, Robert R. et al. A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques. Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1998.
- Perret, Antoinette. "The Rich Colors of Tulip Gardens." *House & Garden* 42 (September 1922): 58-59, 114.

Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builder's Guide, 2 February–28 June 1916.

Polk's-Boyd's Street and Avenue Directory of the City of Philadelphia. Philadelphia:

R. L. Polk and Company, 1925.

Rehmann, Elsa. Garden-Making. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1926.

— The Small Place; Its Landscape Architecture. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918. Sanborn Collection. Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington, Delaware.

- Scully, Vincent J. *American Architecture and Urbanism*. Rev. ed. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1988.
 - ——. The Shingle Style and the Stick Style: Architectural Theory and Design from *Richardson to the Origins of Wright*. Rev. ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Still, Steven M. *Manual of Herbaceous Ornamental Plants*. 4th ed. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1994.
- Tallman, Frank Gifford. Collection. Accession #381. Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware.
- Tatman, Sandra L., and Roger W. Moss. *Biographical Directory of Philadelphia* Architects: 1700-1930. Boston: G. K. Hall & Company, 1985.
- Thompson, Priscilla M. Cool Spring Park Historic District National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Wilmington, Delaware: The History Store, 1983.

Trentman, Emalea Warner. Interview by the author. Greenville, Delaware, 18 October 2001.

Turner, Suzanne L. "Historic Landscapes." In Designers and Places, American Landscape Architecture, edited by William Tishler, 142-5. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press, 1989.

- Westlake, Diane W. Charles Lang Freer House National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Historical Commission on Historic Sites, 1970.
- *Wilmington Garden Day 1956.* Pamphlet Collection. Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington, Delaware.

Wrenn, Tony P. "The Essential Eyre." Old House Journal 26 (October 1998): 46-9.

Yasik, Elizabeth. Telephone conversation with the author. Wilmington, Delaware, 15 March 2002.

Appendix A

Existing Conditions Vegetation Inventory

The designations listed refer to labels that can be found on the existing conditions plans, sheets L-3 thru L-6. The information recorded for tree circumference and diameter was measured at breast height.

Trees

Designation	Common Name	Scientific Name	Circumference	<u>Diameter</u>	Canopy Width	<u>Comments</u>
A	Ginkgo	Ginkgo biloba	8'-2"	2'-7 1/4"	32'-0"	
В	Goat Willow	Salix caprea	2'-1"	0'-8"	15'-6"	
С	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	3'-7"	1'-1 5/8"	23'-0"	
D	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	3'-8 1/2"	1'-2 1/8"	24'-0"	
E	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	1'-11 1/4"	0'-7 3/8"	20'-0"	
F	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	2'-0 1/2"	0'-7 3/4"	15'-0"	Double Trunk
			1'-11"	0'-7 3/8"		
G	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	2'-11 1/2"	0'-11 1/4"	20'-0"	
Н	Magnolia	<i>Magnolia</i> sp.	2'-9"	0'-10 1/2"	15'-0"	
I	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	2'-7 1/2"	0'-10"	18'-0"	
J	Canadian Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	3'-6"	1'-1 3/8"	23'-0"	
К	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-3"	0'-8 5/8"	10'-0"	
L	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-10 1/2"	0'-7 1/8"	10'-0"	
Μ	Saucer Magnolia	Magnolia x soulangiana	3'-9"	1'-2 3/8"	27'-0"	
Ν	American Holly	llex opaca	3'-1"	0'-11 3/4"	19'-0"	
0	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-7"	0'-9 7/8"	16'-0"	
Р	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-5"	0'-5 3/8"	16'-6"	
Q	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-0"	0'-7 5/8"	11'-6"	
R	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-0"	0'-7 5/8"	16'-6"	
S	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-3 1/2"	0'-8 3/4"	19'-0"	
Т	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-6 7/8"	0'-6"	20'-0"	Double Trunk
			1'-5"	0'-5 3/8"		
U	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-11"	0'-7 3/8"	22'-0"	
V	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-6"	0'-9 1/2"	24'-0"	
W	American Holly	llex opaca	3'-0"	0'-11 1/2"	25'-6"	
Х	American Holly	llex opaca	3'-1"	0'-11 3/4"	22'-6"	
Υ	Norway Spruce	Picea abies	3'-4 1/2"	1'-0 7/8"	29'-0"	
Z	Yew	Taxus x media	4'-0"	1'-3 1/4"	34'-0"	
AA	Weeping Cherry	Prunus subhirtella	5'-7 1/2"	1'-9 1/2"	45'-0"	Triple Trunk
		var. pendula	4'-10"	1'-6 1/2"		
			4'-9 1/2"	1'-6 1/4"		
BB	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-11 1/4"	0'-11 1/4"	18'-0"	
CC	Southern Magnolia	Magnolia grandiflora	4'-11"	1'-6 3/4"	27'-0"	
DD	Norway Maple	Acer platanoides	7'-5 1/2"	2'-4 1/2"	25'-0"	
EE	Pin Oak	Quercus palustris	2'-3 1/8"	1'-1 1/2"	30'-0"	
FF	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-9"	0'-6 5/8"	19'-0"	Double Trunk
			1'-8 1/2"	0'-6 1/2"		
GG	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-11"	0'-11 1/8"	20'-0"	

Shrubs

Designation	Common Name	Scientific Name	<u>Width</u>	<u>Height</u>	<u>Comments</u>
S-1	Yew	Taxus x media	6'-10"		Massing of two individual plants
S-2	Yew	Taxus x media	8'-8"		Massing of two individual plants
S-3	Scarlet Firethorn	Pyracantha coccinea	9'-6"	6'-6"	
S-4	Azalea	Rhododendron sp.	3'-0"	2'-9"	
S-5	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	3'-2"		
S-6	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	4'-6"	5'-0"	
S-7	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	3'-6"	6'-0"	
S-8	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	3'-0"	4'-0"	
S-9	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	3'-0"	3'-0"	
S-10	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	5'-8"		
S-11	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	5'-0"		
S-12	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	3'-0"		
S-13	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	9'-2"		
S-14	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	7'-4"		
S-15	Boxwood	Buxus sempervirens	14'-0"		Massing of many individual plants
S-16	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-17	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-18	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-19	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-20	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-21	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-22	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-23	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-24	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-25	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-26	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-27	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-28	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-29	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-30	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-31	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-32	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-33	Littleleaf Boxwood	Buxus microphylla	1'-0"	2'-0"	Recently planted (Fall 2000)
S-34	Koreanspice Viburnum	Viburnum carlesii	4'-0"	4'-10"	
S-35	Koreanspice Viburnum	Viburnum carlesii	4'-0"	5'-0"	
S-36	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	5'-0"	7'-6"	
S-37	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	7'-0"	7'-6"	
S-38	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	11'-9"	7'-6"	Massing of many individual plants
S-39	Yew	Taxus x media	7'-2"	4'-8"	
S-40	Yew	Taxus x media	5'-6"	4'-8"	
S-41	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	11'-0"	7'-6"	Massing of many individual plants
S-42	European Barberry	Berberis vulgaris	3'-0"	3'-0"	
S-43	European Barberry	Berberis vulgaris	4'-4"	2'-4"	
S-44	Scarlet Firethorn	Pyracantha coccinea	10'-0"	4'-6"	
S-45	Scarlet Firethorn	Pyracantha coccinea	8'-5"	3'-6"	
S-46	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	5'-6"	7'-0"	
S-47	European Barberry	Berberis vulgaris	6'-0"	5'-3"	

Hedges

Designation	Common Name	Scientific Name	Length	<u>Width</u>	<u>Height</u>
H-1	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	179'-5"	2'-6" to 5'-0"	6'-0"
H-2	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	14'-11"	2'-0"	5'-0"
H-3	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	17'-3"	3'-0"	4'-6"
H-4	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	34'-1"	3'-0"	5'-6"
H-5	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	14'-10"	2'-9"	3'-0"
H-6	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	10'-6"	3'-2"	3'-0"
H-7	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	5'-10"	3'-4"	3'-0"
H-8	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	6'-7"	1'-2"	3'-0"
H-9	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	17'-4"	3'-10"	3'-0"
H-10	Japanese Holly	llex crenata	29'-6"	2'-6" to 4'-9"	3'-0" to 4'-0"
H-11	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	6'-0"	3'-6"	6'-0"
H-12	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	11'-3"	1'-6" to 2'-0"	3'-0" to 5'-0"
H-13	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	15'-10"	1'-6" to 4'-0"	5'-0" to 6'-6"
H-14	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	75'-2"	4'-0"	5'-6" to 6'-0"
H-15	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	67'-10"	1'-6" to 4'-0"	4'-6" to 6'-6"
H-16	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	43'-9"	2'-0" to 3'-0"	4'-6"
H-17	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	1'-4"	4'-0"	6'-0"
H-18	Privet	Ligustrum obtusifolium	78'-4"	4'-0"	4'-6" to 6'-0"

Herbaceous

Designation	Common Name	Scientific Name	Grouping	Bed Length	Bed Width
HB-1	Hyacinths	Hyacinthus sp.	Bed	3'-11"	0'-8"
HB-2	Hostas	Hosta sp.	Bed	12'-4"	2'-6"
HB-3	Hosta	Hosta sp.	Single		
HB-4	Hostas (variegated)	Hosta sp.	Cluster		

Stumps

Designation	Common Name	Scientific Name	Circumference	<u>Diameter</u>	Suckering	<u>Comments</u>
T-1	Yew	Taxus x media	0'-9 3/8"	0'-3"	No	
T-2	Yew	Taxus x media	0'-9 3/8"	0'-3"	No	
T-3	Yew	Taxus x media	0'-9 3/8"	0'-3"	No	
T-4	Yew	Taxus x media	0'-7 7/8"	0'-2 1/2"	No	
T-5	Forsythia	Forsythia sp.	0'-3 1/8"	0'-1"	Yes	Cluster of three stumps; all similar size
T-6	Unknown		0'-6 1/4"	0'-2"	Yes	Cluster of three stumps; all similar size
T-7	Saucer Magnolia	Magnolia x soulangiana	2'-7 3/8"	0'-10"	Yes	
T-8	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-5 1/4"	0'-5 1/2"	No	
T-9	Saucer Magnolia	Magnolia x soulangiana	4'-8 1/2"	1'-6"	Yes	
T-10	Unknown		1'-0 5/8"	0'-4"	No	Coniferous bark
T-11	Saucer Magnolia	Magnolia x soulangiana	4'-5 3/8"	1'-5"	Yes	
T-12	Honey Locust	Gleditsia tricanthos	6'-3 3/8"	2'-0"	Yes	
T-13	American Holly	llex opaca	2'-4 1/4"	0'-9"	Yes	
T-14	American Holly	llex opaca	1'-3 3/4"	0'-5"	Yes	
T-15	Unknown		4'-11 3/4"	1'-7"	No	Sodded over Fall 2001
T-16	Unknown		0'-10 1/4"	0'-3 1/4"	No	Cluster of two stumps; both similar size. Sodded over Fall 2001
T-17	Unknown		2'-9"	0'-10 1/2"	No	Sodded over Fall 2001
T-18	Unknown		0'-7 7/8"	0'-2 1/2"	No	Cluster of three stumps; two similar size, one half as wide. Sodded over Fall 2001
T-19	Unknown		1'-6 7/8"	0'-6"	No	Sodded over Fall 2001
T-20	Unknown		3'-0 1/8"	0'-11 1/2"	No	Coniferous bark
T-21	Unknown		3'-0 1/8"	0'-11 1/2"	No	Coniferous bark
T-22	Unknown		3'-9 1/2"	1'-2 1/2"	No	Coniferous bark

Appendix **B**

Log of Hard Copies obtained from the Frank Gifford Tallman Collection, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware

The Hagley Museum and Library contains a 95-box collection of Frank Gifford Tallman's business and personal correspondences referenced under accession number 381. Included in this collection are diaries and three boxes labeled "House Files." The following list summarizes photocopies made for the capstone studio from the "House Files" boxes, numbers 64-66. Only items deemed important for the capstone studio were photocopied, therefore, this is not a complete summary of all the items in the "House Files" boxes.

<u>DATE</u> 2-Dec-1915	<u>FROM</u> Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	<u>TO</u> F. G. Tallman	SUBJECT Letter accompanying drawing #1075-5 showing the siting of the house and sidewalk treatment; suggested brick on edge laid in herringbone pattern; drawings were progressing and model was expected to be started
24-May-1916	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for 9" x 9" Quarry Tile on the Broom Street porch
17-Aug-1916	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Anticipating Mr. Eyre's general layout for the wall and garden treatment; hopes to be able to forward it to Mrs. Tallman for suggestions and a decision
18-Aug-1916	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Mrs. Tallman wants Eyre's approval for arborvitae along 10th Street so they can get rooted before frost
17-Dec-1916	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for piping and drains in the garden
2-Jan-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for lighting fixtures and outlets
15-Feb-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for building the hood and wood gate
19-Aug-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	McIlvaine wants to discuss the arborvitae when he brings down the layout of the grounds
29-Sep-1916	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	FGT sketches fountain pool design on back of letter
6-Nov-1916	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Preparing another scheme after consulting Miss Clark that will embody their ideas
1-Feb-1917	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Confirming detail of the iron gate based on models constructed on site

<u>DATE</u> 19-Mar-1917	<u>FROM</u> F. G. Tallman	<u>TO</u> Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	<u>SUBJECT</u> Hooded gate completed; not pleased with the hood
22-Mar-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Eyre suggests they use stone balls instead of lead urns on their posts
2-Apr-1917	Joseph S. Hamilton Company	F. G. Tallman	Description and estimate for the driveway off of Rodney; Spec from architect included
4-Apr-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for the urns in stone and terra cotta
13-Apr-1917	Andorra Nurseries	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
13-Apr-1917	Andorra Nurseries	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
14-Apr-1917	Andorra Nurseries	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
20-Apr-1917	Andorra Nurseries	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
1-May-1917	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Tallman states he does not intend to do anything with the greenhouse this year
24-May-1917	Andorra Nurseries	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
2-Jul-1917	Henry F. Michell Co.	Elizabeth Bootes Clarke	Receipt for plant materials
31-Aug-1917	Elizabeth Bootes Clark	NA	Personal stationary with list of bulbs for fall planting
15-Sep-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Final bill for the house; list of contractors included
24-Sep-1917	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Sending set of photographs taken by Mr. Beidelman to the Tallmans
12-Oct-1917	Wm. H. Moon Company	Mrs. Tallman	Receipt for plant materials ordered by Elizabeth Bootes Clark
15-Oct-1917	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	FGT complaining about photos; taken when garden wasn't finished
29-Jan-1918	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Miss Clark's services were secured at Eyre's suggestion; arguing over \$150 consultation fee

<u>DATE</u> 30-Jan-1918	FROM Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	<u>TO</u> F. G. Tallman	<u>SUBJECT</u> Arguing over \$150 fee for consultation with Miss Clarke
6-May-1919	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Wants stairs in between garage and greenhouse to eliminate garage projecting into garden; anticipating preliminary sketches for the library, pergola, garage, and greenhouse
30-Jun-1919	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Requests change in dimensions of the walkway between the garage and greenhouse to show the stairwell, walls, caps, and rose arbor
21-Jul-1919	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Discussion of a cellar and heater room with the design of the greenhouse and garage
23-Jul-1919	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for the library, pergola, garage, and greenhouse
16-Aug-1919	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	FGT approves work on the library and pergola but puts off construction of the greenhouse and garage
2-Oct-1919	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Work on the pergola is progressing; millwork for the library is at a standstill
10-Feb-1920	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Requesting details on changes to the front entrance of the house; Mrs. Tallman is sick
21-Apr-1920	F. G. Tallman	Lewis & Valentine	Disappointed that a pine tree had not been replaced at the northeast corner of the front lawn
28-May-1922	Antoinette Perrett	Mrs. Tallman	Discussion for selecting prints she had taken; praising garden for color scheme and refinement
5-Jun-1922	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	Mr. & Mrs. Tallman have concluded that "Mauchline" should be carved in the tablet above the door; request a sketch of what carving will look like; praising the appearance of the garden and requesting Eyre & McIlvaine to come visit it
10-Jul-1922	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	F. G. Tallman	Estimate for carving the stone tablet over the front door
22-Aug-1922	Lewis and Valentine Company	Mrs. Tallman	Offer for Mrs. Tallman to inspect 100' of recently purchased boxwood hedge

<u>DATE</u> 29-Aug-1922	<u>FROM</u> F. G. Tallman	TO Lewis and Valentine Company	<u>SUBJECT</u> Not interested in boxwood; Mrs. Tallman has passed away; must manage care of the place alone
2-Jun-1923	H. Langstrotle	F. G. Tallman	Directions for painting Mr. Tallman's swimming pool
15-Jun-1923	F. G. Tallman	Buffalo Wire Works Co.	Request for information on inconspicuous wire fencing because hedge is weak
18-Jun-1923	Buffalo Wire Works Co.	F. G. Tallman	Response to request
Unidentified	NA	NA	FGT probably mapping out fence lengths and post locations for his property on the back of an envelope
19-Dec-1923	Geo. W. McCaulley & Son	F. G. Tallman	Estimate and specifications for installing Christmas lights on a pine tree at the corner of 10th and Broom
22-Apr-1924	F. G. Tallman	Andorra Nurseries	If 3 trees ordered last fall haven't been shipped, ship them now; Arborvitae hedge is not doing well
4-Aug-1924	Harry H. Langstrotle	F. G. Tallman	More advice on painting the swimming pool; apparently FGT wanted a darker shade of green; Harry Langstrotle offers to stop by and do the painting
16-Oct-1924	F. G. Tallman	Wilson Eyre & McIlvaine	FGT is sending Eyre pictures of the garden from last year; foliage is luxuriant
29-Oct-1924	Andorra Nurseries	F. G. Tallman	Receipt for one 4" stem standard cherry, large, double white flowers
31-Oct-1924	F. G. Tallman	Andorra Nurseries	Cherry tree is 4x larger than its companion; FGT is returning it and excepting a closer match
Appendix C

Elizabeth Bootes Clark Research Summary

Summary of Publications

Elizabeth Bootes Clark, "Sansom Gardens,' A Unique Living Quarter in Philadelphia," *The American Architect* 128 (July 1925): 27-30.

Clark writes a brief description and commentary on a project in Philadelphia by William F. B. Koelle.

Elsa Rehmann, Garden-Making. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company 1926).

The table of contents attributes the Tallmans' garden to Wilson Eyre, architect, with the flower arrangements by Elizabeth Bootes Clark, landscape architect. A photograph of the main garden in 1922 appears on page 141. Also credited to Eyre and Clark is the garden of Mr. and Mrs. John Hampton Barnes in Devon, Pennsylvania. A 1924 photograph of this garden appears on page 28. The pictures for this book were contributed by Antoinette Rehmann Perret. The same picture used on page 141 was also used in Perret's 1922 *House and Garden* article. The book provides no direct description of Mauchline or Clark.

Elsa Rehmann, *The Small Place; Its Landscape Architecture*. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons 1918), 121-8.

Rehmann presents a description of Brookmead Farm, the garden of Mr. and Mrs. Frank G. Thomsom. Located in Devon, Pennsylvania, the garden was installed in the autumn of 1914, and the design was credited to Elizabeth Bootes Clark, landscape architect. Other than that credit, the book provides no biographical or descriptive information on Clark.

Louise Bush-Brown and James Bush Brown, *Portraits of Philadelphia Gardens*. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company 1929), 105-11.

This book also highlights Brookmead Farm and credits its design to Elizabeth Bootes Clark, landscape architect. There is no further information on Clark.

Wilmington Garden Day 1956, Pamphlet Collection, Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington, DE, p. 15.

This pamphlet lists Mauchline as the first stop of the 1956 Garden Day. A synopsis of the property reveals that the "garden of two levels was designed by Mr. and Mrs. Tallman in conjunction with the architects [Wilson Eyre and McIlvaine] and Miss Elizabeth Bootes Clark of Wilmington." This document can be located at the Historical Society of Delaware, call number PAM F164.2 G21

Summary of Entries in the Philadelphia City Directories

Five-year intervals of the directories are available in the stacks of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and were searched for the last names of Clark, Clarke, Bootes, and Boots. Intermediate years are available on microfilm and were not searched.

1905	NA
1910	Clark, Elizabeth B. – artist ¹ 524 Walnut Home – 1220 Spruce
1915	Clark, Elizabeth B. – architect ² 235 S. 11 th Street Home – 261 S. 8 th Street
1919-20	NA
1925	Clark, Eliz B – landscape architect ³ 321 S. Isenminger Home – Ditto
1930	NA
1935	NA

Summary of Institutions Investigated

Web-Based Searches:	Personal Visits or Correspondences:		
Avery Index	 Archives of American Gardens at the Smithsonian Institution The Athenaeum of Philadelphia Bush-Brown Special Collections at Temple University The CATALOG of Landscape Records at Wave Hill Free Library of Philadelphia Hagley Museum and Library Historical Society of Delaware 		
FamilySearch Genealogy Service			
Penn State University			
Philadelphia Architects & Buildings			
Syracuse University			
Temple University			
IIMI Dissertation Database			
University of Delaware			
University of Pennsylvania	Historical Society of Demonstration		
Winterthur Library	Historical Society of Pennsylvania		
Winterteiler Elorary	Library Company of Philadelphia		
	Pennsylvania Horticultural Society		

¹ Boyd's Street and Avenue Directory of the City of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: C. E. Howe Company, 1910-15).

² Ibid.

³ *Polk's-Boyd's Street and Avenue Directory of the City of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: R. L. Polk and Company, 1925).

Appendix D

Appropriate Plant Materials for the Main Garden

An important element of the main garden's design is the form, texture, and arrangement of perennial plant materials in the four planting beds. The top section on sheet L-16 gives an illustrative representation of perennial materials. Further defining this representation and preparing a specific planting plan requires detail beyond the schematic goal of this capstone studio. However, there is sufficient photographic and documentary evidence to prepare such a plan and its implementation would be crucial to the restoration of this space.

Due to the importance of a planting plan for the main garden, the following lists have been prepared with the scientific and common names, heights, and flower colors of recommended perennials. In general, these plants are fine to medium in texture and flower with pastel hues of blue, purple, pink, and yellow. Their flowering times range from spring (tulips) into the fall (asters).

Despite their current popularity in nurseries, the following types of perennials should not be used: course textured perennials like *Hostas*; silver-gray foliage perennials like *Perovskia*; and ornamental grasses. These materials are illustrated on the bottom section of sheet L-16.

Perennials for the Main Garden Beds

Scientific Name	Common Name	<u>Height</u>	Flower Color
Aster novi-belgii	New York Aster	24-48"	light blue, violet
Aurinia saxitalis	Goldentuft Alyssum	9-12"	yellow
Campanula medium	Canterbury Bells	24-36"	lavender, pink
Delphinium x elatum	Larkspur	48-72"	blue
Digitalis purpurea	Foxglove	24-60"	blue, purple, lavender, pink, white
Echinacea purpurea	Purple Coneflower	24-48"	purple
Papaver orientale	Oriental Poppy	24-48"	salmon, white
Phlox divaricata	Woodland Phlox	12-15"	blue
Platycodon grandiflorus	Balloon Flower	24-36"	blue, white
Scabiosa caucasica	Pincushion Flower	18-24"	light blue

Bulbs for the Main Garden Beds

Scientific Name	Common Name	<u>Height</u>	Flower Color
Gladiolus x hortulanus	Gladiolus	36-60"	white, pink, pale orange, yellow
Iris xiphium	Spanish Iris	12-24"	blue, white, yellow
<i>Lilium</i> sp.	Garden Lilies	36-60"	white, pink, yellow
<i>Tulipa</i> sp.	Darwin Tulips	24"	purple, lavender, pink, white

Short Perennials for the Outer Boundaries of the Main Garden Beds

Scientific Name	Common Name	<u>Height</u>	Flower Color
Bellis perennis	English Daisy	6-8"	white
Browallia speciosa	Browallia	8-16"	blue, lavender, white
Viola cornuta	Tufted Violet	4-10"	white, purple
Viola odorata	English Violet	6-8"	violet

Nomenclature based on:

- Armitage, Allan M. Herbaceous Perennial Plants: A Treatise on their Identification, Culture and Garden Attributes. Athens, Georgia: Varsity Press, Inc., 1989.
- Still, Steven M. *Manual of Herbaceous Ornamental Plants*. 4th ed. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1994.

<u>Appendix E</u>

Digital Resources

A CD has been provided containing Portable Document Format (PDF) files of the final capstone report. The PDF files can be viewed using Adobe Acrobat Reader. If you do not have Acrobat Reader, you can download a free version of this software from the following web site: <u>http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html</u>

Two files have been prepared for this CD. It is recommended that most users view the file contained in the "High Resolution" folder. If you are experiencing difficulties with this file, then view the file contained in the "Low Resolution" folder. It should be noted that some of the graphic quality has been compromised to create the low resolution file.



Curriculum Vitae

Timothy William Layton

Academic Background:

State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry (SUNY ESF), 1999-2002Master of Landscape ArchitectureCapstone Studio: Rehabilitation Treatment Plan for the Historic Designed Landscape at Mauchline, Wilmington, Delaware

University of Delaware, 1993-1997 Honors Bachelor of Arts, Anthropology Honors Thesis: Looking Beyond "Bad Taste:" The Couper Parterre Garden at the George Read II House, New Castle, Delaware

Experience:

Ontario County Agriculture Conservation Workshops, SUNY ESF

• Research Assistant, 2002

Computer Aided Visualization Laboratory, SUNY ESF

• Graduate Assistant, 1999-2001

O'Doherty Graham Landscape Architecture, P.C.

• Intern, 2001

Cultural Landscape Program, Northeast Regional Office, National Park Service

• Architectural Technician, 2000

Symposia and Conference Participation:

Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture. August 3–6, 2000, Guelph, Ontario. *Panelist:* "Integrating Digital Tools and Media Across the Curriculum: A Case Study in Progress at SUNY ESF"

Awards and Honors:

American Society of Landscape Architects Certificate of Merit Award, 2002.

Sigma Lambda Alpha Honor Society, 2001.

Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society, 1997.

University of Delaware Honors Program Writing Fellowship, 1995.

Eagle Scout Award.