ABSTRACT

University and college landscapes possess unique qualities which enable them to support the educational purpose of their institutions in a variety of ways. Historic campus landscapes further the institutional mission by reinforcing image, providing timeline interpretive information, and by preserving developed inventories of living and inanimate objects for learning. The preservation management of these historic institutional landscapes presents distinctive challenges. Defined by their ongoing educational function, historic campus gardens can be subject to attendant program and institutional pressure to change and “grow.” The response to these pressures can be further complicated by the nature of decision-making in that institutional environment.

Like many cultural resources, historic campus gardens, the object of this study, are known to be significant in multiple ways. They may be important because of the events, people, quality of design, or interesting patterns of use which they represent. The preservation of those things which convey that historic significance while allowing participation in a continuing system of educational uses and change is the challenge facing the historic campus garden.

This thesis utilizes the requirement for a landscape preservation treatment plan for Founders Memorial Garden at the University of Georgia as a case study. In so doing, it will
explore the context of the historic teaching garden, identify the preservation issues that apply at this location, and suggest appropriate levels of change which will encourage the preservation and educational value of the garden.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Context of Study

In order to best plan the preservation treatment of historic designed campus landscapes like the Founders Memorial Garden (FMG) at the University of Georgia, consideration must be given to the unique circumstances that define these gardens: campus location and educational mission. Campuses and gardens are characterized by change and their constant metamorphosis presents obvious challenges to preservationists and managers. Together, historic gardens and campuses hold the potential to transmit heritage and knowledge with a power equaled by few other historic resources.

Cultural landscapes are a resource associated with the extended conditions of environmental change. While this is true of all historic resources, nowhere is the element of change more in evidence than in the cultural landscape. As a means of evaluating these resources and as a basis for informed treatment decisions, determination of meaning and value, or significance, must be made. The evaluation must account for the use, growth, and change of a cultural landscape over time and will often find characteristics of multiple significance, reflecting the property’s many influences and effects.

The creation and maintenance of a designed landscape denotes a strong expression of intent and thus campus landscapes contribute to the educational mission of the institution. FMG and the other historic campus landscapes surveyed for this report were intended to be direct sources of information for teaching purposes. That they may also be the work of a master
designer, a surviving example of a style, or the site of an historic event illustrates the need for several meaningful factors to be considered in any recommended course of action.

With the increasing sophistication of the historic preservation movement and the accumulation of advanced study in the field of cultural landscape preservation, campus landscapes are now being recognized for their unique contributions to heritage appreciation and educational opportunity. Treatment decisions for a designed campus landscape such as FMG should be a function of historic significance with consideration of its value as an institutional component. The educational purpose of these landscapes, their over-arching theme, defines appropriate change.

American college campuses, typically self-conscious of image and tradition, place a premium on history, memorialization and environment, and it is not surprising that they have become repositories of historic designed landscapes. In contrast to the conservative image of permanence and tradition that the landscape often reinforces, universities simultaneously strive to be perceived as dynamic and cutting edge. Infrastructure-hungry research and information technology requirements drive ambitious building programs resulting in a mix of the old and new. By building on established preservation theory, this report will arrive at a treatment decision for FMG with consideration of this contemporary campus environment.

This thesis poses a numbers of questions about this campus property which, having existed long enough to be considered historic by national standards and having undergone substantial alteration of historic use patterns, invites an evaluation of its conditions and future management. How should this resource’s presence on the grounds of a university affect the preservation decision-making process? How have other institutions grappled with this issue and how can their experience illuminate the circumstance of FMG? Does the site fulfill its
commission as a memorial to the initiation of a popular citizen movement, namely garden clubs? How should these elaborate grounds continue in their instructional role and how can they adequately serve?

Of concern is the selection of the most appropriate methodology for determining historic value and the treatment plan which might follow. A wealth of study and guiding philosophies exist for the appropriate handling of cultural resources. The historic preservation movement, having grown out of an early focus on built environments, today embraces the landscape as an equally valued asset. Leading thinkers in the movement recognize, however, that landscapes represent a unique challenge owing to the delicate life cycle and spatial fluctuation of the living things which comprise all cultural landscapes. This study also focuses on the special problem of preserving the individuality inherent in garden creation — the element of idiosyncrasy which makes each designed landscape special in an institutional environment of changing people, policies, and priorities. Perpetuating a spirit of ongoing interaction between the garden and its participants requires treatment sometimes at odds with literal preservation. Static preservation, by definition, is impossible and undesirable in a garden. Treatment decisions for historic designed landscapes aim to manage inevitable change.

At the oldest chartered state university in the nation, the conflict and opportunity brought by accelerating growth in a rich historic environment are brought into focus around a sixty year old garden. FMG is a professionally designed, commemorative garden developed and managed through a collaboration of academicians, administrators, and garden enthusiasts. The elaborately planted garden and historic campus residence are attractively maintained and host many social and academic activities as well as serving as a major pedestrian gateway into the Athens campus.
As one of the most visible manifestations of the College of the Environment and Design and as one of the few facilities actually managed by that institution, there is a strong desire that the FMG be properly evaluated and that any actions taken be in accordance with the principles and practices championed by the College. As the history of the site has revealed, this is consistent with the founding, development and much of the management of this garden which was carefully directed to maturity by its creator. Once organizational headquarters, hands-on laboratory, and cherished campus retreat, FMG emerges at the sixty-year mark with a somewhat unclear purpose. The authors have died or retired, the residing sponsors have departed, and the managing department plans to relocate, which will mean a loss of the historic adjacency of the academic program and teaching garden. At an apparent threshold, the garden warrants investigation of an appropriate course of action.

Methodology

Institutional historic resource planning typically occurs at master plan and historic resource treatment plan levels and is frequently performed by specialist professionals hired by one of several internal organizations. This report will examine the treatment of FMG at the University of Georgia in the wider context of campus preservation. The objective of the report is to identify the significance of today’s garden and its relationship to the campus environment as a basis for recommended treatment.

This report will first investigate the context of campus development in the nation and region. Types of historic campus landscapes are identified and discussed. Historic landscape preservation approaches and techniques are outlined with an examination of specific applications to historic campus landscapes. By necessity, the prescriptive codes and procedures which have been formulated for the identification, analysis, and treatment of historic resources are based
upon generalized principles, thereby enabling them to be applied across a wide spectrum of circumstances. Of interest here is the effect of these principles upon a range of particular types of historic campus landscapes and upon the primary study site FMG. Three regional historically designed landscapes located on a university campus and managed in some way by an institute of higher education are examined. The objective is to find parallels to the FMG and to consider informative contrasts and similarities.

The second section of this report examines the FMG and its University of Georgia environment. Its significance and integrity as a historic designed campus landscape is established. Consideration of institutional preservation values is combined with recommendations for appropriate preservation treatment.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORIC DESIGNED CAMPUS LANDSCAPES

The American Campus

Higher education in America has become an enormous enterprise touching the lives of a significant fraction of the population. According to the *Mini Digest of Education Statistics 2001*, there were 15.1 million students enrolled in degree-granting institutions, employing 2.7 million faculty and staff. This places some six percent of the population in direct contact with higher education as a major component of their daily lives on the campuses of 3,587 individual four-year colleges in 50 states (Dober, *Design* 3). The impact of higher education on American families and businesses is vast. Education has long been held as the great egalitarian device which, if obtainable, could further enhance American opportunity and welfare, and the physical form of campuses has come to symbolize the democratic values of the nation. Initially displaying a transplanted English precedent, college form in American has passed from Thomas Jefferson’s “academical village” to “modern…conglomerates, with many specialized buildings and landscapes” (Dober, 229).

Historic Context

Western universities evolved from the secluded and contemplative communities of the medieval age (Dober, *Planning* 13). The college grounds often included the gardens of the monasteries from which they typically grew. Mob Quad, within Oxford’s Merton College, dates to 1277 and “would seem to be the oldest college lawn extant” (Dober, *Design* 186). Though it was the traditions of Old World learning and culture which early settlers strove to establish in America, the geography of dispersed and far flung colonies made it impossible to achieve the academic centralization of the European precedent. (Dober, *Planning* 13). The result became
separately chartered colonial colleges which eventually led to the pattern that would characterize American education - discreet, modest regional institutions.

The first university in North America, Harvard University, was established in 1636 and its buildings, which were separate rather than joined by walled cloisters and courtyards, established the open model which came to typify American colleges (Turner, *Campus* 24). Aside from the conscious development of a campus plan at the College of William and Mary, which included the first large-scale building constructed in the English Colonies and an extensive Anglo-Dutch garden (Kornwolf, 185), most colonial colleges were known for their imposing buildings set in open green space (Turner, 79).

The layout of the early American towns and colleges reflected the fact that they were planned rather than organically evolved and adapted over long periods as had been the case in Europe (Turner, 55). The American quality of spaciousness resulted in block forms, at right angles to one another with buildings widely separated to optimize natural light and reduce the risk of fire (Dober, *Landscape* 160). At Princeton, in what is probably the oldest surviving master plan for an American college, John Trumbell produced in 1792 a layout with a long block of brick structures and rows of trees, rectangular lawns, and secondary, informal areas of irregular beds and sinuous paths (Turner, 38).

The political principles of the Post-Revolutionary American republic came to be reflected in the physical planning of college campuses. The mandate for an accessible democracy resulted in a college plan looking “outward rather than inward, directing itself to the community or to nature” (Turner, 31). This openness was a rejection of the linked cloistered structures of aristocratic England, and campus plans began to take on a more cohesive and developed appearance than those of colonial origins (Turner 53).
Often prepared by architects, the sophistication of professionally prepared campus schemes could be seen in their symbolic as well as functional aspects. Joseph Jacques Raimée’s 1813 plan for Union College in Schenectady, New York, joins two outreaching arms of housing and instruction with a central domed structure for gatherings (Turner 68). The most original and enduring of these early plans was that of Thomas Jefferson’s University of Virginia. In the opinion of some, “Jefferson stands as the most extraordinary master planner in American education” (Dober, Planning 21). Rather than simply an area of cleared woodland, his campus lawn became an organizing element, utilizing buildings and trees to contain space. His U-shaped composition of a colonnaded grouping of connected student rooms, professors’ houses and lecture halls converged on a domed library. Arrayed side-by-side, individual gardens were each enclosed by Jefferson’s unusual serpentine brick walls.

A trend toward rural locations, often along east-west roads, railroads, and canals, offered many early American schools picturesque settings fortunately offsetting any need for expensive landscape improvements (30). Buildings upon the college grounds also began to be sited “at greater distances from one another, producing an impression that each was an independent object” (Turner 93). Early state universities included small, coordinated villages alongside and in support of the institution. Separating college from town would be a sturdy fence or low stone wall. An excellent example of these characteristics of wide building placement, adjacent villages and delineating barrier may be found at the University of Georgia in Athens (93).

In the mid-nineteenth century, a less formal, picturesque appearance drawing inspiration from the natural environment gained favor (101). Frederic Law Olmsted was commissioned in the design of many land-grant institutions and became an advocate for an arrangement which was more park-like, suited to topography, and informal. Olmsted rejected “formality and strait-
lacing” and felt that his ideas were appropriate to democratic, rural values and an environment, “suggesting a rural village or naturalistic park” (145-150). Olmsted’s sensitivity to site rather than preconceived notions of formality was an innovation (Dober, Styles 45) and many institutions redesigned their campuses as the style gained fashion. This park-like scheme allowed ever-diversifying schools to adapt their facilities as they grew from their one or two building origins. As a device for populist, agrarian rejection of the elitism and formality of eastern and European colleges, Olmsted’s schemes instead celebrated local topography, climate and vegetation, and were “a tangible symbol for the new liberal and democratic ideals of education” (150). However as American educational institutions grew, it was often in the absence of professional designers. A “new curricula and a new collegiate way of life gave rise to new building types: sheds, laboratories, libraries, dining halls, gymnasiums …” (Dober, Styles 45) and within the informal style, this collection of novel structures often resulted in chaotic campus layouts.

Olmsted himself presaged yet another era in the design of campuses when he undertook the commission to develop the plan for Stanford University along with the firm of architect H. H. Richardson. Stanford was to be a monument to the late son of a railroad magnate and former California governor, and the plan emphasized formality and monumentality. Though he was “known for informal, naturally asymmetric designs, he (Olmsted) prepared a plan that conceded to Stanford’s desire for formality” (Lettieri 69). The design was a turning point. The powerful Romanesque architecture of Richardson and the axial monumentality of the quadrangles led Frank Lloyd Wright to remark that “the quads represented the greatest university architecture… and… the hand of the master” (Allen 32).
Just as the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago gave rise to the City Beautiful Movement which sought to organize and control the many forces affecting city life and appearance, so college planning looked to similar Beaux Arts principles to give some control over campus growth. Attacking the traditional campus as a collection of unrelated, independent buildings, Beaux Arts “principles of monumental organization” and “orderly planning on a grand scale” (Turner 167) employed perpendicular and secondary spatial corridors around which the ever-growing campus could be arrayed. The Beaux Arts “multiaxial layout and the careful scaling of buildings, together with central public spaces and sensitive landscaping provided a hitherto unknown sense of visual unity” (Muthesius 25). Perhaps a reaction to the urban industrial environment, some campuses “sought, through the Gothic style and courtyard arrangement, ideals of a medieval past” (Balmori 129). In 1912, Beatrix Farrand began her work on campus landscapes at Princeton University. Farrand advocated “simplicity and calm” in her planting plans of trees and grass with restrained use of shrubs and avoidance of flowers other than bulbs (131).

Increased sophistication and the pressures of rapid growth of campus programs eventually brought about a need for college planning and “a growing acceptance … of the usefulness of master plans, development plans, and the college planner in general” (Turner 238). The eclectic architecture of most campuses was difficult to alter in order to “accommodate changes in educational concepts” and this “helped bring about a gradual acceptance of a more contemporary architecture” (Dober, Planning 40). The economic depression of the 1930s and World War II were periods of limited growth despite the New Deal building programs of the federal government and military. The conclusion of World War II, however, brought explosive and radical change to American higher education (Dyer 340). Due to the increase in enrollment
resulting from the GI Bill of Rights, and the subsequent influx of their “Baby Boom” progeny, a steadily greater percentage of Americans began to attend college. New principles of growth began emphasizing a “process for planning … more … than the final form” (Turner 249-260). Formal master plans, in their inability to accurately predict the politics and complexity of the modern institution, were “almost always impossible to execute fully” (60). Campus buildings began to stand on their own and were sited to allow for what had become perhaps the main factor in postwar campus planning, the automobile (Gaines 10). The physical growth of campuses combined with increased access to automobiles by students and staff resulted in the expansion of convenient vehicular accommodation (Turner 267). Parking lots and the drives and roads that access them invaded and consumed vast areas of the campus. The Modernist disdain for grand axial planning and desire for varied architectural masterworks in the place of Beaux-Arts uniformity, encouraged the pattern of stand-alone structures in “an overall low density… with plenty of greenery” (Muthesius 25).

The “multiversity” of the 1960s had little coherence and the increase in commuting by automobile replaced the traditional desire for an isolated location with a requirement for access to the centers of population. Eventually, dissatisfaction with the results of the Modernist campus led to a more sympathetic application of traditional American college planning ideas. A neotraditionalist trend in campus planning today emphasizes consolidation and compatibility. Recalling its original employment as a campus planning device, Beaux Arts-inspired systems of axes and spatial planning are again being employed to create unity out of variety (Turner 286-297). The desire to “accommodate rapid growth while preserving the values and character of a nineteenth-century campus” (Hilderbrand 86) led to this renewed interest in historical traditions of campus planning. Encouraged by the architectural preservation movement, this reexamination
of planning traditions coincided with the end of the post-war enrollment explosion (Turner, 301).

More modest alternatives to large-scale campus expansion have been seen in the restoration and remodeling of existing campuses. The trend is well illustrated on the University of Georgia campus. The 1999 master plan for the Athens main campus proposes to limit the southward expansion of the campus, promote more contiguous green space to encouraging comfortable walking, construct infill building in place of existing surface parking, and adopt architectural massing and design guidelines. Densification schemes apply Beaux Arts planning principles with axes and focal points (University of Georgia, *Master Plan*). A 1905 plan for the Athens campus by Charles Wellford Leavitt (Bowen 110) has been revisited and is the inspiration for the restoration of a planned north-south axis and pedestrian corridor.

**Campus Landscapes**

**Types**

The campus landscape is the “collection of gardens, yards, and grounds into one broad scene” (*Landscape* 17). Dating to the cloister gardens and interior lawns of the medieval period, the landscape has been a powerful component of the academic environment. The desire to project an atmosphere conducive to study and meditative retreat has drawn on images of the grove and quiet beauty. A 1986 Carnegie Foundation study found that three-fifths of prospective students indicated “visual environment (as) the most important factor in choosing a college” (Ellertson 51) and quadrangles, courtyards, venerable architecture, and landmarks are employed to “leave a strong impression on alumni and friends” (Dober, *Landscape* 158).

More than simply the space between buildings, campus grounds, provide “outdoor rooms for campus rites, rituals, pageants, social encounters … meetings and discussions … unstructured recreation and relaxation, and … ad hoc outdoor classrooms” (Dober, *Landscape* 15). They
function as “the skeleton for the overall campus plan (and) circulation systems…and… can abate noise, control dust, divert traffic, secure boundaries, afford privacy, and be arranged for pleasure” (Dober, Design 167). The familiar forms – quadrangles, yards, lawns, and park-like forests – have become synonymous with colleges and universities.

This study focuses on historic designed campus gardens. Many of the best examples of this type combine cultural, heritage, scientific, and artistic values and fall within the National Park Service definition of a historic designed landscape:

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. The landscape may be associated with a significant person(s), trend, or event in landscape architecture; or illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. Examples include parks, campuses, and estates. (NPS, Protecting 2)

Uses and Meaning

Heritage and Memory. A campus landscape may be associated with “an event or series of events of historic note. (It) may also be the visual perception of a particular period of civilization, a way of life or patterns of living” (Murtagh 125). Certainly, Thomas Jefferson’s design for the University of Virginia must epitomize such heritage spaces. The horseshoe at the University of South Carolina by architect John Mills celebrates the Federalist period in America.

Landscapes can serve as “a mnemonic device for remembering and preserving historic experiences,” (Wasserman 43). Opportunities for reflection and meditation and the preservation of the memory of a significant event or person typify the campus memorial garden. The Stanford
University plan illustrates how heritage and memory might be expressed in a significant campus landscape. One hundred years after construction, the original quadrangles, with their formality and monumentality, continue to be the “inner city” (Allen 34) of the institution, a vibrant, lasting memorial. Education. Numerous American universities collect woody and herbaceous plants for teaching. These collections, often labeled, are maintained for study, display, teaching, and research. Botanical gardens, arboreta and pleasure gardens display trees, shrubs, perennials and medicinal and culinary herbs, often arranged for aesthetic effect and scientific value. University botanical gardens such as the Arnold Arboretum at Harvard University, the Davidson College Arboretum, and the campus arboretum at Swarthmore College, hold great forests and other collections of woody plant specimens and actively evaluate those collections generating valuable information for a variety of disciplines, both on and off campus (Dober, Landscape 205-219).

An example of a campus landscape for learning is the country’s oldest agricultural experiment field still in use - the Morrow Plots, located near the center of the University of Illinois Urbana campus. A National Historic Landmark, the research fields have been the site of continuous corn research since 1876 (Illinois, Morrow1) and differ from most historic landmarks in being a working research site. The Morrow Plots are significant as “a living reminder of the purpose for which this university and land-grant system were established” (Illinois, Century par.1). Recognizing their importance, the adjacent undergraduate library was constructed underground so as to not interfere with solar exposure (Dober, Design 199).

**Historic Designed Campus Landscapes**

Historic designed gardens, the focus of this report, comprise a particularly memorable and easily recognizable component of the campus. Distinguished by design, style, or tradition, their form expresses some intent, meaning or value. The “physical characteristics that existed
during (their) historic period” (NPS, *Standards* 5) and the degree of survival of these characteristics is a measure of their authenticity. These landscapes have become institutional properties in many ways, and many are the result of gifts or later acquisitions by the institution. Not all are on university campuses and there is a wide variation in form and emphasis. The design for the gardens of Dumbarton Oaks was commissioned in 1922 as a private residence. Beatrix Farrand’s multi-axial, sequential landscape design was intended to reflect the owner’s “intensely personal vision” (McGuire 8). The Washington, D.C. property was given to Harvard University in 1941 under the condition that increased use and public access not result in the loss of that personal quality of the garden (McGuire, 1981).

As the work of recognized designers, campus gardens such as Farrand’s “Oaks”, celebrate the work of masters. The Sara P. Duke Garden at Duke University and Reynolda Garden at Wake Forest University are two college properties recognized as surviving works of distinguished professionals. Historic campus gardens may also be examples of superior workmanship and materials or significant in their location or association with persons, events, or programs. Historic designed campus landscapes are managed according to a blending of purpose and use. The Coker Arboretum on the campus of the University of North Carolina contains a registered botanical collection with an emphasis on medicinal plants and its location and setting are an integral component of an historic college plan.

**Landscape Preservation**

**Emergence and Establishment**

The ‘cultural landscape’ — “formed and influenced by human activity … associated with aesthetic and cultural-historical values” — was first described in 19th century German geographical literature (Daugstad 267), but the concept wasn’t related to historic preservation for
many years. The preservation movement in America can be traced to the 1858 acquisition of Mt. Vernon by a private association with the express purpose of managing the house and grounds as a historic property (Hood 135). National preservation policy was enacted in legislation of 1906 and 1935, and The National Register was established in 1966 as the “inventory of historic places and the national repository of documentation on … historic propert(ies)” (United States, Register 1).

It was in the 1970s that cultural landscapes emerged as a specific resource type. The National Park Service (NPS) recognized cultural landscapes in 1981 and established criteria for their identification and description (Alanen 7). The NPS described “four general types … not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes” (United States, Protecting par. 5). In 1987 guidelines and procedures for nominating historic designed landscapes to the National Register were published. Released in 1992, The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Landscapes has become “the most important document to influence landscape preservation” in America (Buggey 3).

Preservation Methodologies

A convention exists throughout the various methods of cultural landscape resource preservation which values authenticity and the protection of aspects of the resource which reflect its history. In America, preservation decision-making is based upon concepts of “significance” and “integrity”. The NPS is the federal government’s principal agency charged with the preservation and management of historic and cultural resources and defines these concepts as follows:
“The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- That are associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history” (United States, Register 2).

The NPS defines integrity as “the ability of a property to convey its significance… grounded in an understanding of a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance” (United States, Register 2).

A similar basis for preservation treatment is employed by the National Trust in the United Kingdom. Decisions are based upon a thorough understanding of the resource and describe “a consensus view of why a resource is important and what levels of damage or loss can be accepted” (English Heritage 7). Canadian preservation policy has assessment criteria for historic landscapes that factor three fundamental aspects of “cultural value”: aesthetic interest, environmental interest, and historical interest (Fardin 18). The Canadian evaluation process identifies and describes the features which have a connection to site history and which exhibit “heritage character” (Fardin 23). As with other preservation systems, the higher the interest and
integrity, the more compelling the recommendation for preservation or restoration over modification or new design.

In the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is charged with providing cultural resource preservation advice and for developing and establishing professional standards. The Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* have been amended to apply to “all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places” (United States, *Standards 3*), and defines four alternative treatments, namely preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction. The *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* published in 1996 applies these treatments to cultural landscapes. NPS recommends a step-by-step planning process in *Preservation Brief #36 Protecting Cultural Landscapes* as “a framework and guidance for undertaking projects to ensure a successful balance between historic preservation and change” (2). *Brief 36* details a process that should involve:

- Historical research inventory and documentation of existing conditions
- Site analysis and evaluation of integrity and significance
- Development of a cultural landscape preservation approach and treatment plan
- Development of a cultural landscape management plan and management philosophy
- Development of a strategy for ongoing preservation maintenance
- Preparation of a record of treatment and future research recommendations

A Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is the preferred way to document history, significance, and treatment recommendations for a National Register eligible cultural landscape. These reports document the evolution of the property, identify existing materials and condition,
and describe historic and geographical contexts. The CLR ties history, geographical context, use, archeological resources, and natural systems to the treatment recommendations. The Department of the Interior bases subsequent management, maintenance, and interpretive guides upon the treatment recommendations of the CLR (United States, Protecting par. 9-12).

The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes defines the three main preservation treatments as follows:

Preservation is “… the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon … maintenance and repair … rather than extensive replacement and new construction.” Rehabilitation is “… the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” Restoration is “ … 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.” (United States, Standards 18-89)

All landscape preservation methodologies rely heavily on an initial process of survey and assessment. Archaeological and historical research, a field survey, land use-descriptions, site ecology, and other planning information all “provide the base data needed to discern … (the resource’s) condition, and its importance” (Campbell 136). Specialist studies, such as a botanical inventory of Fairsted, the office property of F.L. Olmsted, performed by the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, illustrate a scholarly approach of careful identification and documentation
(McCormick 84). Historical research reveals the landscape as a continuum of chronological periods often represented by physical layers.

**Change and Continuity**

Historic resource preservation creates a dilemma similar to that of the subatomic physicist who, by observing an object, in some way changes it. By preserving resources, we alter them, “suspend(ing) their erosion only to transform them in other ways” (Lowenthal 410). This difficulty is all the more profound in the case of cultural landscapes where change is an inherent and defining characteristic. Designed landscapes will, by definition, contain “living tissue, obeying its own organic laws of growth and decay” (Fitch, *Historic Preservation* 262) — botanical growth and loss which can alter the way the various components of the landscape relate to one another.

Historic gardens often contain various phases of planting installed in succession complicated by “aesthetic considerations, modern pressures of use, and archaeological constraints” (London, 1997). Maturing historic plantings may change dimension in stark contrast to architectural and other built elements. Such metamorphosis is particularly marked in “formal gardens in the United States, especially those in … the Deep South” (Fitch, *Historic Preservation* 268)

Cultural landscapes therefore operate and interact in a balance between change and continuity (United States, *Standards* 6). As collections of living matter they are ecological systems and artifacts. It is the intense dynamic quality of cultural landscapes that “regardless of a designer’s intention or the patterns of use … mark it as separate from other resources”. This system must also be seen in the context of “the intricate relationship between people and the landscape (and) may include years of change and transition” (Alanen 16). Historic landscapes are
a complicated synthesis of living and inert elements which have developed over an extended period of time. The components of a historic landscape, while usually intentionally placed, may nevertheless owe their modern form to chance (Sales par. 2). The more immediate variation apparent in day-to-day, season-to-season, and year-to-year aspects of a historic landscape further reinforce an experience of change and development not found in other types of historic resources. Since much of the pleasure and individuality of these landscapes is derived from this metamorphosis, literal preservation would seem to be counterproductive.

Another defining requirement of historic landscapes is that they “have to function as contemporary environments” (Howett 54) and questions of adaptive use must address “change in the larger social fabric as well as the artifact itself” (Murtagh 133). Society’s demand for accommodations for people with disabilities, sanitation, safety and transportation direct treatment decisions to acknowledge the present world and changing circumstances (Patton 60). This “honest expression of our need to make the past useful to us” (Howett, 1987) places contemporary landscape preservation treatments and actions directly in line with earlier interventions which have added, adjusted, and accumulated change.

Historic designed landscapes, especially gardens, often possess a very high element of individuality and pose a problem of a different kind. Highly poetic gardens “owe their beauty rather to the sensibility of an individual than to the horticultural tradition of their time” (Fedden 136) and reflect a process of intervention not easily reproduced in prescriptive guidelines. Codification requires a “presumption of equality or equal value that can be quantified … (by) supposedly disinterested application”. Yet strict application of such standards “holds the potential to negate the very idiosyncratic landscape qualities that set one place apart from another” (Alanen 17).
The aesthetic satisfaction of historic gardens may demand that these artifacts be “displayed in the most favorable fashion” (Fitch, *Preservation* 278) possibly violating strict historical accuracy or authenticity. While preservation of historic gardens in their present state is difficult, restoration to a particular period, especially if original plant material exists, is much more complicated and might, for instance, require drastic and severe pruning. If modern plant materials exist, their replacement would involve acquisition of antique varieties which may or may not be available (Fitch 277). Strict restoration and recreation of a historic garden, therefore, holds the potential to contradict principles of conservation by destroying much of what exists (Sales par. 8). The dilemma is one of removing accumulations of growth to restore historic form or compromising the clarity of the original design in the interest of retaining mature plant specimens.

**Conclusions**

Historic landscape preservation requires an acknowledgement that to save these resources unchanged is difficult and can even be damaging. A philosophical shift in traditional preservation thinking is required due to the dynamic processes which define landscapes. The inevitability of change and transience of structure and detail demand “subtle but critically important shifts in perspectives from emphasis on the art of creating to that of care-taking” (Fitch, *Preservation* 280). Conservation of historic gardens becomes a continuous process of sensitive, sustainable management (Sales par. 2).

Without ongoing intervention, natural processes can destroy the identity of historic landscapes, particularly gardens. Informed actions involving replanting, adjustment, and renewal allow these resources to be sustained in the long term. Codification must not inadvertently eliminate the individuality which exists in each historic landscape but should only provide broad
outlines which convey physical and aesthetic aims. Historic landscape treatment requires continuous intervention and intentional change at the hands of proficient managers, rather than the perpetuation of a static ideal. This constant alteration is “not an inconvenience but a positive quality. In fact … it is probably what we enjoy most about gardens and landscapes” (Sales, ICOMOS 2-3).

Campus Landscape Preservation

Historic campus landscapes originated in one of two ways: as purpose-built components of a developing institution (quadrangles, memorial gardens, arboreta) or as privately developed landscapes which have been subsequently donated or willed to the college (pleasure gardens, estates, parks). Regardless of origin, these landscapes possess a wide range of individuality and significance. Richard Dober has identified these as “heritage spaces … overlays of site history … loaded with symbolism” (Landscape 158). Often photogenic mixtures of exquisite horticultural display, formal and informal design, and outdoor settings for campus gathering, these landscapes come to personify the institution, as testified by their appearance in countless promotional segments, catalogues, news reports, and brochures.

Efforts to preserve campus landscapes began in the last half of the twentieth century. It has been estimated that two out of three university buildings were built between the end of World War II and the close of the century. Numerous historic campus buildings and landscapes have been demolished or replaced with structures inspired by the styles of the mid-twentieth century. Though “charged with the excitement of pioneering ventures … critical opinion does not rate (late twentieth century campus developments) as exemplars of building technology, aesthetics, or site development” (Design 89). In the face of this threat to their historic resources, many universities began to reevaluate their development policies and practices.
In 1998, the firm of Landscape Research, Inc. of St. Paul, Minnesota, prepared the University of Minnesota Preservation Plan for a statewide system of facilities. Working closely with the Master Planning and Facilities Management offices of the university system and the State Historic Preservation Office, the report is an evaluation and management study which has been specifically designed to take into account unique university planning, development and operational factors. The report incorporates and expands upon National Register of Historic Places criteria by applying a “University Preservation Value.” The report is official policy which recognizes that while many University of Minnesota properties have been on the National Register, and despite a Regents policy “to preserve and enhance … historic buildings and area(s)”, no formal guidelines existed related to their management nor the “daily decisions about (their) costs and benefits” (Minnesota 179).

Five broad statements define the institutional values upon which the plan is based. These statements recognize historic resources as image-building assets, advocate their integration into campus planning, promote their understanding and enjoyment, commit the institution to continued assessment and research of these resources, and ensure that new construction promotes maximization of use and sustainability (186). The evaluation methodology provides a device for determining preservation value by incorporating National Register criteria, but emphasizes those which “are oriented primarily toward significance within the University community” (186). The Preservation Plan indicates properties which might be eligible for the National Register “as well as those of high significance to the University which are not Register-eligible” (162). The two matrices are integrated and rank University property according to preservation value. All properties were also separately and independently reviewed for “eligibility potential using only National Register criteria” (161).
The University of Minnesota Preservation Plan functions as an understandable and convincing extension and implementation of that institution’s adopted master plan. As preservation policy, the plan embodies a wider set of campus planning principles including user experience, economy and master planning process (179). In addition to exhaustive research identifying important resources, the management model provided in the plan identifies properties for further study. This section of the document is a planning tool which recognizes changing college facility needs, costs associated with aging resources, and the need for “appropriate integration of conservation and development” (2). Timely, open and accountable administrative processes are advocated. Property reports and design guidelines are outlined for identified historic areas.

Regional Examples

For the purposes of comparison, a discussion follows of the preservation of three historic designed campus gardens located on the piedmont of North Carolina. These gardens exhibit a wide range of styles and associations with the affiliated institute of higher education but in each case education is acknowledged as their core purpose. The criteria for selection of these three gardens – Reynolda Gardens, The Sara P. Duke Garden and the Coker Arboretum – were 1) that they have regional proximity to the University of Georgia, 2) that they be of multiple function and type, 3) that they display varying intensity of management and relationship to the institution, 4) that documented evidence of historic treatment be evident and, 5) that the scale and size of these gardens be comparable to the study site.

Several questions are presented by the regional examples. How are they distinguished by being in an institutional environment? How effectively have they been managed and preserved as historic campus gardens? How do they relate to the study site and can they inform a treatment
plan for Founders Memorial Garden? Specific issues relevant to the historic campus garden are discussed in the context of these regional examples.

Reynolda Gardens

Located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Wake Forest University is a private coeducational institution with a relatively small enrollment of approximately 6,300 (Quick Facts 1). Founded in 1834 in Wake Forest, North Carolina, the campus was relocated in the early 1950s onto lands which were once part of the estate of tobacco magnate R.J. Reynolds. This estate, Reynolda, developed in the early 1900s, was composed of a working farm and village and was the principal residence of the Reynolds family (Reynolda, Currents 1). On the grounds was a four-acre complex of formal gardens, greenhouses, and outbuildings which is today known as Reynolda Gardens.

Reynolda was conceived by Katherine Smith Reynolds and it was her wish that citizens of the surrounding community have access to “learn about the latest information on agriculture and home arts and to enjoy the gardens …” (Wilcox 1). It was at Mrs. Reynolds direction that the formal gardens were located away from the house to allow for direct public access, and, along with the public chapel, that it be built before the Reynolds house (Griswold 214). The estate and formal garden are otherwise typical of the Country Place era of the early twentieth century and were designed by Thomas Warren Sears (1880-1966) (Reynolda, Currents 2). His symmetrical formal garden was composed of two box quadrants anchored at one end by elaborate Victorian glass greenhouses. The greenhouse garden, with a central lawn and thematic displays in the quadrants, was separated from the adjoining fruit, vegetable and cut flower garden by Arts and Crafts pergolas and a pool (Griswold 214).
Sears remained involved in the subsequent management and development at Reynolda and in 1931 recommended a simplification of the design to reduce the maintenance of the formal garden (Reynolda, *Currents* 3). In the early 1950s, he designed the campus of Wake Forest College on “hills that were once part of Reynolda.” The 300-acre gift of the Reynolds family was of land adjacent to the house and gardens (Reynolda, *Calendar* 1). The formal gardens, greenhouses, and 125 acres of woodland were bequeathed to the school in 1958 “for the operation and maintenance of a botanical garden having an aesthetic and educational value” (History par. 8). An endowment was left for the maintenance of Reynolda Gardens, but this was eventually deemed insufficient (Wilcox, 2000). To supplement this endowment and University funds, a volunteer organization from within the community was formed as a vehicle for fundraising, and to ensure Mrs. Reynold’s vision of a vibrant educational program (Wilcox 3). Nevertheless, by the 1980’s, due to the age of construction features and plant materials and an accumulation of piecemeal additions and replacements, “the garden no longer conveyed the spacious, open feel and formal visual relationships that were the intent of the original design” (Reynolda, *Currents* 2).

An initiative was undertaken in 1994 by Wake Forest University, Reynolda Gardens, and the Friends Volunteer Group to evaluate conditions in the formal garden and develop a plan for management which addressed maintenance concerns. A cultural landscape report prepared by the consulting Jaeger Company was adopted and a restoration project followed (Reynolda, *Currents* 2-4). Based on historical documentation, the “character defining features from various times … would be preserved, repaired, or replaced” and later alterations found not to be significant removed. Over five years, walls, fountains and structures were restored. Garden replanting was undertaken with an emphasis on the authenticity of replacement species. This
philosophy guided the implementation of the strong measures necessary to restore the open
color of Sears’ design from an overgrown and deteriorated landscape (Reynolda, *Currents* 1-5).

**The Coker Arboretum**

The Coker Arboretum at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is a teaching
garden which has been preserved on that historic campus near downtown. The garden hosts many
exotic species displayed in association with their Piedmont and coastal plain counterparts. The
Chapel Hill campus rests on the transition between the rolling plateau beneath the Blue Ridge
Mountains and the Atlantic coastal plain. South facing slopes and northerly bluff exposures
allow a “surprising meeting of … mountain and coastal flora” (Henderson 265). The late-
eighteenth century development of the campus aligned a north-south axis with the village of
Chapel Hill and sited buildings to define a “Grand Avenue,” which never contained the intended
road but preserves a central quadrangle (Carolina 2).

The Coker Arboretum occupies a five-acre tract to the northeast of “the Grove,” the
central quadrangle. The northern section of this site was the first to be designed and developed in
1903-1904 by William C. Coker, the university’s first professor of botany (Coker 1). Initially,
Coker developed an outdoor classroom for the study of woody plants native to North Carolina,
but from the 1920s to the 1940s, Dr. Coker expanded the collection to include many East Asian
trees and shrubs (Coker 1). The Arboretum was incorporated and preserved in the 1920 campus
master plan by McKim, Mead, and White which extended the main axis of the original
quadrangle to the south. This plan guided the placement of buildings for years to come (Carolina
2). In 1936, “an extension of the Arboretum” was established two miles from campus for a
collection of native shrubs and woody vines (Henderson 262). By the 1960s after the death of Dr.
Coker, the original site had become overgrown and ill kempt (Jones, 2002). A murder on the grounds caused the university to cut back and remove sight-line obscuring vegetation, but by the 1970s with the memory of the homicide fading, the University no longer placed restrictions on plantings within the Arboretum. In the mid-1980s, the North Carolina Botanical Garden assumed management responsibility for the Arboretum (Jones).

The University of North Carolina now operates some 600 acres of garden and arboretum lands with major themes of botanical diversity, related human dependence, conservation needs and research (Landscape 214). As the oldest of the botanical garden tracts, the management of the Arboretum has been guided by a philosophy devoted to developing “a collection of medicinal, indigenous plants … in keeping with the original intent of the garden” (Coker 1). The botanical garden uses the Arboretum as an on-campus vehicle for their educational and outreach programs. Self-directed walking tours are supported by extensive explanatory labeling and reference brochures.

Sarah P. Duke Gardens

The Duke University campus was created by leveling the hilly countryside north of Durham and constructing buildings in the Gothic style in a formal cross-axial plan. At the intersection of a drainage valley with the leveled quadrangles is the Sarah P. Duke Gardens. Originally envisioned to be a lake, this “ravine” was left unmodified in the early grading of the campus (Dober, Landscape 206). In 1931, the first attempts to develop the area as a campus garden began, though this early construction would later be completely transformed (Durden 190). Upon the death of Sarah Duke in 1936, landscape architect Ellen Biddle Shipman, one of the first generation of women in that field, was hired to design what would become the core of a 55-acre campus garden (Bryan 45). Grounded in Italianate garden design, Shipman designed an
elaborate terrace garden with a large ironwork pergola above and small lake below. Flanking hexagonal buildings and low terrace walls are built with “Duke Stone,” a distinctive locally quarried stone used throughout the campus. The garden formally opened in the spring of 1939 (Durden, Duke 13).

Though developed through private endowments, the management of the Gardens was vested in the University Department of Biology in 1945. Paul Kramer, the first director, determined three primary purposes for the gardens: aesthetic appreciation, demonstration, and experimentation (14-19). Shipman’s terraces were richly planted through the years and in 1959 the gardens were enlarged to their present size based upon a new master plan which provided a new public access point from an improved visitor parking area (Bryan, 2000). The Blomquist Garden of Native Plants was begun in 1968 on the southeast quadrant of the garden and is distinguished by microclimate sensitive plantings of a wide diversity of regional species.

The northern half of the site is now designated the Culberson Asiatic Arboretum. In 1982 the ravine in this area was dammed to form a lake, and it became the centerpiece of a garden expansion begun two years later which was based on the master plan of landscape architect Linda Jewell. The purpose of this new garden was to show the relationship of Far Eastern flora to those of the eastern United States. The garden is not “an imitation of an Asian-style landscape garden but rather a place for the culture of Asian plants” (Brief History 1).

In 1996, a restoration plan for the gardens “addressed circulation and operational problems, clarified some of the planting schemes, and added another generation’s share of plants and trees to the celebrated collections” (Dober, Landscape 206). An outgrowth of this plan is the garden’s most recent addition — the Doris Duke Center, completed in 2001 at the eastern main entrance. The facility is the gardens’ first point of contact with the public. Built on the site of the
1959 visitor’s parking lot, the structure incorporates environmentally sensitive design and contains a gallery, educational and administrative wings. The adjacent horticultural complex includes service and work areas (Durden, *Duke* 27).

The Sarah P. Duke Gardens have multiple values. As a campus garden, it forms a “botanical and topographical counterpoint” (Bryan, 44) to the formal open spaces of the adjacent campus. It provides important campus pedestrian connections to the Medical Center and west campus, and the commitment to education is expressed in a full schedule of classes and programs and a “superior horticultural collection” (*Landscape* 206). Ellen Shipman’s signature terrace garden is considered “the most architectonic and dramatic feature in the gardens” (Bryan 50) and was the nucleus of later garden development. Her involvement as a pioneer designer and the design having been “considered Shipman’s greatest work” (Brief History 1) add to the gardens’ significance.

The evolution of Sarah P. Duke Gardens has required a wide collaboration of educators and designers building on the early Shipman designs, and it has included landscape architects and architects of national renown. The Terrace Garden planting scheme has been modified from her alternating color schemes composed of trees, shrubs, and perennials to uniform bands of color at each level (Durden, 1997). The garden now consists of a “juxtaposition of diverse garden types … (and) … interlocking areas” (Bryan, 2000).

**Summary**

There is a variety of missions, endowments, and associations at these three historic gardens which is reflected in their varying emphasis on programming, visitation, funding, and preservation. Historic records indicate that they were purpose-built to provide learning opportunities, a charge that has been reaffirmed in subsequent mission statements and
management policies. With varying levels of user involvement, these gardens illustrate the diversity of their institutional environments. All have undergone measures to protect and restore historic character and educational potential. The following discussion compares these gardens in terms of their educational functions, institutional influences and effects, management and operations, and preservation approaches.

Education. All of the institutional designed spaces discussed above share an educational history. They are significant for the broad array of activities which have occurred in instruction, interpretation, and demonstration. That they also possess significance as important works in and of themselves and in association with notable persons reinforces their cultural value. Educational purpose is the defining characteristic of these gardens. This overarching theme promotes the preservation of and accessibility to these resources and defines their operation and growth. These pedagogical functions range from passive display to active outreach programs.

The Coker Arboretum represents the most single minded approach to being an educational landscape. The form of the garden and the placement of instructional specimens are dictated by botanical and horticultural criteria rather than aesthetic design criteria. The many mature shrubs and trees, garden features such as walls and terraces, and the surrounding campus setting result in a visually appealing garden nonetheless. Duke and Reynolda Gardens are more complex educational gardens. These are surviving examples of a distinct landscape architectural style, which has value in itself. All three gardens have inventoried and labeled their plant collections, but at these latter sites, plant groupings have been made to achieve aesthetic design objectives as well.

Each of these places participates in educational outreach programs which extend beyond an internal institutional curriculum. The Coker Arboretum is managed by the off-campus North
Carolina Botanical Garden and is one of several educational components of that organization.

Much more vigorous programs operate at Reynolda and Duke Gardens. At these facilities, regular history, horticulture and arts programming is offered to the local communities. Classes, speakers, seminars and hands-on activities are advertised through garden publications.

Preservation. The effectiveness of preservation treatment at these three sites can be evaluated by noting the degree to which significant, character-defining aspects have been retained. Renolda Garden was thoroughly researched and analyzed by Jaeger and Associates leading to a recent restoration to its historic period of significance: reducing, removing and restoring features to return the scale and composition of the landscape to that historic date. The Coker Arboretum is not noted as an example of landscape architectural design. Its informal pathways function as routes to the collection and as pedestrian connections to the campus. Plantings are arranged by botanical family, as specimens, or for informative contrast rather than for aesthetic affects. The collection theme has evolved from native to exotic and today displays a large inventory of both, but with a contemporary emphasis on indigenous plants (Jones). The most historically significant feature of this garden is the ongoing display and management of a varied botanical inventory with relevance to the Piedmont region. The Sara P. Duke Garden has preserved the work of Ellen Shipman as its central identifying feature, but high-quality modifications have been allowed. A series of complementary modern gardens and facilities have been added to the Shipman plan of a terrace garden surrounded by naturalistic woodlands. The maintenance of significant period physical resources has provided an organizing framework to support the teaching, research, and outreach missions.

Institutional Relationship. There are benefits to the historic garden which are a result of its institutional relationship. The educational, institutional environment can offer more control over
land uses and the degree of change permitted on those landscapes. When exercised with restraint, this control can retain the overall historic context of campus and garden. Association with the visible state or private institution is a boon to efforts to publicize the site, the educational programs, and various support opportunities. Historic gardens are commonly seen as backdrops to institutional educational and promotional venues.

Universities are unusual in the continuity of the planning process(es) they employ over time. These historic campus landscapes are in fact distinguished by the high degree of protection afforded them by their institutional relationships, for university systems generally encourage consensus through committee or bureaucratic process and often the result is a beneficial resistance to change. The attempted integration of campus planning and campus garden preservation is evident at each of the regional examples. The current UNC Master Plan strongly recommends the preservation of the area containing the Coker Arboretum, specifically noting the significance of that site (Carolina). The Wake Forest Master Plan (2000) similarly recognizes the historic significance of Reynolda (9). Wake Forest facilities and planning offices participated in the preparation of the cultural landscape report which guides the ongoing preservation management of the garden.

Sarah P. Duke Gardens is in terms of layout, the most closely integrated into its campus of the three examined. The large property, filling an “L” in the Gothic campus plan creates a campus landmark and provides convenient pedestrian circulation. The Coker Arboretum is also an integral component of the main campus. These gardens are open to the campus community for study, walking or quiet recreation as are other areas of their campus landscapes. Reynolda Gardens is well off the Wake Forest main campus. It does not provide through-campus circulation and has more restricted access hours than Coker and Duke.
An important measure of campus preservation is the sensitivity with which intrusions, expansion, or other effects from the adjacent institutional environment have been handled. The sites differ in their relationships to the main campus but in each case, the historic context of the site – informal counterpoint to a classically arranged campus or outlying farm and estate teaching garden – has been preserved while the garden remains integral to the facilities and operations of the university.

Redesign and Expansion. Duke Gardens have developed as specialized gardens surrounding the Ellen Shipman Terrace Garden, and represent the work of other designers attempting a coordinated approach over many years. The character-defining Terrace Garden has been carefully protected and the expanded gardens have enhanced a vigorous educational program. New visitor accommodations have been located on the perimeter in support of the historic garden. In contrast, Reynolda’s treatment plan, focused on the formal quadrant gardens, has been a restoration to a determined historic period. Acknowledgement of modern requirements and limitations, however, can be seen in minor wheelchair adjustments, limited plant substitutions, and the decision to plant and manage the rear quadrants as vegetable rather than color display opportunities as originally designed.

The expansion of the Coker Arboretum and its subsequent association with the entity which evolved at that site two miles from campus is an important distinguishing feature of this garden. Clearly requiring more space and environmental orientation than offered at the constrained campus site, themed educational collections continued to grow at the rural locations. As noted earlier, the North Carolina Botanical Garden, which evolved there, now manages the original main campus botanical garden.
Management and Operations. Varying management strategies have evolved at the three sites. The involvement of public botanical garden expertise on the main campus, the application of the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for treatment and management, and ambitious, high quality garden expansion and programming characterize each garden’s response to mission requirements. Each facility is oriented to advocate and serve the community as well as the academic mission of the institution.

All three regional examples are managed by highly-skilled staff. The North Carolina Botanical Garden staffs the Coker Arboretum with a full-time horticulturist supported on an as-needed basis by the UNC Landscape Division (Kirk). Reynolda Garden generates funds to support the gardens, public programs, shows, and retail activities. Duke Gardens operates an even more ambitious program of garden enhancement and educational programming. The recently completed visitors’ center illustrates the extent of the public outreach, interpretation, and orientation at this garden.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the regional examples which may have relevance to the FMG. The central aim of this thesis is to define appropriate change in a historic campus garden. The preceding discussion of regional examples has attempted to identify and compare the factors which are important to preservation management in those locations. Historic campus gardens share distinctive characteristics such as educational purpose, institutional influences, and unique planning and protection opportunities. But it is the comparison of change and the factors which have managed change that will best aid the recommendations for FMG.

The shift in emphasis among gardens reflects the particular recognition of historic significance at each place and this determines the way in which appropriate change has been
defined. At the Coker Arboretum emphasis has always been on education. A continual attempt to update plant collections has been the management strategy and in this way, change has been a desirable characteristic. With no very important built elements, paths and low walls form a background to the intensive botanical displays.

At Reynolda Gardens a famed, early designer’s work, that of Thomas Sears in 1917, has been the subject of a preservation rehabilitation treatment. Non-historic and declining materials have been removed while historic, character defining features of Sears plan have been preserved (Currents 2). In order to restore the historic spaces of Sears plan and accommodate heavy visitation, restorative pruning, plant removal and replacement and “technological updating” have occurred in accordance with rehabilitation guidelines.

At Sara B. Duke Gardens the historic design emphasis on the renowned work of a pioneer landscape architect is combined with an ambitious expansion of the gardens and updating of collections. Ellen Shipman’s Terrace Garden, its historic approaches, and visual relationship to powerful campus architecture, have been carefully preserved and nurtured. New construction and expansion have occurred as the multiple specialized gardens and structures have been added, but new construction is carefully designed to support and protect the important historic core. Emphasizing education, this strategy has allowed new display and evaluation opportunities – important objectives for this garden.
CHAPTER 3

FOUNDERS MEMORIAL GARDEN

The University of Georgia

The University of Georgia is an important American educational institution, both in size and in its history of growth. The pattern of development “parallels the growth of American public higher education” from frontier preparatory academy to a contemporary modern state university (Bowen, i). Initially conducting classes in a log structure built from hardwood trees cleared from the site (Dyer 17), the University of Georgia today enrolls some 32,000 students and possesses a physical plant of 332 main campus buildings on 605 acres (UGA, 2001). Though chartered in 1785 as the nation’s first state university, it was not until 16 years later that adequate resources had been collected to allow actual instruction to begin.

By the time of the Civil War, the college was composed of a handful of permanent structures enclosing a green space which opened symbolically toward the town (Bowen, 36). A sturdy brick faculty residence on a wooded slope to the southwest, which had been constructed in 1857, would eventually become the centerpiece of the FMG. Only one building would be added to the campus between the time of the conflict and the turn of the century, but an era of modernization characterized the first 30 years of the twentieth century in Athens and at the University of Georgia. The small college village grew into a center for the cotton trade and a corresponding campus emphasis on agriculture resulted in a southward expansion to accommodate related disciplines.

Landscape architect Charles Leavitt, Jr. was employed to produce a campus master plan, and in 1906 produced a Beaux-Arts scheme for overall development (Bowen 94-110). This plan, using long rectangular quadrangles tied together with axes, attempted to unify and define a
hierarchy of spaces but ultimately “made no marked impact on the development of the campus” (Owens 183). Nonetheless, by the 1930s the school had doubled in size. Federal programs in the wake of the Great Depression led to the provision of almost four million dollars for development, rehabilitation, and improvements including some 19 major buildings, plus several roads, and landscape projects. Though not a beneficiary of these national relief funds, FMG was nevertheless initiated during this period. The need for facilities during World War II to train military personnel led to further campus construction and improvement as the University of Georgia was designated one of four “preflight” training schools for the Navy.

Unprecedented enrollment growth after World War II continued into the 1960s and federal funds, this time for grant-supported research, made possible the expansion of increasingly specialized programs. A sprawling science center, new libraries and facilities for continuing education typified the major physical changes to the campus (Dyer 253). The campus had now grown to some three miles in length and initiatives in the 1970s and 1980s to implement a comprehensive master plan or master planning process met with only lukewarm administrative support (Bowen 211).

In 1997, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia required all system institutions to prepare master plans based upon templates provided by that office. The incentive for subsequent master plan compliance was that in order to secure funding for campus capital projects, the proposed improvement must be in accord with this guiding document. The goals of the University of Georgia plan were to promote the characteristics of the historic North Campus; provide comprehensive solutions to traffic and parking problems which had degraded the campus both functionally and aesthetically; and develop strategies for future physical development on contiguous land in an attempt to arrest continued sprawl (University of Georgia, Master Plan 1).
The plan, which was adopted in 1999, identified 23 historic campus buildings and landscapes that had been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. An unfortunate oversight and absent from the list is The Garden Club of Georgia Museum-Headquarters House and FMG which were nominated and placed on the Register on June 23, 1971 (Appendix B).

University of Georgia Preservation Policy

Other than the listing of historically significant resources, the 1999 University of Georgia Master Plan gives no specific guidance regarding these landmarks. The Office of University Architects for Facilities Planning, the organization charged with administering the plan, has indicated that historic preservation guidelines for campus will be prepared in the 2004 or 2005 update of the Board of Regents Master Plan (Messer).

State legislation passed in 1998, on the other hand, does provide for the preservation of state-owned historic properties and subsequent directives of the Board of Regents now require system schools to comply with this legislation. The State Agency Historic Properties Stewardship Program (O.C.G.A. 12-3-55) defines broad historic preservation responsibilities for Georgia State agencies. The statute was subsequently converted into standards and guidelines for those departments by the Department of Natural Resources Historic Preservation Division. The standards developed by the Division recommend that each agency: 1) develop a program that is coordinated by a preservation professional; 2) provide timely identification and evaluation of properties; 3) nominate qualifying properties to the Georgia Register of Historic Places; 4) develop and maintain a preservation plan; 5) consult with knowledgeable outside parties; 6) manage historic properties in full consideration of their significance; and 7) give priority to the use of historic properties in agency operations (Messer). In response to the Board of Regents
directive, the Office of University Architects for Facilities Planning was given oversight of historic preservation activities on all campus properties.

History of Founders Memorial Garden

Appendix A provides a detailed narrative of the development of this property. The patterns of use and treatment are discussed within historic periods which are distinguishable in the evolution of the property. The site history is summarized in the following table in order to identify these important periods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801 - 1856</td>
<td>Athens campus of UGA founded, campus boundaries include property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857 - 1897</td>
<td>Construction and occupation of Lumpkin House as professor's residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898 - 1919</td>
<td>Lumpkin House serves as student dining hall and student athletes' housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 - 1925</td>
<td>House serves as residence of first Dean of Women, Mary Lyndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 - 1930</td>
<td>Property occupied by first campus sorority (Phi Mu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1930 - 1937</td>
<td>Property utilized for various administrative and instructional purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Lumpkin House assigned as quarters for UGA Landscape Architecture Department Professor Owens proposal for garden development accepted by college and the Garden Club of Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 - 1941</td>
<td>Construction and planting of Boxwood, Terrace, and Perennial gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942 - 1945</td>
<td>Limited planting and programming due to Second World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 - 1950</td>
<td>Construction of remaining garden components: Camellia Garden; South Arboretum; North Arboretum; perimeter walls, steps and fencing; parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Expansion of Landscape Architecture program from garden buildings to Denmark Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Renovation of Kitchen Building as headquarters of the Garden Club of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Renovation of Lumpkin House as the Garden Club of Georgia headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Lumpkin House property placed on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Retirement of Hubert Owens as garden director and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Garden Club of Georgia relocates headquarters to State Botanical Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Period One: 1801-1897

This earliest known period of cultural use is marked by the inclusion of the property within the bounds of the original Franklin College and the construction of a faculty home. The first reference to the site was probably an 1801 description of the land selected for the college containing orchards and woodland. This woodland appears to have covered the western slope of the old campus for many years until 1857 when the so-called “Lumpkin House” was constructed as a professor’s residence with grounds for animals and crops. Spanning the nineteenth century, the period was characterized by a utilitarian arrangement of the vegetable gardens and livestock facilities on the site.

Figure 1. Lumpkin House and Grounds in 1894
Map Courtesy University of Georgia Archives

Period Two: 1898-1937  
During this period the property was used by the institution for a variety of dormitory and instructional purposes. During one five-year period it was again a faculty home. Eventually this residential function ceased, and it was used by various departments for instructional space.

Like the house, the outbuildings and adjacent acreage served the college in a variety of ways during these years. The southern end of the site was lost to an academic building, Joe Brown Hall, but the realignment of a steep service drive immediately north of the house added
contiguous acreage to the grounds. After housing professors and their families, the first Dean of Women, a sorority, a students’ mess hall, and athletes, the property became the home of the landscape architecture program in 1938 (Owens 86).

Figure 2. Lumpkin House and Grounds – 1899 Campus Survey (Detail)  
Map Courtesy of University of Georgia Archives

Period Three: 1938-1973

This is the extended period of design, construction and management of FMG overseen by Hubert Owens. Construction of the garden essentially removed any trace of past landscape use beyond the three buildings and existing trees. Though most construction occurred between 1939 and the early 1950’s, Owens continued to refine and develop the property in cooperation with the Garden Club benefactors until his retirement in 1973.
Construction of the garden began in 1939. The design, prepared by faculty under the supervision of Owens, was in the Colonial Revival style, exemplified by formal garden spaces complemented by informal, naturalized areas. The formal units—the Boxwood Garden, the Terrace Garden, and the Perennial Garden—were completed by the beginning of World War II, during which work was suspended.

By 1946, sufficient funds had been raised by member garden clubs for completion of the project, with the addition of a living memorial to wartime service (Cohen, 1945). The designs for the final stages of garden construction—including enclosing brick walls, the extension of the historic iron fence, North and South Arboretum walks and plantings, and the main entry steps—involved new faculty, again under the direction of Owens. A “3-story wing” addition to the Lumpkin House, appearing on several drawings of the period, was seriously contemplated. Though unbuilt, the proposed addition was symptomatic of a growing academic department and its requirement for additional space.
Surviving plans of this period reflect an emphasis on student and faculty involvement in the later phases of construction. The final unimproved section of the garden was addressed in 1950. The original concept plan prepared in 1939 had proposed an “auto court” of granite cobblestone paving which would allow service access and turnaround space. The courtyard was to be defined by an enclosing wall but was expected to accommodate both service vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Perhaps in order to provide garden club member access to the memorial, a more conventional, asphalt parking lot designed by Wigginton, was installed in 1950. With the relocation of the landscape architecture program from the Lumpkin House in 1956, the property became the headquarters of The Garden Club of Georgia in 1958. In 1961 the landscape architecture program moved into adjacent Denmark Hall and the garden club headquarters shifted to the main Lumpkin House. Shortly after his retirement from University and garden affairs, the event marking the end of this period, Owens reflected that FMG had “fulfilled an essential need for students … for learning about plants and planting design and … maintenance” (Owens 47).
Period Four: 1974-Present

Changes in the operation and configuration of the property during this period have been a result of the maturation of the garden, the relocation of The Garden Club of Georgia headquarters and increasingly heavy use by the campus and department. In August 1973, Owens retired as Dean of the School of Environmental Design. The following year he described FMG as having “acquired a maturity and patina … appropriate … for the majestic oaks and antebellum brick buildings” (47) but disastrous freezes in the early 1980s led to the loss of much tender vegetation, most notably the Jeff Smith camellia collection in the South Arboretum (Hitchcock, 1997). Damaging wear to turf associated with ever-increasing pedestrian circulation led to a 1988 project to surround the perennial garden pool in limestone paving. The enclosing magnolia trees were removed and replaced with smaller varieties. In a revival of an earlier tradition, horticulturist Alan Armitage was employed to redesign border plantings in this area.

As the plant collections, theme gardens and other facilities of The State Botanical Garden of Georgia (SBG) expanded in the 1980’s, FMG, with its limited size and established plantings, was no longer the principle campus teaching garden. The Botanical Garden was much bigger and was more varied in thematic, instructional landscapes.
Figure 6. Planting Plan-Additional Landscape Development - 1967
Plan Courtesy of UGA Physical Plant
Figure 7. Opportunity Analysis – 1968
Plan Courtesy of College of Environment and Design
Ongoing initiatives on the part of garden directors and curators have led to other, incremental changes in FMG. Tree loss and growth have created shifts in shade patterns and resulting decline or loss of understory plants. Substitution of plant material has been common. Annual color has been added in new areas such as the Lumpkin Street entry steps and along the eastern entry drive. Other collections of shrubs have been introduced in response to the wishes of instructors requiring examples for plant identification classes.

In 1997 the old Lumpkin House fully reverted to the occupancy and management of the School of Environmental Design as the State Garden Club of Georgia relocated to a new building at the SBG. The new facility serves as a house museum, and provides offices and meeting space for seminars, social, and school activities. In 2001, the administration of the College of the Environment called together representatives of the faculty, garden management and University Facilities to discuss the future of FMG and the Lumpkin House. It was felt that this “great asset for our college” was suffering from a lack of focused direction (Crowley 1). Several problems were identified: deferred decision-making was resulting in a facility which was becoming run down, insufficient storage space hampered special event planning, planting activities were occurring without a plan, previous building restorations were not consistent with contemporary preservation standards, and the parking lot was unattractive yet service access was still required (Crowley 1-2).

Though there was no consensus on the severity of the problems identified, students and faculty prepared proposals for addressing the parking and storage questions. These recommendations generated lively debate between those who saw them as destroying the integrity and “design history of the site” (Waters 2) and those who considered them an
appropriate response to the changing role of the Garden. All parties agreed on the need for a
guiding preservation plan for the facility.

Existing Conditions

A description of existing conditions within FMG is provided in Appendix A. Field work
for the inventory of existing conditions was conducted in March 2001. The condition of built
elements such as walls, walks, pavements and water features was the focus of this investigation.
Two detailed inventories of plantings have been made: one by the University of Georgia
Grounds Department in 1992 and another in 2000 by Heather Birrell for the Director, FMG.
These reports are attached as Appendix C and Appendix D respectively.

A number of period plans for FMG survive, especially for the post-World War II phase of
construction, but many of these are for schemes that were not implemented. Surviving planting
plans differ from what was actually implemented, since most were based on the unbuilt addition.
Other features which are shown on surviving planting plans but which were never implemented,
such as on-street parking along the northeast border of the garden, further compromise the
reliability of these drawings as a true representation of the landscape as it was actually installed.
Figure 8. 1948 Planting Plan - Detail
Courtesy of University of Georgia Archives

Figure 9. 2000 Plan of Existing Conditions - Detail
Plan Courtesy of UGA College of Environment and Design
Character Defining Elements of FMG

The identification of elements that are important to historic landscape character is critical to any preservation treatment, for these features and materials must be retained in order to preserve that character. *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and the *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*, provides a series of headings for consideration of these resources and lists “larger organizational elements of the landscape…followed by individual features” (14).

Spatial Organization. The component spaces of FMG are the readily observable, discreet garden rooms of this composition. For purposes of this summary of character defining elements, the property has been divided into six areas in accordance with the sequence of development and the existing spatial organization of the garden. These contributing resources are:

- **Buildings and Associated Hardscape.** This area is dominated by the Lumpkin House and includes the smokehouse, kitchen building, central courtyard and the Lumpkin Street stairway and forecourt. No attempt is made to evaluate the integrity of building structures beyond their exterior appearance and contribution to the qualities of the surrounding garden space.

- **Boxwood and Terrace Garden.** This includes the picket fence enclosed boxwood parterre, its approaches, and the adjacent gravel terrace overlook.

- **Perennial Garden.** This lower formal garden includes the terrace wall and descending stairway, the manicured lawn, serpentine walls, serpentine perennial beds, oval pool and its limestone skirt.

- **South Arboretum.** The southwest quadrant of the property, which includes the Camellia Garden, an informally edged lawn beneath mature hardwood trees, and naturalistic
planted terraces along Lumpkin Street. It also includes the patio terrace adjacent to the kitchen building.

- **North Arboretum.** This area comprises the large, northernmost informal garden area. It includes the so-called Living Memorial, a fountain, a roughly semicircular lawn, and the extension of the woodland terraces between Lumpkin Street and Bocock Street.

- **Driveway/Walkway/Parking.** This arena includes automotive access and service drive, parking, and adjoining walkways to the northeast of the Lumpkin House.

The spatial organization of FMG is a function of the vertical and horizontal relationship of ground, vegetation, buildings, and other built elements. Particularly evident in the formal garden units and typical of the Colonial Revival style, is the attempt to create outdoor rooms with specific entry points. The Boxwood and Perennial Gardens focus inward from their edges since there are no particularly special views from those gardens which might be defined and emphasized. Axial relationships link garden rooms to one another and to memorial structures, and relate formal to informal sections of the garden.

Perimeter walls, fences and plantings along the western and eastern edge of the garden form strong visual boundaries and spatial containment. The enclosure and separation of the property is purposely reinforced with thickly planted terraces above and below the garden edges. Formal Colonial Revival garden units define space architecturally through the use of the stone walls, steps, leveling and geometric delineation. Informal arboretum areas are less-severely graded and rely on plant massing at various scales to express spatial definition.

**Topography.** FMG occupies an elongated area lying between the historic Lumpkin Street corridor and the slope below North Campus. The relationship of the Lumpkin House to Lumpkin Street was given a formal character when the retaining wall, iron fence and entry steps
were constructed along that road in the late 1940s. The manipulation of topography within this site is one of its most characteristic features. The leveling of ground to accommodate the straight lines and box borders of the Colonial Revival style is particularly evident on this steep campus slope. The strong topographical distinction between the lawns and terraces of the various units reinforces the spatial organization of these garden rooms.

Vegetation. The horticultural diversity, form, and value of the plant collections -- evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs, ground covers, vines, and perennials -- is an important characteristic of this site. This “dynamic component of the landscape’s character” (15) involving plant growth, loss and replacement plantings has contributed to shifts in scale, shading, density and the effectiveness of boundary screening. The established and mature hardwood trees of the site, most of which predate the garden’s development, create a feeling of age and “roof” the garden, making these important to the spatial organization of the property. Over the years many large trees have been lost necessitating replacement. The variability of tree age reinforces this characteristic of process and change.

Circulation. A planned hierarchy of walkways links garden rooms, meanders through plant collections, and conducts pedestrians through the garden. The historic road cut north of Lumpkin House was realigned to a gentler gradient farther north as Bocock Street, but has been replaced by a driveway providing vehicular access to the garden and an important campus pedestrian entrance. Within the garden, a variety of walkway textures and widths create a diversity of experience for the visitor.
Vehicular access and parking share space with the busy campus entry. The concrete curbing and asphalt pavement have no intrinsic appeal but the alignment and its relationship to topography, structures and the garden does illustrate sensitive design minimizing the negative impacts of such a utility.

Water Features and Small Scale Features. Two water features within the garden represent the memorial aspect of FMG. A major focal point of the formal units is the oval pool at the south end of the Perennial Garden. Along with the Boxwood Garden, this fountain is an often photographed symbol of the garden. In a more understated fashion, the intimate North Arboretum fountain possesses a reflective quality appropriate as a memorial to war veterans.

Resources which survive from original garden construction (1939-1950) include all existing masonry and stone walls, stairways, gates and railings. The long period of “fitting out” of this garden by Owens included the careful addition of many more objects such as the
Perennial Garden sculpture, a Japanese lantern, large olive jars, and several benches. Elements in this category which were added after Owens tenure (and therefore not associated with him) are the limestone paving around the Perennial Garden fountain, the cobble stone walkway through the South Arboretum, and the arbor at the western terminus of the Camellia Garden (Hill).

Significance

National Register Criteria

As a public institution, the University of Georgia is expected to abide by the best management practices of state and federal agencies. In the treatment of historic resources, guidance has been provided at the national level by the Secretary of the Interior. The criteria for the listing of sites of national significance are codified in the requirements of the National Register of Historic Places. The NPS has recommended procedures the research, analysis and registration of cultural landscapes, as well as recommendations for treatments consistent with significance, condition and planned use (United States Management 93).

FMG is a highly visible and symbolic component of the University of Georgia campus and particularly associated with the College of the Environment and Design. The programs in landscape architecture, historic preservation, and ecology which comprise the college are of national stature. The “principles that are a part of the … curriculum” (Waters 2) might logically be considered to be the primary guide in formulating treatment recommendations for this property. To do otherwise would be a contradiction of those very teachings.

The significance of the FMG property has been established in its 1972 listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore associated with the historic fabric of the adjacent “Old North Campus” which has also been placed on the Register. As a cornerstone in
the curriculum of the College of the Environment and Design, National Register criteria should
be adopted as the most appropriate guide to preservation treatment for this historic property.

A review of the 1971 nomination (see Appendix B) reveals, however, that it is the house
and outbuildings that are the primary subject of the designation. The garden is described and the
entire property is registered. The garden was only 21 years old at the time of the nomination,
well short of the usual qualifying age of 50 years. Though that application was well researched
and thoroughly recorded, a reexamination would seem necessary to address the property within
the context of the now more developed criteria for candidate National Register historic
landscapes.

Aspects of Significance

National Register criteria for the determination of significance requires that the resource be
associated with notable persons or events, be illustrative of a distinctive type of construction, possess
artistic value, or be the work of a master craftsman or designer (United States, Register 6). A resource
may also be important for the informational potential of archaeological remains. Many people,
occurances, uses, and objects figure in the evolution of FMG, but characteristics associated with the
property’s early mission as a campus residence have mostly been transformed or razed in the process
of garden construction. The following is an evaluation of the historical significance of the property
based upon National Register criteria that it be significant within an important historic context.

Association with Events, Activities, and Patterns of Development

As a campus holding since the establishment of the university, the property has been the
scene of several important activities ranging from women’s studies to education in gardening and
landscape architecture. Several themes are evident which illustrate the property’s relevance in
the historic context of events, activities, and patterns of development.
First developed in an 1856 initiative to upgrade the physical plant of the small UGA campus, the surviving buildings in FMG, in their historic position along Lumpkin Street, are important reminders of the 19th century development of the campus. Serving the institution as a residence for its first 70 years (Period One - Period Two), the property housed instructors and their families on a small in-town farm with barn, well, vegetable garden, kitchen and smoke house. The layout of the property reflected the need to access this western side of the campus, first via a steep, vehicular roadway which was later replaced by a popular pedestrian pathway.

In its later configuration as a developed garden (Period Three), the site has strong association with the development of the campus landscape in the 20th century. The development of the garden spurred initiatives to improve the appearance of the campus. FMG is now one of a number of specialized, departmental gardens such as the Horticulture Trial Garden and the Latin American Ethnobotanical Garden.

Like most American public institutions, the University of Georgia came late to the practice of educating women. The first Dean of Women, Mary Lyndon, resided on the site for approximately 20 years, and afterwards it was the home of the only campus sorority, Phi Mu. FMG continued a strong association with women as the headquarters of The Garden Club of Georgia, which has historically had a predominantly female membership.

There are few reminders of the belated admission of women to the University of Georgia or of the identity and accomplishments of those pioneer students. Nearby Candler Hall, now undergoing restoration, was for many years the only women’s dormitory on campus. Previously the State Normal School, the teacher’s college located approximately two miles east of the site and now the United States Naval Supply Corps headquarters, had been the primary locus of women’s studies.
Historic campus landscapes have inherent educational value in that they provide an atmosphere conducive to study. As part of the campus fabric, these landscapes have institutional value as green space, activity area, space maker, and corridor. Any such surviving open space preserves continuity of appearance and implies that institutional permanence and stability exists to sustain the educational mission. Historic designed campus landscapes, with their strong expression of original intent, have the potential to express educational information about people, events and objects. Such landscapes, which have been specifically designed to promote learning, possess the highest educational significance since in addition to their general institutional value they concentrate features and specimens directly related to teaching and research.

According to its stated purpose, FMG was to be a “planned garden in an academic setting” (Owens 42) that would memorialize American gardening pioneers by providing an educational tool for future generations of garden designers. Its location was the grounds of the first college program for the study of landscape architecture in the southeastern United States. In its construction and ongoing management, FMG has allowed for first-hand student observation and interaction with the forms, materials, and processes of garden design, construction, and management. It continues to be a focal point of plant display, comparison, and identification opportunities. During Owens’ tenure, portions of the garden requiring modification or periodic replanting were continually redesigned in an ongoing and changing display. This work generally adhered to the earliest master planning for the garden, but allowed interpretation based upon changing uses and educational requirements, a process which allowed Owens to maximize educational values over an extended period of time.

FMG is highly significant as an educational resource associated with one of the first programs in landscape architecture in the United States. As a campus amenity, it provides
benefits such as open space and circulation for the campus community. As a landscape for learning, it has provided several generations of students exposure to the components and processes of landscape architecture.

Association with the lives of persons significant in our past. A number of notable Athenians had strong connections to the FMG site. When a campus residence, educators such as Charles and Sylvanius Morris, W. L. Broun, and Mary Lyndon lived on the property. Sylvanius Morris taught at the college and wrote a notable history of the early town and campus. After leaving the University of Georgia, Colonel Broun, like Robert E. Lee at Washington College, became a pioneer in vocational education in a war-ravaged south. Ms. Lyndon founded women’s studies at the University of Georgia. These individuals made meaningful contributions to their community and college, however, their influence was essentially local or regional. With the exception of W. L. Broun, the impact of their accomplishments did not extend beyond the state. Broun’s major contributions to higher education came after leaving Athens.

Under the watchful eye of Hubert Owens, many individuals were involved in the design of FMG, a collaboration of many, including landscape architects and students Brooks Wigginton, Wolfgang Oehme, and Robert Marvin. By the author’s count, some 14 professional designers have left evidence, in drawings or testimony, of creative involvement.

But if a single designer’s name were to be attached to FMG it would be that of Hubert Bond Owens. Owens was a pioneer in the practice of landscape architecture in the South, and head of the program at the University of Georgia from 1928 until 1973. In a career dedicated to the advocacy and promotion of landscape architecture, Owens participated in national and international professional dialogue. His development of FMG (Period Three) can be interpreted as a device for the promotion of landscape architecture in general and the University of Georgia
program in particular. Owens’ garden and campus design achievements are of regional importance as the property most associated with Owens as a designer and educator.

Illustration of Design and Construction. The sturdy façade of the Lumpkin House has looked over the “Watkinsville Road” for almost 150 years. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as notable in its plantation plain Greek Revival construction. Significant is the fact that the house is complemented by its original masonry outbuildings (Nomination, 1971). The house is the largest of the surviving campus professor’s homes and is the only one in its original location. This thesis does not attempt to evaluate in detail the FMG building structures, however, these structures are significant in their representation of the early campus environment where professors resided on the campus with their families and served in loco parentis to the student body. The main house, kitchen building, and smokehouse arrangement speak to the pre-modern lifestyle on the early American campus.

The memorial garden which was begun in 1939 is a noteworthy regional example of the Colonial Revival style (Hitchcock, 125) containing formal garden rooms sewn together with cross-axial relationships and a complementary, enveloping naturalistic arboretum. The range of ornamental plants and examples of stone and masonry construction and detailing — boxwood, serpentine brick walls, cherry orchard stone pavement, granite setts, classically styled limestone copings, espalier, wrought iron railings, and extensive understory shrub plantings — were purposely selected to define the garden as a model landscape. Often associated with large country or suburban estates, several examples of Colonial Revival gardens exist, many in nearby Atlanta.

Informational Potential. In the absence of any archaeological investigation, it is not known if the site contains any evidence of prehistoric settlement or other activities. There is a potential that important information about antebellum life could be revealed in careful and appropriate
examination of the buildings, however, considerable disturbance occurred with the creation of FMG due to leveling, terracing, construction, and planting which certainly compromised archaeological information on the property.

Conclusion: Statement of Significance

FMG has historical significance at a regional level primarily due to a pattern of repeated educational activities, in its association with landscape architect Hubert Owens, and as a notable surviving example of the Colonial Revival garden period.

Eligibility as a Commemorative Property

These types of properties are not usually considered for listing in the National Register unless they have significance independent of their commemorative purpose. Though FMG has been nationally recognized as the memorial to the founding of the national garden club movement, the property has no association with the actual event or early activities of the group. But as noted above, the garden is invested with multiple significance of educational activity, association with Owens, and as an example of recognized design style. Since this garden has come to importance in ways distinguishable from the event or persons it commemorates, it is an eligible property under this National Register criteria.

Integrity

An evaluation of integrity relates existing physical features to significance. The National Register requires integrity in a property because it insures the survival and protection of features which convey the things that are important about that place. There are seven aspects of integrity – location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association (44). These aspects of integrity are evaluated below.
The location of FMG is an important aspect of its significance. The site has always been a part of North Campus and convenient to the programs it was intended to support. Programs in landscape architecture and historic preservation have continuously utilized this property. The location is important in that it is the location Owens selected and for which he designed this garden. Furthermore, it is a location with which he was intimately involved for much of his career.

The design of FMG strongly relates to its significance as a surviving example of the Colonial Revival style. The organization of elements and spaces and the manipulation of topography “made during the original conception and planning” (44) survive and contribute to an understanding of the application of this style in this region. The design of the garden also illustrates the professional work of its principal designer Owens. The setting of this property on the historic North Campus of the college, the way in which it was positioned on a narrow, steep slope, and the integration with the much older site structures, establishes much of the character of the site.

The construction materials in evidence on the site, such as crab orchard stone and architectural limestone detailing, indicate the preferences of Owens and are indicative of the style which the garden represents. They also reflect his intention that the diverse elements of the garden unite to serve instructional purposes. This is similarly true of the high quality workmanship which can be found in masonry, wrought and cast iron, pavements, amenities and fixtures throughout the site.

Institutional Considerations in Selecting a Preservation Treatment

As has been discussed, there are preservation challenges and opportunities in the institutional environment which are particular to that ownership type. The special responsibility
of the educational entity to employ accepted practice and methodology in its own management of historic resources requires that they be evaluated and managed consistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary of the Interior. While other requirements and pressures of institutional ownership require due consideration, they must not override the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines. These guidelines ensure the protection of resources critical to conveying that which is important and significant in the history of the landscape. Accordingly, other institutional requirements must take second place to sound preservation decision-making or the historic integrity of these special resources will be lost.

The criteria employed by the Secretary of the Interior, through an evolving set of standards, serve as a means for identifying and preserving significant historic resources. They are not a means for maximizing the function or efficiency of operations on and around an historic resource. Once historically significant aspects have been identified and the measures determined which would sustain them, other institutional requirements can be considered and compared. Other objectives of the institution, therefore, play a role in the rehabilitation process which must follow a determination of historic values.
### Table 2. Summary of Significance and Integrity of Components of FMG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Register Criteria</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Setting</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; Hardscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxwood Garden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial Garden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Arboretum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Arboretum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Court</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Summary of Institutional Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Considerations</th>
<th>Exterior Condition</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reuse/Master Plan</th>
<th>Early Campus University Life/Culture</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; Hardscape</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxwood Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Arboretum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Arboretum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Court</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Founders Memorial Garden and the University of Georgia Master Plan

The current master plan for the University of Georgia campus calls for the preservation of FMG. That plan will be updated by the Office of University Architects during 2004 (Sniff). Issues related to the current plan which impact FMG are a proposed realignment of Lumpkin Street, the “Northwest” Precinct, and the Herty Drive and Bocock Street corridors. Projects in each of these areas could have a direct bearing on garden operations.

The main body of the historic UGA North Campus is visually detached from FMG. Infill building and attendant service drives and parking has been allowed to occupy an area that separates the garden from the quadrangles and the pedestrian corridor along Herty Drive. A heavily-used, east-west pedestrian corridor runs through the garden but along the interior campus edge of the property is an area, which is largely impervious to comfortable walking.

The 1999 UGA Master Plan recommends the removal of automobile surface parking and all but essential service access and circulation. There is an opportunity to create a more pleasant and efficient pedestrian network from FMG into North and Central campus. The integrity of historic resources — FMG, Gilbert Hall, Denmark Hall, Brooks Hall and Park Hall — could also be improved with the restoration of pedestrian scale if there is a severe restriction of vehicles in this area. Design studies, such as that prepared by Dean John Crowley, point to the need to eliminate some of the roads in this area. The plan proposes to give pedestrians priority in walkways and connecting malls, which should be made wide and without curbs to accommodate pedestrian and service vehicle access to these campus buildings.

Further precinct planning is required to extend this level of planning and design study to the areas which surround FMG. This thesis recommends the following goals for master plan updating in this area:
• Remove all roadways, drives, and parking from a zone bounded by FMG, Gilbert Hall, the Law Library Annex, Caldwell Hall, Denmark Hall, Brooks Hall, Sanford Hall, and Park Hall. Develop a walkway/service network with pedestrian scale and priority.

• Improve pedestrian paths into and through FMG. The primary desire lines from academic buildings to the Garden are from the east and south-east. The historic Lumpkin Street crossing will continue to provide an important access point to the Garden and campus. Plans for campus areas west of Lumpkin Street should consider a convenient pedestrian collector on this axis.

• Expand FMG. Campus Plan updates should consider the expansion of the garden into an area currently characterized by heavy pedestrian circulation and service traffic. Lumpkin Street will continue to define the western extent of the garden. To the east, however, is the haphazard parking and service corridor running from Denmark Hall to Park Hall. Existing conditions in this area are not appropriate for the historic environment of North Campus. Larger campus circulation issues are involved as vehicular/pedestrian conflict is evident. The University Master Plan has identified this area for parking removal and increased green space. This area offers the only space for possible expansion of FMG. A number of service, fire, and utility requirements will provide several formidable constraints to garden expansion, but nevertheless, this area should be evaluated for action which might accommodate some of the pressures of increased use which have resulted in damage to the integrity of FMG.
Lumpkin Street

The Athens-Clarke County government has been studying conditions on Lumpkin Street for several years. High traffic volumes and narrow lanes result in an uncomfortable driving and walking environment. Originally envisioned as a widening project, subsequent schemes have examined lane reductions and road reconditioning with no widening.

A major realignment of Lumpkin Street as proposed in the 1999 University of Georgia Master Plan held the potential for removing this single most degrading external influence upon FMG. The realignment scheme, ultimately rejected by the Athens-Clarke County Government (Sniff), would have converted the roadbed to greenspace, thereby allowing possible garden expansion as well. Current Athens-Clarke County plans propose to rehabilitate Lumpkin Street, reestablishing the disappeared curb height, install conventional and alternative drainage improvements, and repave the roadway. The historic granite curbing is to be reconditioned along the FMG edge (Clarke).

The embedded flashers which have been installed in the road by Athens-Clark County have improved visibility and comfort at the mid-block FMG pedestrian crossing. Their presence indicates the importance of accommodating safe access to the campus at this location. As planning proceeds, complementary measures should be considered which could further enhance safety and appearance at this important location. Brick pavement and speed tables will not be permitted on Lumpkin Street, per Department of Transportation and Athens-Clark County policies and ordinances (Clark). Other, permitted traffic calming measures should be considered such as the use of granite curb cuts, attractive signs, overhead utility fixtures, and high quality materials on adjacent sidewalks.

Visitor Accommodation
This report recommends the removal of general vehicular access to FMG. This can be accomplished easily with a combination of fixed and moveable bollards at the driveway entrance to the garden. Possibilities for the use of the emptied parking area will be discussed elsewhere, but this begs the question of visitor access and accommodation.

The way in which such visitation issues should be addressed is a function of the mission, goals, and objectives of FMG and the ability to influence campus and city planning outcomes. Currently there is no visitor parking for the facility. In order to make the garden accessible to the public for programs, visitation, or meetings, reasonably convenient access to transportation must be developed.

All parking on the University of Georgia main campus is regulated by the Parking and Transportation Department Auxiliary Services Division. Visitors are required to obtain passes which will permit parking in most University lots. For the purpose of wayfinding, orientation and arrival experience, visitors will need to be directed to a specific parking location for reasonable access to FMG. Three potential locations should be considered for FMG visitor parking: the Bocock Street/Brooks Hall lots, the Northwest Precinct, and the North Campus Parking Deck.

Bocock Street

The existing configuration and use of Bocock Street does little to serve FMG other than providing a way to access the facility. The street is heavily used by private and service vehicles. The extension of Bocock Street, which accesses staff parking behind Brooks Hall, completes the encirclement of FMG with parking spaces and makes for confused approaches to the garden from the main campus.
A recent rearrangement of vehicular access controls has restricted all of North Campus to gated access. This will limit access to those with permits for staff/faculty parking behind Brooks Hall, service, vendor and handicapped vehicles. Though this is still a considerable volume of traffic, the plan promises to eliminate Bocock Street as an unrestricted and dangerously congested area on the northeastern garden border. The long-term redefinition of parking and service needs in the North Campus precinct provides opportunities for improving access to the FMG. Pedestrian movement toward the garden from the main campus filters through service and parking facilities. These should be replaced with barrier-free, pedestrian-friendly pavements connecting the garden with Herty Field, Herty Mall and the major academic buildings.

The elimination of staff/faculty parking behind Brooks Hall and the restricting of this area to service vehicles and pedestrians would allow development of an improved campus-side garden entrance and support structures. These are areas outside the historic limits of FMG. Visitation to the garden via public and University bus transportation should be encouraged. Plans should be considered for an improved transit stop at the Bocock Street/Lumpkin Street intersection and wheelchair access from Bocock Street.

Northwest Precinct

The current precinct plan, as developed by the Office of University Architects, will relocate to parking decks all parking to the west of Lumpkin Street and FMG. Major road realignments will be made in this area to allow the construction of the Special Collections Library, housing, and a parking deck. Currently under construction, this parking deck along with the extant North Campus Parking Deck, may offer the best strategy for providing parking for FMG visitors. These facilities will be staffed and relatively secure, offer orientation, and have in place a system for visitor parking (Sproston, 2003). They will be approximately equidistant from
the garden. Circulation from the North Deck is through North Campus, a comfortable walk until
the pedestrian encounters Herty Drive and Bocock Street. The provision of routes for
pedestrians, clear and convenient from the proposed Northwest Precinct parking structure and
existing North Campus parking deck, is critically important to garden visitation.

Figure 11. 2004 Northwest Precinct Plan
Plan Courtesy of UGA Office of University Architects
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The high level of integrity of significant character defining features within FMG support a general management philosophy of preservation. In this context, preservation is defined as the “process of stabilizing, rebuilding, maintaining or improving the condition and specific qualities of an historic landscape so that the landscape is protected and the design intent is fulfilled” (Kunst, 1981). The preceding analysis has attempted to identify critical aspects of FMG which contribute to our understanding of its significance. The treatment and management recommendations which follow strive to preserve these important contributing resources while promoting and continuing the educational purpose of the property.

Treatment

Based upon the history of the garden, its historic periods, significance, integrity, and identification of contributing resources, the following treatment recommendations are made for FMG. These recommendations are based upon the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. The overall preservation strategy employs these standards in determining treatments and relates institutional requirements to the management recommendations.

As would be expected in a garden with many component parts and multiple aspects of significance, no one treatment can be applied throughout the garden. The Secretary Standards describe four treatments: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. The treatment strategy will employ varying levels of intervention required to retain or reestablish the character defining features of FMG. Recommendations will focus on the treatments of “preservation,” “rehabilitation” and “restoration” as defined by the Secretary of the Interior.
‘Rehabilitation’ is “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical or cultural values,” while ‘restoration’ depicts the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular time” (10).

Overall Treatment Strategy

The historic period of this property spans over a hundred years. The end of the third period, 1973, is taken as the close of the period of significance. The recommended treatment is preservation of the historic landscape with restoration and rehabilitation initiatives in specific locations. Since the spatial framework of this landscape is intact, most treatment actions recommended here only require the repair, replacement, and restoration of specific features within the component parts of the designed landscape.

The area of least integrity – of materials, workmanship, feeling, design or setting – is where significant change is recommended. Recommended changes are aimed at allowing treatment in other more historically significant areas of the garden to succeed. Finally, garden growth and expansion is identified as an opportunity to support the preservation and educational value of the property. Off-site opportunities for a thematic addition to FMG and/or campus circulation improvements which benefit the property are identified.

Plantings—Treatment Strategy

A much needed detailed study of period planting plans is necessary before the recommendations made in this thesis can be implemented. Sixty-four years of continuous garden activity – installations, replacements and losses – have led to a great variety of conditions and maturity in the collections. Period planting plans, based upon drawings, documentation, correspondence, and historic photographs, would begin to provide the basis for the detailed
planting treatment recommendations which this generalized report does not attempt. Extensive research conducted by Susan Lee Hitchcock on the work of Hubert Owens provides detailed descriptions of his design and planting philosophy at FMG and other Colonial Revival gardens (91-119).

The priority action which is recommended is the identification, retention, and protection of existing historic vegetation (United States, Standards 31). Existing inventories provide the basis for an evaluation of condition and a determination of age. The protection, stabilization and maintenance of the existing plant collection must precede and inform any proposed treatment project work. The perpetuation of threatened historic vegetation should be considered through propagation of existing stock or by seed collection. These initiatives to retain and document extant plant materials are needed to form a sound basis for future decisions.

Of the preservation treatments most relevant to vegetation, protection generally involves “measures necessary to guard against further deterioration or damage” (Meier, 1990). It is the appropriate, initial treatment recommendation for the plantings at FMG. This treatment can be vigorously implemented while study continues and is compatible with any subsequent decisions that might be made to employ other treatments on a case-by-case basis.

The meaning and implications of preservation when applied to landscapes of living plants must be clear in order to develop a sound treatment philosophy. The educational mission of the garden is in direct conflict with strict interpretation of preservation, but otherwise the garden could not fulfill Hubert Owens’ concept that it be used to inform students as to the best plants adapted to this area (Hitchcock 39). New introductions or replacement with a better suited native species would not be allowed if a historic planting scheme were preserved exactly. Other complicating factors, such as plant growth, change in size and scale, and evolving light and
environmental conditions, make rigid control and preservation of the status quo difficult, possible futile.

The spatial organization of Owens’ design used existing and introduced plant materials to organize a sequence of spaces. The diversity of species, shapes, textures, and applications, provide a series of lessons in plant use. This organizing idea of using diverse plant material and the resulting spatial characteristics define the FMG landscape.

The character-defining aspects of spatial organization and plant texture should guide landscape rehabilitation, rather than any rigid replication of a particular planting scheme replacements which may no longer be horticulturally appropriate, or educationally relevant. The rehabilitation of a particular arrangement of plants guided by a determined historic period of significance might involve a range of interventions. These could include historic plant stabilization and preservation, replacement with historically accurate species, substitution with newer varieties, or other measures which perpetuate organizing spatial and textural effects yet maintain a vibrant and relevant teaching garden.

Formal Units – Overall Treatment Strategy

The preservation treatment for the formal garden units aims to restore them to the layout established by Owens. The design of these units is considered to be Owens work (Hitchcock 39) and the architectural and spatial organization is typical of the Colonial Revival style. Hardscape and turf panels in these areas, including the Perennial Garden pool surround, should be returned to their original configuration. Plantings should be evaluated for their appropriateness in this Colonial Revival context. Though no original planting plans for these areas are known to exist, the correspondence of Owens contains frequent reference to his intent that the formal units,
particularly the Boxwood Garden, display "old fashioned" plants appropriate to the historic reference of the Colonial Revival.

Informal Units – Overall Treatment Strategy

The wooded, terraced informal arboretum units provide for extensive display of woody vegetation and are the traditional focus of teaching activities in the garden. The dominance of vegetation rather than architecture in these areas requires acknowledgement of the greater relative degree of change to be expected. The restoration of these plantings to their original configuration would ignore the continuum of change which has allowed adjustment to these environmental and cultural factors. The maintenance of a relevant educational display has required intervention and adjustment to these inevitable changes. The preservation treatment recommendation for the informal North and South Arboretum areas is rehabilitation of the original spatial characteristics, with special consideration of the growth requirements of the plant collections and acknowledgement of the degree of change which is inevitable.

Treatment Recommendations for Individual Parts of the Garden

Spaces in the Buildings Area

The Central Courtyard should be repaired, missing furnishings and plantings replaced, and the space maintained consistent with its historic appearance. Steps within and at entry corners of the courtyard should be retained. Ramps to provide handicapped access in these locations would be of such length as to seriously compromise the appearance and historic design of this central courtyard area. The brick retaining wall and steps from Lumpkin Street and the granite cobble medallion should be repaired. Deterioration and heaving of brick garden walls and displacement of stone pavement are evident in this area.
Boxwood Garden

As a critical component of the historic landscape, the Boxwood Garden exemplifies the Colonial Revival ideal of enclosed formality. Restoration of missing elements (sundial) and a planting scheme based upon period selections are required to reestablish the intended historic and intimate feel of this focal garden unit.

Perennial Garden

This area is comprised of the terrace overlook, lawn and perennial borders of the sunken garden. As a critical component of Owens’ Colonial Revival garden design, it is recommended that this component be returned as nearly as possible to conditions reflecting its period of significance. This recommendation calls for the removal of additions which detract from the intended design effect, most notably the pool pavement. Though the limestone surround is an elegant and attractive solution to years of heavy pedestrian use compaction and loss of turf, its removal and restoration of the original composition would better reflect the feeling and intent conveyed by the simple oval pool “floating” in the clipped lawn panel. However the implementation of this recommendation must be preceded by broader campus pedestrian circulation measures to relieve this corridor of heavy foot traffic. Structural or engineered soils will be required to improve drainage and resist compaction at points where people gather in the restored garden.

South Arboretum

This component of FMG is a transitional landscape in which the informal arboreta interconnects with the sharply defined formal units. Like the adjacent Perennial Garden, sustained pedestrian traffic necessitated the change from turf to pavement. It is recommended that this landscape be restored as closely as possible to the historic alignment of bed lines and
pathways as shown on the 1948 plan by Brooks Wigginton. The feasibility of this proposal
depends upon the resolution of the broader pedestrian and service vehicle access issues
mentioned earlier. The removal of pavements, such as the widened service vehicle access at the
southwest corner of house, and the granite “Belgian Block” walk laid across the turf area will
require the provision of alternate routes, restriction of access and the engineered reinforcement of
certain turf areas.

North Arboretum Treatment Recommendation: Restoration

Equivalent in size to all other parts of the garden combined, the North Arboretum holds
much of the plant collection which has been placed in FMG for teaching and display. The
recommended treatment for this area is restoration of the historic alignment of bed edges and
furnishings and rehabilitation of the plant materials with due regard to historic spatial and
textural effects. Layout and pathway alignments have changed little since the arboretum was
completed, but the need for extensive materials repair and restoration to walls, walks, and
features is evident.

Driveway and Parking Area

The materials which comprise this part of the garden are the relatively plain asphalt
paving and concrete curbing. The need for vehicular access into the garden was recognized in
the earliest concept of a service area with a garden-like character and of materials in keeping
with the remainder of the garden. The driveway and parking which were eventually built reflect
a more low budget response to the need for Garden Club parking, and automobiles have been a
fixture of the garden environment since. Though such accommodations were not uncommon in
Colonial Revival garden planning, the driveway and parking area in FMG contains little in the
way of features appropriate in a garden setting. Now providing a main pedestrian corridor
through the garden and onto North Campus, conflict between vehicles and pedestrians has become a feature of this area.

The objective of a vehicle-free garden has been set by managing College administration. Off-site parking is provided in the University master plan west of the garden. It is therefore recommended that rehabilitation of this area be undertaken considering the change in parking and priority given to pedestrian access and circulation patterns. With its low cost industrial materials, the 1951 parking lot contrasts with the workmanship and feeling of the other garden components.

It is recommended that a rehabilitation treatment for the drive and parking area permit distinguishable new design while preserving historic spatial characteristics, if critical garden accessibility challenges can be overcome. Elimination of garden parking offers the opportunity for new circulation routing into and through the garden, redirecting the pedestrian flows which have resulted in the erosion of the historic integrity of the Perennial Garden and South Arboretum areas. The design should speak to the continuum of educational thinking that the garden represents and reflect contemporary values in design. The character defining elements of the surrounding garden environment should inform the scale, texture, and form of the new garden corridor.
Figure 12. Proposed Major Pedestrian Routes
Base Map Courtesy of UGA Office of University Architects

Mission and Management

In addition to being an important educational resource, FMG is valued for its aesthetic appeal to students, faculty and visitors, the majority having little connection to the professions which created and now manage the garden. This is a component of the landscape’s “university value.” On the other hand, the house and garden are an object lesson in the fields of landscape architecture, historic preservation, horticulture and landscape management. The degree to which the facility’s role as a teaching resource can continue is a challenge to management. The resource should offer more than pleasant scenery to visitors, but this requires the interpretation of the significant aspects of the site’s composition and history. Manifold benefits to amateur and professional alike would fulfill the statement of purpose for which this “planned garden in an academic setting” (Owens, 1939) was created. Like so many other aspects of change which have occurred in its history, garden purpose and mission require occasional re-evaluation, amendment,
and restatement. When properly done, this process spawns guiding principles which in turn guide decision making. It is a process which is beyond the scope of this report, but it is clear that the educational purpose of the resource has been and must be of paramount consideration.

A proposal to rehabilitate the Lumpkin House to interpret multiple periods of significant occupants and activities put forward by Professor John Waters presents an opportunity for the most effective treatment of this historic structure. Currently providing a mix of office, meeting, and storage space, the Lumpkin House could become a house museum of period furnishings. It is proposed that the various rooms, wings, and additions celebrate notable periods of importance to the property, campus, and community. This structure has not received significant investment since the 1960 renovation to become The Garden Club of Georgia headquarters. This highly significant University of Georgia building deserves rigorous historic preservation study, treatment, and management consistent with contemporary standards.

The professional involvement of the relevant campus disciplines would benefit both the participants and the resource. Interpreting treatment or management activities would provide a valuable bridge between professionals, students and visitors. Tree condition is an example of a needed study which would provide valuable hands-on classroom experience and an instructive interpretive opportunity of value to nonprofessionals. In 1998, a very large and apparently healthy red oak (Quercus ruba) fell in the northeast edge of the garden into Lumpkin Street. The failure occurred on a calm day; analysis revealed “nearly complete fungal destruction of the root system” (Orr, 2003). Systematic professional analysis of old garden trees would likely reveal structural and biological weaknesses for informed management. A professionally led investigation could employ students in forestry and allied programs. Such a study could yield improved inventory information, report hazards, identify potential tree health problems, and
quantify nutrient deficiencies. The display of this process could provide the general public with practical information about home tree care.

Maximizing the educational potential of FMG broadens the field of relevant and instructional disciplines to include: garden history, landscape management, landscape design, botany, horticulture, forestry, historic plant conservation, built materials conservation, cultural landscape planning, campus design and planning, archaeology, and ecology. There are multiple opportunities for expanding the instructional role of FMG. First and foremost, it is important to continue class and independent study assignments within and about the garden. Continuing education programs might offer opportunities to introduce the public to the facility, the care of historic landscapes, and the contributions of respective disciplines. Integration of the facility with campus and community life can be enhanced by social, professional, and organizational utilization and by programs designed to convey the history of the site, college, and community to the users.

Problems of visitor access must be addressed. Parking is difficult under the best conditions. The small lot is barred to visitors and supports general campus parking unrelated to FMG. Very good access to city and campus transit exists, but buses are crowded with students. A reasonable and self-directed plan for driving or riding to the garden should be identified, developed and transmitted to the public. Campus planners have not considered this requirement specifically in development plans for the “Northwest Precinct.” Garden visitation would benefit from a separately identified parking facility or an allowance for visitor parking and orientation in the proposed parking deck with the possibility of an axial relationship to the Lumpkin House centerline, perimeter wall penetration and Lumpkin Street crossing.
Pedestrians entering and departing the eastern garden openings into and from North Campus face a confusing maze of service drives, control gates, parking, and narrow sidewalks. Campus planners must clarify and remove barriers to provide safe, attractive access. A final consideration of user accommodation is that of handicapped access to and through FMG. Numerous barriers to wheelchairs and the sight-impaired exist and require sensitive and appropriate modification.

Treatment recommendations for FMG can only be accomplished by influencing and participating in the larger campus plan. Off-site garden visitor parking and orientation has been discussed. The restoration of the Perennial Garden requires that “campus” pedestrian through-traffic be discouraged in that area. This heavy traffic must be routed north to enter the garden in the current parking area, then across Lumpkin Street. New walkways from the parking area east of the garden (Brooks Hall parking lot) connecting to the garden would offer an opportunity to alter pedestrian flows.

Expansion of FMG to the east would not only offer new program and display opportunities but could also be the means for solving key campus circulation problems. The constant mix of service and personal vehicles and pedestrian traffic in the Brooks Hall parking lot and chaotic Bocock Street is unsightly, unsafe and in contradiction of stated institutional policy aims. The greening of this area as an elaboration of FMG offers the chance to establish new garden approaches and to implement the university’s plan to attractively and safely accommodate pedestrians and service for its buildings.

The above recommendations require resources in excess of current funding levels to support salaries, preservation treatment projects, and other associated costs — at a time characterized by diminishing budgets in higher education. Active public outreach has not been a
prominent aspect of FMG since the departure of Owens and the Garden Club. Staffing levels do not allow the time required to plan, advertise or coordinate such activities. The formation of substantial and reciprocal associations with external related agencies might be one means of expanding the educational mission.

One local organization which specializes in garden education and interpretation is The State Botanical Garden of Georgia. At the Coker Arboretum at the University of North Carolina, such a relationship exists. Programs and expertise of the North Carolina Botanical Garden has widened public access to the arboretum, improved its appearance and collections, and given the botanical garden an on-campus presence (Pelland). Such an association between FMG and an organization like The State Botanical Garden of Georgia could draw on the already-existing “infrastructure” of their garden programs while providing them access to the in-town and highly visible historic garden.

The fact that The State Garden Club of Georgia relocated to the Botanical Garden offers the intriguing possibility of reaffirming the relationship which made the original garden possible. Numerous organizations, both town and gown, offer potential for affiliation: the Cooperative Extension Service, Athens-Clarke Heritage Foundation, and the Georgia Center for Continuing Education. Many possibilities exist for collaboration and joint-sponsorship of lectures, classes, plant walks, formal ceremonial observances, and restoration activities. Such recommendations need to be built on the foundation provided by clear statements of mission and purpose, and can only be done by the assembled stakeholders. These include many allied academic departments, facilities planners, university and local government administrations, students, and perhaps all of the aforementioned local agencies.
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Introduction

The Founders Memorial Garden occupies two and a half acres on the University of Georgia campus and honors the pioneers of American gardening as well as the men and women who served in the most calamitous world war in history. These two groups, at first seeming to have little relation to each other, are, in fact, associated due to one man - Hubert Bond Owens. This garden was the brainchild of this educator and landscape architect who energetically encouraged amateur and professional, patron and student, and in so doing, created a living memorial to both.

The following report examines this landscape in a process aimed at the eventual identification of a treatment guideline that best reflects this property’s historic significance and condition. An ambitious University Master Plan, changes in use of garden facilities, proposed changes in garden configuration, and the fact that the property is entering an age at which “historic” status is commonly considered, all underscore the need for protection and future treatment. It is hoped that this site history will contribute to a study that will provide an informed basis for the analysis and treatment recommendations leading to responsible and respectful stewardship of the Founders Memorial Garden.
SITE HISTORY
Site History Prior to Garden Development

The original site of the Founders Memorial Garden rests upon a west-facing slope in the American Piedmont Plateau of Georgia. The slope drains into the nearby Oconee River and one of its tributaries, Tanyard Creek. Elevations through the site run between 690 and 725 feet above sea level. Soils are characterized as belonging to the Cecil Series of sandy loams, comprised primarily of weathered gneiss and granite. Beneath this thin loam lies a subsoil of red clay.¹

There are two known sites of prehistoric habitation very near the site. In the area now known as Sanford Stadium, along Tanyard Creek, a site of the Late Archaic Period (3,000 B.C. to 1,000 B.C.) was discovered. A handsome artifact, a long chert blade, was discovered at this site and occupies catalogue listing number one in the collection of the University of Georgia Anthropology Department. Within the embankment along the west side of Jackson Street, near the Main Library, an Archaic Period (8,000 B.C. - 1,000 B.C.) encampment was discovered which also produced a “hint” of the latest aboriginal habitation in this area (around 1500 A.D.).² It can be said that the area now known as North Campus, which includes our site, was the kind of location favored for prehistoric camps as well as more permanent habitation sites. In fact, the first Euro-American settlers in this area, notably Josiah Meigs in 1801, “found almost as many Indians as whites.”³
The history of the founding of the University of Georgia and Athens has been variously and completely told and will only be summarized here. A 1785 legislative charter established the University of Georgia as the first such institution in the nation, but it was not until 1801 that the location along the west bank of the Oconee River was selected. After initially holding classes under the trees, the first campus building, a one-and-a-half story log cabin, was constructed in 1802.4

As a means of generating revenue, the University was authorized to survey lots for private sale. These lots were arrayed adjacent to the early campus and represented the future town of Athens. A nearby “rock spring” served both college and town.5 The road to the older community of Watkinsville originated at the western end of the town lots and descended the ridge opposite the slope to the river. This “Road to Watkinsville,” as earlier maps describe it, would become busy Lumpkin Street and provide a border to the campus as well as forming the western edge of the study site.

Franklin College, as the school was known, eventually grew to reflect the traditional physical campus plan of the time. Anchored at one end by its main academic building, a rectangular space was defined by a chapel, two debating society headquarters, supporting academic buildings and professors’ homes. A nearby arboretum, along Tanyard Creek and adjacent to our site, was developed by the school and supported a variety of introduced and native botanical specimens. It was the sale of this land in the 1850s that financed the erection of the sturdy iron fence separating town and campus.

Concurrent with the fabrication and installation of the campus iron fence, and financed with further sales of University holdings, the first documented development was reported on the study site. The July 16, 1857 edition of the “Southern Watchman” reported that “the iron railing furnished and now being put up around the college campus by the Athens Steam Company is both ornamental and useful”.6 A further account of university activities within that same issue observed that “Mr. Crane lately erected an edifice on the college grounds a professor’s house, we
believe - and improvements are going on all over the place.” This account is confirmed in the meeting notes of the Prudential Committee, an executive subcommittee of the Board of Trustees that could exercise some day-to-day supervision of the school and could direct the construction of campus improvements. These notes indicated that the treasurer was ordered to “pay Ross Crane, five hundred dollars in addition to the one thousand heretofore awarded him on his contract for building the new Professor House.”

This initial construction included the house, smokehouse and kitchen building in their present configuration. All were of red brick with low-pitched gable roofs. The two-story main house was built in a “plantation plain Greek Revival” style with two rooms and a central hall on each floor. A twenty-by-forty-foot room was soon added on the east side at the end of the first floor hall. Floors of the main house were of heart pine. The kitchen building was divided into two rooms and, like the smokehouse, had brick floors and white plaster over brick walls.

Figure 1. Lumpkin House. View South prior to garden development
Figure 2. 1894 Campus Map

Figure 3 1901 Campus Map
A.L. Hull stated in 1894 that the “brick dwelling on Lumpkin Street” was built for $4,000 and that a “mess hall scheme was not even attempted, and the house has only been tenanted by renters, excepting a brief occupation by a professor.”¹⁰ The practice of housing instructors was common and helped provide eyes and ears over an immature and unpredictable student body, not a phenomenon peculiar to the age. One of the most notable early occupants of the house was a Confederate veteran, Lt. Col. William Leroy Broun of Virginia, a professor of natural science who would go on to become President of Alabama Polytechnic Institute (Auburn). His daughters were born in 1867 and 1868 in the “brick house under the hill below the forest on the college grounds.”¹¹

After the departure of Professor Broun came the thirty-year occupation of the “house on Lumpkin Street”¹² of the Charles Morris family. Another Confederate Virginian, Major Morris was professor of Belle Lettres, Greek and English and the father of Sylvanus Morris.¹³ While on the property, Sylvanus and a brother “had a cotton crop in the garden, corner of Lumpkin and Baldwin. They made fifteen dollars....”¹⁴

Figure 4. Campus, Lumpkin Street and Future Garden Site. View South From Town (c.1920)
Maps prepared in 1874, 1894 and 1901 do indicate that the Lumpkin Street - Baldwin Street corner was, if not fallow, actively cultivated and part of the parcel associated with the house. These surveys also confirm that this was the most heavily wooded portion of the area now known as North Campus (the land bordered by Broad, Lumpkin, Baldwin and Jackson Streets). Another interesting feature of these diagrams is a roadway cutting eastward up the slope, perpendicular to Lumpkin Street and directly north of and adjacent to the Lumpkin House. This campus drive, later to be realigned and known as Bocock Street, apparently served this property and the Strahan House, another faculty residence. Fascinating aspects of the campus survey of 1894 are asymmetrical formal gardens at the front of the house as well as additional outbuildings southeast of the house-kitchen-smokehouse complex. Another structure, possibly a well, is indicated among the trees in the southwest corner of the house plot.

In 1898, the Lumpkin House served as a student mess hall “under a cooperative plan originated and directed by Colonel Charles M. Snelling”. In the legislative session of 1900, funds were earmarked for a new dining facility. Denmark Hall was located just uphill from the Lumpkin House and with its completion, student renters occupied the house. The house provided athletic housing “in early teens” due to its close proximity to Herty Field where sporting and martial activities were focused.
With the admission of women to the university in 1920, the house became the home of Miss Mary Lyndon, the University’s first Dean of Women. Presumably, the property became a focus for the activities of the female minority on the campus and, upon the death of Dean Lyndon, became the headquarters for her sorority—Phi Mu. Thanks to their occupancy, we have the first images of the house and site. Taken two years apart in 1926 and 1928 from the street below, the photos reveal a clapboard addition made to form a southern wing to the main structure. This alteration was not shown on the survey maps of 1894 and 1901. The photos hint at the existence of some form of landscape treatment above the brow of the obscuring barren embankment. Unfortunately, all that is visible is a low hedge. Also of note is the original, straightforward treatment of the steps into the house, these were significantly modified in later years.

Phi Mu moved from the Lumpkin House to their current home in 1928 but the building continued to house women until the mid-30s as one of the school dormitories. It was eventually used for instructional purposes in the 1930s by the sociology and biology departments. Opening in 1932 and occupying the site of Sylvanus Morris’ “cotton patch” at the corner of Baxter and Lumpkin Street, Joseph E. Brown dormitory was built with surplus funds from the World War I Memorial Hall Construction Fund. The grading for this construction resulted in a six to eight-foot cut between this building and the higher house plot.

Figure 6. 1926 Phi Mu House
The landscape architecture program during this period had been housed in several locations including Conner Hall (1928-29), Hardman Hall (1929-30), the Ceramics Building (1930-32), Moore College (1932-37), and the Lustrat House (1937-39). This department moved into Lumpkin House in 1939. In January of that year, and prior to the move into new headquarters, department head Hubert Owens observed that “adjacent to the building is an area admirably suited to the development of a complete garden.”
Development of the Founders Memorial Garden

Hubert Owens began his work with the Garden Club of Georgia almost immediately upon assuming his post at the University of Georgia in 1928. He became a member of the Board of Directors of that club in 1938. At the organization’s 1936 convention in Albany, a member proposed to develop a suitable memorial in recognition of the founders of the Ladies Garden Club of Athens, the first organization of its kind in America. The garden club concept had eventually spread across the nation, and the state council wanted to commemorate the approaching 50th anniversary of this occasion.

The knowledge of the lost nineteenth century campus botanical garden and the impression made upon him by his experience at verdant Berry College in 1926-27 had convinced Owens of the “value of a planned garden in an academic setting.” During the late 1930s the university took advantage of “PWA [Public Works Administration] and other federal funds as well as the million(s of) dollars provided by the state.” The physical plant of the old school grew by leaps and bounds and it was within this atmosphere that Owens approached University President Harmon W. Caldwell with a proposal to combine public and private resources in order to create a much-needed campus garden.

Hubert Owens’ proposal for a Founders Memorial Garden was accepted by the executive board of the Garden Club of Georgia at the Hotel DeSoto in Savannah on January 27, 1939. Prior to this formal acceptance and in correspondence with Mrs. W.F. Bradshaw, chairwoman of the Founders Memorial Committee, University President Caldwell announced that the “University would welcome the location of this garden on its campus.....(by) providing a satisfactory location.....and supplying funds for adequate maintenance.” Owens proposed a design with terraces and formal gardens, a courtyard and a large, wooded area suitable for a naturalistic treatment. The funds for construction and planting would be raised by the Garden Club with design and construction supervision to be provided by the Landscape
Architecture Department. Funds for upkeep would be the responsibility of the university. A detailed cost estimate (see appendix), a presentation plan and a model were prepared in order to promote the project and raise funds for its initiation.

The design of the Founders Garden, in early plans and in the eventual build-out of the garden, was decidedly Colonial Revival, exemplified by axes, cross axes and terraces. Box-bordered parterres, a sunken turf panel defined by perennial borders, the terrace overlook, and strong axial connections between units can all be seen in the garden proposed by Professor Owens. According to this early plan, the formal units were to be complemented by informal areas to the north and south where many mature hardwoods were in existence. Extensive under plantings of smaller ornamental trees, woody ornamentals, groundcover, bulbs, and herbaceous plantings would be placed in these areas.

Construction began in late March, 1939. Significantly, the first undertaking was both a functional necessity and a symbol of the new partnership between the school and garden club - a courtyard which was constructed between the main house and the two outbuildings. It was proposed that the smaller smokehouse would become a Garden Club Memorial. The courtyard plantings included “mondo grass, white azaleas, and crocuses in the rectangular strips and Carolina Jessamine and clematis” which grew over the pierced brick walls. Meanwhile, the landscape architecture program had moved into the Lumpkin House and work had begun on the boxwood garden construction and smokehouse alterations. The construction was performed by a private builder, Mr. G.S. Wright, in a series of five contracts totaling $1,817.70.

The next unit, the Boxwood Garden was completed in 1940 and was modeled on the boxwood parterres typical of the Georgia piedmont in the first half of the nineteenth century and so well remembered by Hubert Owens from his childhood. The dwarf boxwoods of each quadrant are arranged such that they represent plants which are important in their association with the State. A bay window
installed in the east wall of the smokehouse building overlooked the centrally placed sundial. The garden and window were gifts of the Peachtree and Sand Hills Garden Clubs respectively and are typical of the fund-raising mechanism which made the improvements possible. A focal point of the Founders Garden, the Boxwood Garden serves as a dramatic extension of the “shrine”: the smokehouse trophy room and bay window reserved in remembrance of the founding twelve members. The most intensively cultivated of the several garden rooms, the margins and cut-outs of the boxwood parterre were planted in apricot and blue violas, clumps of herbs, Johnny jump-ups, violets, burnt orange geums, lemon lilies, buttercup ranunculus, jonquil snowdrops, and foxglove.32
A funding scheme had been finalized by spring, 1941 to develop the next series of improvements. Substantial retaining walls and steps, critical to the necessary grade adjustment between the overlooking terrace garden and the sunken perennial garden, were funded by the Charter Garden Club of Columbus as a memorial to Mrs. W.C. Bradley. Mrs. Clifford Swift of Columbus donated the oval pool in memory of her mother and agreed to advance funds for the serpentine walls if Owens and the Garden Club of Georgia would guarantee funds to cover all other expenses and provide a complete project. The funds were secured and G.S. Wright again provided all labor for grading and construction of walls, steps and railings, using specialty limestone treads and copings from Indiana and cast railings.
The Terrace and Perennial Gardens, completed in August, 1941, marked the end of the first phase of development in the Founders Memorial. The Terrace formed a passage from the houses and Boxwood Garden into the lower perennial unit. Paved with river gravel, defined by the white picket enclosure of the boxwood “old fashioned garden” and supported by the new brick and limestone Bradley steps, the terrace offered an inviting and shady space affording a dramatic view to the south. Vinca minor was underplanted with emperor and empress narcissi within the free-form beds.35

With its signature serpentine walls, the perennial garden featured a highly manicured lawn whose edges undulated with the walls six feet beyond. The appearance of this area was so important that the sunny borders were planned and planted by the instructional staff of the school on an alternating basis.36 It was Owens’ desire to use new varieties of irises, peonies, and other spring-flowering perennials, along with chrysanthemums and asters to make a spectacular display.37
Owens now turned his attention to the Lumpkin House. Plans were developed to replace the “unattractive existing wooden steps of the Lumpkin Street facade” with “cast-iron columns and balustrade with twin staircases which sweep out from both sides of the porch”. Owens stated in a letter with the ominous date of December 9, 1941, that “the war news is very distressing. I hope we can get the steps built before conditions become too upset.”
The War Years

Pearl Harbor was the defining moment in twentieth century American history. As such, and due to the overwhelming insult which resulted from this event, the nation was united and focused as never before (or since). All affairs were judged in light of the successful conclusion of the conflict and every endeavor must contribute toward that end. Accordingly, it was announced that, due to the national emergency, the Garden Club of Georgia would postpone the completion of the garden until after the war.41

Hubert Owens had resigned his commission as a Second Lieutenant in the Army Reserve in 1938 and was rejected for service in World War II due to poor eyesight. He remained in Athens and continued teaching “to 15 women students and two young men with 4-F military classifications!”42 June Harrel, class of 1948, remembers that “there just weren’t many people around.”43 Despite the restriction on labor and materials, maintenance and planting proceeded and Owens completed the formal gardens constructed before the war with a steady stream of solicited donations. But the conflict did have a physical effect upon the garden. A wartime publication stated that curators were keeping in line with the Victory Garden movement: the beds in the Boxwood Garden were being used for herb growing.44 Otherwise, the maintenance of perennial borders in the garden was seen as a war service as it helped to build morale on the home front by providing enjoyment for citizens who were forced to convert their home gardens entirely to vegetable production.45

Plant materials seemed to be one of the few commodities not restricted by the War Material and Price Administration Boards. In February, 1942, the Georgia State Nurseryman’s Association voted to give all the plants needed to finish the garden.46 They donated magnolia and ligustrum to provide serpentine garden enclosure, a specimen double-flowering dogwood, and a Douglas pear for espalier on the smokehouse. The garden club members and other “loyal friends of the Garden” made per-
sonal donations. Garden furnishings and gifts of service were also accepted. Occasional offerings were politely declined or redirected: “I wonder if it would be agreeable with you for me to use your check for purchasing Ilex vomitoria instead of fig bushes?”

The original concept of the Founders Garden as a living memorial began to take on a new dimension as the toll of war was exacted. In January, 1945, Mrs. Robert Neeley, President of the Garden Club of Georgia proposed “a Living Memorial and Arboretum for our boys and girls in the Armed Forces [and that it be] planted at the Founders Memorial in Athens.” Original plans for the garden had called for the five formal units (house, courtyard, boxwood, terrace, and perennial gardens) to be complemented by a “naturalized woods area” and “planted with the best of the native small trees, shrubs and wild flowers.” Aerial and ground-level photographs of the area show the northern and southwestern portions of the property as wooded, rough and crisscrossed with dirt paths. The Living Memorial offered a means to complete the “new half-finished garden.”
**Garden Completion**

The notion of the garden war memorial was a popular one. The Garden Club of Georgia undertook a fund raising drive and the University promised utmost cooperation. A plan dated April, 1945, by Brooks Wigginton, a new instructor in the landscape architecture program, details the extension of the historic iron fence and retaining walls along the garden’s boundary with Lumpkin Street. A stairway penetrating the wall and fence was to be separately designed as the principle entrance to the development. The university agreed to finance this construction even though costs were extremely high. At the same time, Wigginton and students, such as Harry Baldwin (BLA ‘50), were engaged in the design of the two areas, which combined, comprised the Arboretum. This last phase of garden construction was slow due to post-war shortages and the club’s resolve that work proceed only when sufficient funds had been secured. By October, 1947, however, donations were no longer being solicited “but [would] be gratefully received”.

Rough grading of the pre-existing terraces had been completed by the beginning of 1948. As a means of addressing the completion of the garden enclosure and as a deterrent to “walkway(s) across the Arboretum,” an ivy-covered wire fence was proposed by Mrs. Neely. This was rejected by University President Caldwell who instead offered to contribute toward a pierced-brick wall along Infirmary Drive, a roadway created when the old driveway which had bisected the site just north of the house was realigned. While no documentation has been found to date, it is presumed that the road was built in concert with the construction of Denmark (1901) or Brooks (1924) halls.
Facing the terrace banks with stacked slate provoked some controversy. Hershel Webber, an instructor, did not approve of the treatment, claiming it was only a veneer and would ultimately fail. The installation of the Jeff Smith Camellia collection, a crab orchard stone path, turf, extensive shrub and groundcover plantings, and the “necessary pipes and hydrants” for watering were completed during these early post-war years.

![Figure 14. Arboretum construction](image1)
![Figure 15. Terrace before planting Arboretum](image2)

The program in landscape architecture was bursting at the seams. In addition to the Lumpkin House, students occupied the adjacent kitchen building, as well as prefabricated military barracks east of Jackson Street on the current site of the Visual Arts Building. Studio space also occupied the upper floor of the “Beanery,” the former living quarters of the Denmark Hall dietician. The need for instructional space was illustrated in garden plans which were prepared during these years. One site plan shows a proposed building adjacent to and north-east of the Lumpkin House. This expansion never occurred but does reflect the school’s need for space.
A new generation of older, confident veterans taking advantage of the G.I. Bill had filled the program. Many of these students who experienced combat and saw the resulting devastation of war had at the same time, been exposed to the culture and landscapes of the world as no generation in American history.\textsuperscript{63} The result was a fierce vocational work ethic aimed directly career and family support. There was also an open attitude toward design, perhaps best exemplified by the influence of Thomas Church, whose work straddled the line between tradition and modernism.\textsuperscript{64} In response to the lifestyle America yearned for after years of sacrifice, these students would respond, like Church, with new forms and a new “preoccupation with use.”\textsuperscript{65}

It is appropriate that this generation of students benefited most from the development of the Living Memorial. Classes were involved in design and construction observation and several students provided the labor for planting and laying stone.\textsuperscript{66} The garden was the subject of senior projects and countless plant identification sessions. The classes observed the design and construction of Wigginton’s “contemporary” terrace off the south side of the kitchen building and chided him over the resulting drainage problems.\textsuperscript{67} Lifelong impressions were guided by this total immersion in environment and curriculum. Graduates even recounted dipping their presentation paper in the Perennial Garden pool and dashing indoors to prepare their watercolor washes.\textsuperscript{68}

![Figure 17. Postcard of fountain](image.jpg)
By the late forties, the Founders Memorial was nearing completion. The Garden Club of Georgia began negotiating with the university over eventual occupation of the Lumpkin House as the state headquarters while the college made plans for new dining facilities to replace those in Denmark Hall. The landscape architecture program would be relocated into that building. In 1949, a small commemorative fountain was constructed as the last major improvement to the Living Memorial and a small tablet dedicating the Arboretum “to those who gave much and those who gave all” (See Appendix) was mounted on the pool wall. A driveway and parking lot, designed by Brooks Wigginton, was installed in 1950.69 This asphalt driveway, originally to be a cobblestone auto court, was considered by Mrs. Robert Neely “a vast improvement...but she sorely missed the green grass”.70 Others remember this area as “unimproved” prior to this construction.71 Above the Lumpkin Street steps, serving as a forecourt to the house, a plaza of historic granite cobbles donated by the University was constructed. A design by Jim Coile, utilizing brick within concrete borders, was rejected in favor of the granite units as designed by Wigginton.72

Figure 20. War Memorial fountain
The Founders Memorial Garden was completed. This living laboratory and memorial, begun in 1939, had taken eleven years and $18,000 to build (exclusive of donations and cost of land). All funds had been supplied by the Garden Club of Georgia. The garden set a new standard for the campus and provided Georgia with:

A comprehensive collection of deciduous and evergreen shrubs, ground covers, vines and a limited number of perennials and trees which can be used in this region for ornamental purposes. New varieties are being tried.\(^7^3\)

Hubert Owens, who “always had the final word”\(^7^4\) had persevered to make the garden an example of “the best in the landscape architect’s art [using only] the very best and most appropriate material.”\(^7^5\) Planting and placement of memorials continued. Finally, in 1954 the National Council of State Garden Clubs, on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary, awarded the Garden Club of Georgia its Silver Seal Award in recognition of the garden. The event was commemorated by the placement of a classic limestone figure at the base of the Bradly Memorial Steps on the north end of the Perennial Garden.
In October, 1954, the Garden Club of Georgia and the university finalized plans for the club’s occupation of the Lumpkin House and its outbuildings while the Department of Landscape Architecture retained oversight of the development and maintenance of the garden. The department relocated into a renovated Denmark Hall in 1956. Disastrous freezes occurred in November, 1950 and March, 1955 and did much apparent damage to the more tender specimens. The 1955 bout killed “all the boxwood edgings in the Boxwood Garden.....and [they] had to be replaced.” Plant evaluation was, however, one of the objectives of the garden program as the planting of “rare and unusual species...enabled [Owens] and the other...staff to conduct some important research” in determining species appropriate to the region.

The garden entered a period of establishment and stability. Despite occasional scares that the university would renege on its promise and utilize the property for its ever-expanding building program, the site continued to host garden club meetings, roving plant identification classes, historic preservationists, and garden lovers from around the world. In lieu of any other area arboretum or botanical garden, Founders Memorial “fulfilled an essential need for students...for learning about plants and planting design and...maintenance.”

Figure 22. Terrace overlook c. 1965?
Maintenance of the Founders Garden had long been a concern. President Caldwell’s 1939 letter authorizing the project on University land stated that the college would “supply...funds for adequate maintenance of the garden to include expenses for labor, fertilizer, sprays and other necessary service and material”. This commitment certainly was an attraction to Garden Club participation and funding. It was obvious that the installation would require more attention than that possible on the larger “run down, overgrown” main campus. As early as 1939, however, a paid, non-university gardener was hired by Owens. In 1954, Owens proposed a scholarship in landscape architecture; recipients would assume some of the garden maintenance responsibilities. Eventually, a full-time gardener was hired by the department and the university funded all materials, utilities and building maintenance.

Conditions surrounding the garden changed dramatically in the 1960s and 1970s when increased enrollment brought new and expanded university facilities east of the garden. Across increasingly congested Lumpkin Street, large staff and commuter parking lots were constructed. The result was a crush of pedestrian traffic unforeseen by the garden’s creators. Telling symptoms included the development of a major pedestrian corridor crossing Lumpkin Street at mid-block and through the garden, particularly around the north side of the house and up the driveway. Through the southwest quadrant and across the Perennial Garden, quaint slate walks became paralleled with dirt paths and the turf enclosing the oval pool disappeared due to compaction. The demand for campus parking kept the small garden lot full at all hours.
Several projects were undertaken to resolve some of these problems. Most notably, and perhaps the most significant alteration made to the garden, was the installation of cut-stone paving around the Perennial Garden pool. In addition to the sparse turf, problems with subsurface drainage and an ever-spreading magnolia canopy had resulted in the decline of the border plantings. Dan Franklin (BLA ‘63) designed an improvement plan for this area, which was completed in 1988. The University Grounds Department pruned the magnolias and eventually removed the unhappy result and replaced them with a slow-growing variety. In 1990 the inadequate and deteriorated slate walk in the South Arboretum was replaced by granite cobbles. Labor and materials were donated by the grounds department. In 1991, after the death of Hubert Owens and at the request of the garden director, an arbor was constructed at the western end of the Perennial Garden cross axis walkway. This structure was dedicated to Owens and was a gift of the Garden Club of Georgia, Inc.
In 1999, the American Society of Landscape Architects commemorated its 100th anniversary with the recognition of 362 significant designed landscapes. The Founders Memorial Garden received one of these Centennial Medallion Awards. This honor was bestowed, coincidentally, on the fiftieth anniversary of the garden’s completion, an event which itself celebrated the half-century since the garden club movement founding.

Figure 24. Belgian block path in South Arboretum

Figure 25. Arbor detail
APPENDIX I

AN OVERVIEW OF GARDEN BUILT ELEMENTS AND THEIR EXISTING CONDITIONS
Existing Conditions

The following section provides a compilation of garden features as they currently exist. Wherever possible, the origins of a given feature will be cited in an effort to guide decisions regarding the resource’s significance, contribution toward character, and subsequent treatment. Conditions of the site as a whole will be examined first, followed by the component landscapes in the order of their development. Please note that this study does not extend to the house and outbuildings. Their significance has been established elsewhere. 85

A detailed examination of plantings and their conditions has not been undertaken out of necessity. The sheer number of individual plantings, their defining characteristics of change through growth, decline and disappearance, and the limitation of time upon this study necessitate their examination en masse. In order that it receive a properly thorough study, this evaluation has not been undertaken at this time.
**Boundaries**

The study site retains the original boundaries from those indicated on the original 1938 plan. It is entirely enclosed by walls, fences and barrier plantings. To the south, a four foot brick wall sits atop a bamboo covered embankment falling toward Joseph E. Brown Hall, which presents an unbroken facade across that end of the property. This south extreme is the garden’s widest point at approximately 180 feet. The most defined edge is to the west, where the iron fence and retaining wall combination was constructed in 1945-46. This 540-foot length is further reinforced by another sharp grade drop and the paralleling Lumpkin Street. From the narrow northern “prow” of the property, a pierced brick wall runs parallel to Bocock Street (a.k.a. Infirmary Drive) and terminates after 230 feet at the driveway entrance to the garden. From this point southward to Joe Brown Hall, the boundary is defined by thick plantings of bamboo and magnolia. A campus walkway along this edge is generally considered to mark the limit of garden property.

The Founders Memorial Garden is not a separately platted property. Boundaries are defined by use and convention but the property is owned by the Board of Regents of the State of Georgia. Other than the 1938 consent memoranda between President Caldwell and the garden club allowing that group and the department of landscape architecture to construct the garden, there are no formal delineation of bounds.
### Courtyard Garden

Other than the house and outbuildings, the central courtyard is the oldest construction in the garden. Approximately 30x50 feet, the courtyard includes two levels: a narrow landing at the north end, accepting steps from the house and the gated entrance at the northeast corner. Limestone steps then descend to a main level which centers on the smokehouse and kitchen building. The paving pattern is comprised of brick-in-mortar panels set in a basket-weave pattern. Panel borders are made of cut limestone slabs. Brick for the pavement and enclosing walls was donated by the university. The limestone was a gift of the Tennessee Stone Company.

In the late 1980s the stone and brick steps into the main house were removed and reconstructed to code in order to provide a landing. The original wrought-iron handrail was removed along with one of four cast-iron, pedestal-mounted urn planters located at the top of the full width courtyard steps, and replaced with a lighter machined railing. A large oak toppled into the courtyard around 1992 damaging the pierced brick wall at the northeast corner and damaging another of the urns.
Original materials along with some modern brick was used to repair the wall. Limestone border pieces have been selectively replaced with a major repair of these elements occurring in the late 1980s. Two cast-iron benches occupy the courtyard, donations dating to 1948. Gates, originally Williamsburg green have been painted black. Nothing remains of the courtyard’s white azalea planting. Generally, however, Owens’ concept of an area of “vines and espalier on the walls” has been maintained.
Boxwood Garden

This unit retains the segmented geometry and representational dwarf box plantings of the original parterre plantings. The running bond brick walks and edgings, the low brick walls and steps, and the sundial pedestal are the only surviving, original features. The white picket fence was last replaced in the mid 1990s and the boxwoods have been renewed numerous times. The herbaceous parterre filler beds are, of course, replanted frequently. The condition of the boxwoods is problematic and will be discussed in a later section.

Figure 28. Boxwood garden

Figure 29. Boxwood detail
Terrace

Other than minor coping damage atop the Bradley Steps, the Terrace overlook, sparsely furnished and planted as it is, remains in good condition. After mounting two small “French” urns in 1990, one of the corner stones broke. The urns, a donation, are similar to those originally placed in the courtyard but are woefully small for the support of plantings. The pea gravel surfacing which distinguishes this unit is thin but easily replenished.

The Bradley Steps remain in good repair. Several limestone treads were replaced at the time of the above-mentioned courtyard repairs. No further damage was observed. Original handrails are sound and require only painting. Ficus pumila completely covers the south wall making visual inspection impossible.
Perennial Garden

This unit has experienced the most extensive modifications since the garden was completed. In order to maintain a showcase display, measures addressing wear and tear, shading, overgrowth and structural failure have been undertaken.

As mentioned earlier, the 1988 renovations brought new pavings, a drainage system and plantings to the area. These measures have indeed solved the problems. The replanted magnolias have attained a scale reminiscent of the early 1950s yet now admit enough sunlight to support turf and flowering perennials. Repairs made to the serpentine wall have addressed heaving damage caused by of the original magnolias. Soldier course brick edging between the turf and perennial bed has been reset and is in good order. Turf, which previously suffered from a lack of drainage, light and aeration, now appears to be in good health.

The most obvious change is the limestone paving that surrounds the oval pool at the south end of the lawn. Although this paving has solved the problem of increased pedestrian traffic, it presents a strikingly different appearance from early images of the pool floating in the turf panel and prohibits plantings at or near the edge, as seen in historic photographs.
**Camellia Walk and South Arboretum**

As a transition area, this unit blends some of the formality of the previous areas within an area of woodland character. It is dominated by several mature hard-woods and is enclosed by sizable evergreens along the southern end of its Lumpkin Street edge. The camellia plantings re-established in the place of those donated in 1949 by Mr. and Mrs. Jeff Smith are notable. This area is perhaps the most secluded zone in the garden due to these heavy evergreen plantings. An arbor with iron bench, designed and built in 1991, sits at the west end of the cross-axial walk-way. Near the arbor, in the extreme southwest corner of the garden, is a recently constructed “rock outcrop” of small smooth stones formed into a mound. As described earlier, a granite cobble walk replaces the original loose-laid slate path and connects this area with the house. Turf on either side of this walk appears thin from shading. The South Arboretum contains the first informal woodland path, which parallels Lumpkin Street and winds through understory plantings of camellia, lonicera, viburnum and philadelphus.
Wall, Fence and Steps

The fence along Lumpkin Street is in good repair and the university provides periodic maintenance and painting. In 1997, a large red oak fell out of the garden and Lumpkin Street destroying several panels, which were replaced by the physical plant from spare components. The retaining wall and steps in front (west) of the Lumpkin House have fared poorly. The wall has separated at the recessed returns supporting the steps, though there appears to be no immediate structural danger. The brick treads of these heavily-used steps have worn considerably and were recently repointed. In the early 1990s, another tree failure destroyed much of the retaining wall immediately north of these steps; repairs are evident. The pierced brick wall constructed in the late 1940s, ascending Bocock Street, is in very good condition and shows no signs of breakage or instability.
The Living Memorial (North Arboretum)

This largest of the component landscapes, envisioned as more of a botanical arboretum than a show garden,\(^9^7\) contains an impressive collection of woody ornamentals. Its numerous pathways of Cherokee and crab orchard stone conduct the visitor and student in such a way that close inspection of many specimens is possible.

The freestanding and retaining walls of stacked slate are in remarkably good condition. No failure is evident. Low, informal walls recently added in the extreme northern portions of the Arboretum are of a stone previously unused in the garden. These walls allow for the addition of new woodland paths on this sloping terrain and allow (non-A.D.A.) accessibility to this area.
This work is not of the same quality or appearance as the nearby, original garden walls. The lining of these paths with stones is another feature inconsistent with original path construction. Several original woodland paths have been reset and reinforced and provide comfortable walking. The primary walkways in the North Arboretum are distinguished by individual large pieces of squared crab orchard stone. Modern repairs to these walks are obvious as smaller, random pieces of this stone have been used.

The main feature in the Living Memorial is the quiet pool at the north end of the lower terrace wall. Most obvious is the vandaled cherub-and-goose figure that is the water source. Plantings in the pool, evident in black plastic nursery containers, and the spotty plantings of euonymus and Liriope, combined with the damaged statuette, make for a less than desirable scene. Additionally, the pool does not appear to recirculate and is continuously fed fresh water. Site furnishings in this area include: the two masonry benches described earlier, a teak bench installed in 1990 near the fountain, and an authentic stone Japanese lantern.
According to Bob Hill, former director of the Founders Memorial Garden, the greatest visual change to this section has been the decline of plantings to the west of the entry drive (between the drive and the slate walk and steps to Denmark Hall). At one time this area was heavily massed with azalea and a short lived Acer circinatum (Oregon Vine Maple). This area is now very open.
**Driveway, Forecourt and Service Yard**

All part of the same development which installed brick and concrete curbings, bituminous paving sidewalks and the striking Lumpkin House forecourt, this unit provides service access to the houses and parking for six or seven automobiles. It also functions as a major campus pedestrian connection between North Campus and the variously designated parking lots along Hull Street.

The condition of these pavements varies. The main driveway and parking area are sound, though blemished by underground utility cuts and repairs. The sidewalk connecting this parking with the Courtyard and Boxwood Garden is heavily damaged due to a falling tree. Repairs to this walk were temporary and it was understood that a more permanent replacement would be made. The terminus of the crab orchard stone path adjacent to the parking lot and leading into the Arboretum is badly damaged. Its proximity to the tight parking area enables cars to back over and occasionally park on this walk.
Asphalt pavement on the northwest and southwest corners of the Lumpkin House was most likely placed by hand, versus the machine application of the main drive.\textsuperscript{99} This surface is slightly more uneven and is coarser, with the aggregate stone more apparent. Considerable cracking of this surface due to roots of nearby trees is evident and the southwest corner is further marred by utility cuts. The granite cobbles of the main entry forecourt show considerable unevenness, due to the roots of nearby trees.

A lattice screen was extended around the southwest corner of the Lumpkin House in 1999 to screen the unsightly supplies and debris common in garden maintenance. The corner of this structure protrudes beyond the inside border of the drive and still does not suffice, as these materials continue to accumulate outside this enclosure.
Herb Terrace

Structurally, this feature off the south side of the Kitchen Building is in excellent condition. Tight-fitting cut-stone paving on the landing and main level remain level and unbroken. Herb plantings are evident, with space for summer planting, despite shade problems. A beautiful cast iron bench, a war memorial, provides the central feature. Containerized plant storage in this area detracts from its appearance and is yet another symptom of the lack of maintenance support provisions for this garden.
Lighting

A carriage light, the original garden light, continues to burn at the north gate of the Boxwood Garden. For several years, and in a safer time, the garden was lighted only by a porch light, this carriage light, and any spillover illumination from adjacent campus and city streetlights. A number of exterior lighting treatments exist in the garden today and yet deficiencies have been reported as recently as 1998. Only one freestanding fixture is known to have been erected as an original garden fixture. With increases in student population, after-hours operation, campus crime, and the pedestrian traffic which laces through the garden at all hours, adequate lighting has been a frequent concern.

Campus safety lighting was given high priority after the 1984 killing of a female student on North Campus. Since then, an annual audit of campus exterior lighting deficiencies has been carried out by representatives from the Crime Prevention Bureau, Student Activities, and Physical Plant. Funding and implementation is applied based on the prioritization of this list by the Public Safety Division. The first such project undertaken in the Founders Memorial Garden was in 1991 in an effort to indirectly illuminate paths by uplighting certain structures: the west face of the Lumpkin House and west and east face of the Kitchen Building.
These fixtures are standard off-the-shelf exterior uplights and still work although vegetation now obscures the Kitchen Building west wall. In 1993 certain areas within the Founders Memorial Garden were further identified as safety hazards and were given high priority for funding. In an attempt to avoid additional freestanding fixtures, tree lighting was installed in the Smith Camellia Garden, in the South Arboretum and above the parking area. The fixtures used are architectural flood-lights (AFL Series) manufactured by the Kim Lighting Corporation. These luminaries were tree mounted for vertical flooding. Conduit supplying power to the fixtures is readily apparent.

In 1998, upon adoption of the University of Georgia Physical Plant Master Plan, a prototype of the new standard area illumination pole and fixture was offered to the Founders Garden in response to deficiencies noted in a November, 1998 survey. The installation was also to be evaluated by various campus offices prior to final adoption. This lighting (Dynamic Lighting, Pittsburgh Series) — a 22 inch white acrylic globe on an 11 and half-foot fluted column — was installed at the base of the drive.

A request for additional lighting was submitted to Physical Plant in 1999 for implementation. This audit sited the need for further illumination of the paths through the Smith Garden, the South Arboretum, and the northwest corner of the Lumpkin House and is currently under study.
**Land Use**

As has been described in earlier sections, the boundaries of the Founders Memorial Garden have not been compromised since its creation. The most significant alterations to the study site previous to garden construction were the realignment of the “Strahan” drive to form Infirmary Drive (Bocock Street) and the construction of Joseph Brown Hall over what was the property’s southern extension. These developments effectively define the site as it exists today.

The surrounding land use, particularly on the east (campus) side has changed dramatically. Unlike other portions of North Campus, this southeast corner of that precinct has seen an explosion in academic building expansion and infill. The Strahan residence was razed for law school expansion in 1967, an addition was made to Park Hall near the garden’s southwest corner, and the University Health Center built a modern addition in the 1970s at the northeast corner of the site. Brooks Hall, originally constructed in 1924, has been enlarged twice and now looms over the garden’s east border. Caldwell Hall rose seven stories in 1982, infilling a former parking lot, and the law library annex was constructed over the last remnant of Herty Field in the same year.
To the west of the site, land-use patterns differ but nevertheless dramatically impact the site. Lumpkin Street, restriped to a sub-standard four-lane configuration with nine-foot-wide lanes, carries traffic counts averaging 19,000 trips per day. Though posted with a 30 m.p.h. speed limit, velocities average significantly higher, compounded by the straight alignment and gradient in this stretch alongside the Founders Garden.

Three national fraternity houses, the graduate dormitory, Morris Hall, on university property, and the private Baptist Student Union lay opposite the site along Lumpkin Street. Beyond these facilities lie the large, mixed designation university parking lots along Hull Street. These lots provide the following capacities: Graduate ("G" zone), 617; Employee ("E" zone), 150; Perimeter ("P" zone), 119.\textsuperscript{103} This parking serves the high-density campus precinct described above.

In 1945, extension of the iron fence created penetrations in only four locations from Broad Street to Baldwin Street - a distance of 1500 feet. By far the most heavily-used is the main entry to the garden which aligns with the “front” of the Lumpkin House. The mid-block crossing of Lumpkin Street in this location (now protected with embedded pavement flashers) funnels students, faculty and staff through the Founders Memorial Garden. The last available count of activity at this location showed that in 1984, the peak hourly pedestrian volume was 392 and a similar vehicle volume of 493.\textsuperscript{104}

Service traffic and parking demands on the main campus, east of Lumpkin Street, have correspondingly increased and have resulted in a constant pressure on the limited (six spaces) parking within the garden. In 1999, a parking gate was installed at the intersection of the Brooks Hall/Denmark Hall service drive and Bocock Street. This was done at the urging of administrators in the Terry College of Business in order to better regulate parking near Brooks Hall.\textsuperscript{105}

For years, a severe parking shortage existed at the Gilbert Health Center. Serving upward of thirty-thousand students just prior to relocating, the facility offered only eleven spaces to clients. These short-term, “customer spaces” were
notoriously difficult to enforce and resulted in the construction of a turnaround to
keep traffic flowing and the placement of a full-time attendant to monitor park-
ing.\textsuperscript{106} Ironically, the relocation of the Health Center has caused a new circulation
dynamic on this portion of Bocock Street. Given the dearth of such opportunities on
this portion of campus and the convenience of the turnaround, Bocock Street contin-
ues to be heavily congested, particularly just after class change. This “cul-de-sac” now
serves as an informal student pick-up location and has caused frequent mayhem
along this northeast perimeter of the Garden.

The Facilities Master Plan has specified improvements to campus that will
bear directly upon the garden and its nearby environment if implemented. This docu-
ment, mandated by the Board of Regents in 1997, requires all system institutions
make a plan in order that they may approach that Board for funding approval of cap-
ital projects. The distinguishing characteristics of the Athens campus plan are: to
check the continued southward sprawl of campus growth and use an infill building
strategy; arrange existing and infill structures to improve spatial definition; con-
struct perimeter parking decks; remove interior surface parking and convert green
space; build a student housing building program.

The plan specifically recognizes the Founders Memorial Garden as a valuable
resource and recommends that it be protected.\textsuperscript{107} Plans for the surrounding
“Northwest Precinct”, however, are considerable. Lumpkin Street, the plan proposes,
is to be realigned from its intersection with Baxter Street to the Broad Street/Pulaski
Street intersection, making an in-line connection with the latter. In other words, the
reconfigured street would intersect Broad Street approximately 900 feet west of the
current location. The purpose of this costly proposal is to allow for an unbroken
expansion of North Campus westward and into a “Northwest Precinct” which would
allow these new campus facilities to exist within, rather than be separated by, a busy
Lumpkin Street. It is the contention of university planners that the widened interface
of campus and town, in addition to the close-in location that this plan affords college
housing, would be a boon to downtown development.108

The effect of these proposals upon the Founders Garden depend upon the disposition of the existing Lumpkin Street. The possibilities mentioned range from the creation of ill-defined “green space”, presumably eliminating the street, to the simple closure of the street, allowing for the operation of a trolley-like shuttle connecting town and central campus. Almost certainly, and whether or not the Lumpkin Street realignment occurs, significant development is to occur in the “Northwest Precinct” to include a major parking deck, a library for the University’s special collections, and student housing. This continued urbanization is certain to increase pressures on the garden.
APPENDIX II.

1938 Letter to Mrs. Bradshaw Approving

Garden Development at UGA
June 2, 1956

Mrs. E. F. Bradshaw  
Prince Avenue  
Athens, Georgia

Dear Mrs. Bradshaw:

It has come to my attention that there is a possibility that the Garden Club of Georgia is considering the advisability of sponsoring the development of a Founders' Memorial Garden on the campus of the University in Athens.

As President of the University, I am writing this letter to say that the University would welcome the location of this Garden on its campus. The University is willing to cooperate with you to the extent of providing a satisfactory location for the Garden and supplying funds for adequate maintenance of the Garden. This latter item will include expenses for labor, fertilizer, sprays and other necessary service and material.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

RMC/H  

[Name]
APPENDIX III.

1939 Estimate of Garden Construction Costs
May 10, 1939.

Mrs. W. F. Bradshaw,
Prince Avenue,
Athena, Georgia.

Dear Mrs. Bradshaw:

Enclosed you will find a list of estimates of costs for the various units of the Founders' Memorial. As far as I am able to tell every necessary item is listed, and I must call to your attention that a minimum estimate has been given in each instance. On the last sheet is a summary which shows the total amount of money needed. After you have had time to look this over I would like to discuss it with you.

Enclosure No. 2 is a list of all Clubs to date responding as favorable to my letter of December 1, 1938. The slips are still straggling in. I thought you might like to have this information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Signature]

Ho/sh
**Founders Memorial Garden**

**Courtyard Garden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading and planting</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced concrete slab and drain</td>
<td>$285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying brick and stone paving</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 M new brick</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open work brick wall</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight on stone</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps with iron railing</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large gate</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small gate</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small gate</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pottery oil jars @ $15.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knot Garden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading, preparing soil, planting</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage tile</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick retaining wall</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick for walks</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor for laying walks</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket fence and gates</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Driftading roses</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial bench of wrought iron</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armillary sundial and pedestal</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing and spigot outlet</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gravel Terrace (between Knot Garden and Perennial Garden)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading and planting</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps with iron railing leading to perennial garden</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75' Iron fence</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dogwood Trees @ $5.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perennial Garden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading and preparation of soil</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 4' old brick for walls</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270' brick wall and 35 brick vine piers</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 picket fence and 3 gates</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation system, pipes, etc.</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor for preparation of soil and planting creeping bent grass in 25' x 100' grass panel</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 sq. ft. Random Rectangular stone for walks</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor for laying stone walks</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily pool - materials and installation</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting - 4 boxwood specimen for corners of pool @ $15.00, 2 boxwood specimens at steps @ $25.00</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 trees in variety for corners of pool and steps @ $25.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Flowering trees @ $6.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering shrubs around garden</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen trees and shrubs around garden</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous perennials</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cold Frame and Seed Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold frame</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel paths around seed beds</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading and preparation of soils</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lawn Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor for grading and seeding</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of soil for planting shrubs and trees</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Native shrubs</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbs for naturalizing</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous woods plants for naturalizing</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Yard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lumpkin Street Approach

Labor and materials for place up bank from Lumpkin street to driveway  $125.00
Driveway ofamped
Reconstruction of house steps, including brick and iron railing  150.00
Planting - ground cover plants in variety  35.00
Planting - undergarden shrubs and small trees  35.00
Herbaceous weeds plants and bulbs for naturalizing
  sidewalk paths  45.00

Foreclosures

Paving cobble court concrete foundation  $150.00
Paving cobble court laying cobble stone  100.00
Cherry laurel hedge around court and planting  100.00
Driveway concrete

Garden Club of Lumpkin Building (small)

Concrete foundation for floor  $ 45.00
Tile floor  95.00
Beet roof  100.00
Bay window  25.00
Plastering inside walls  25.00
Panellled door  25.00
Cabinets and shelves  25.00
Lighting fixtures and accessories  25.00
Ceiling  25.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repairs on window and door frames</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 panelled doors @ $30.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing plumbing fixtures</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing plumbing fixtures</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting plaster and painting interior</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping architecture treatment &amp; building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing bathroom next to courtyard garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ิด in a common room</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight on donated materials</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden benches and tables</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV.

Designated Memorials - Founders Memorial Garden
On the wall above landing, NW Corner of Perennial Garden:

THESE STEPS WERE ERECTED
BY THE
CHARTER GARDEN CLUB
COLUMBUS, GEORGIA
IN MEMORY OF
MRS. W.F. BRADSHAW

On the Perennial Garden Statue Pedestal:

A TRIBUTE FROM
NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF
STATE GARDEN CLUBS
ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY
APRIL, 1954
PRESENTED TO
THE FOUNDERS
MEMORIAL GARDEN
ATHENS, GEORGIA
“...FOR EVERY GOOD THING
HAS A BEGINNING AND
THE BEGINNING WAS HERE.”
On Foundation Wall by Cherub:

DEDI CATED IN LASTING
MEMORY TO ALL WHO SERVED
IN WORLD WAR II
“TO THOSE WHO GAVE MUCH
AND TO THOSE WHO GAVE ALL”

General Bronze Corp.
Garden City, N.Y.

On the Teak Bench in Arboretum:

IN MEMORY OF
HUBERT BOND OWENS
GEORGIA LANDSCAPE DESIGN
CRITICS COUNCIL
1990

On Cast Iron Bench, Herb Terrace:

IN MEMORY OF
WILLIAM STOKES WALKER
FIRST LIEUTENANT, U.S.M.C.R.
KILLED IN ACTION ON
THE ISLAND OF SAIPAN
JULY 7, 1944
Over Smokehouse Door:

GARDEN CLUB
OF
GEORGIA

On Main House Steps into Courtyard:

COURTYARD ENTRANCE
IN MEMORY OF
MRS. PIERCE BLITCH

On the coping edge, oval pool, Perennial Garden:

IN MEMORY OF
JOHNNIE KYLE WOODRUFF
OF COLUMBUS, GEORGIA

Engraved Brass Plaque on West Gate, South End, Perennial Garden:

THIS GATE PRESENTED BY
MRS. J.J. NICHOLSON
IN MEMORY OF HER SON
FRANCIS WILLIAM NICHOLSON
On Ground-Mounted Plaque under Arbor:

ARBOR AND CAMELLIA WALK
IN MEMORY OF
HUBERT BOND OWENS
THE GARDEN CLUB OF GEORGIA, INC.
1991

On Lumpkin House, West Side by Entry:

THIS PROPERTY
HAS BEEN PLACED ON THE
NATIONAL REGISTER
OF HISTORIC PLACES
BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FIRST HOME OF THE
GARDEN CLUB OF GEORGIA, INC.
DEDICATED OCT. 6, 1964

On Porch Landing Wall, W. Side Lumpkin, On-Center with Cobblestone Court:

LADIES GARDEN CLUB
FIRST GARDEN CLUB OF AMERICA
FOUNDED 1891

CLAUSUM
OCTOBER 13, 1992 - 2091
On Stone Next to Smoke House, Bay, in ground:

BOXWOOD GARDEN  
GIFT OF  
PEACHTREE GARDEN CLUB  
ATLANTA  
1941

On Brass Plaque above Smoke House Bay Window:

THIS WINDOW PRESENTED BY  
SAND HILLS GARDEN CLUB  
AUGUSTA, GA  
1940

On Brass Plaque, top of steps, Terrace, by one of two metal urns:

FRENCH URNS  
IN MEMORY OF  
HUBERT BOND OWENS  
THE GARDEN CLUB COUNCIL OF  
ATHENS  
1990
On Lumpkin House, East Door @ Courtyard:

IN TRIBUTE OF  
JEANNIE TATE ANDERSON  
FOR INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS  
OF TIME, KNOWLEDGE AND  
LEADERSHIP  
AS RESTORATION CHAIRMAN  
OF STATE HEADQUARTERS HOUSE  
THE GARDEN CLUB OF GEORGIA, INC  
SEPTEMBER 19, 1984

On Cast Iron Fern Bench, West Side, Courtyard:

UNMARKED

On Cast Iron Fern Bench, South Side:

LADIES GARDEN CLUB  
ATHENS, GEORGIA  
1948
On Lumpkin House, West Side on Main Entry Steps:

IN MEMORY
OF
IDA TAYLOR HILTON
OF
SAVANNAH, GA.
FOUNDER OF THE GARDEN CLUB
OF NYACK - ON - HUDSON, NY
THESE STEPS WERE PRESENTED BY
HER DAUGHTER
IDA HILTON SEYMOUR
1942
APPENDIX V.

Supplemental Plans and Drawings
APPENDIX VI.

Who Designed the Founders Memorial Garden?
Who Designed the Founders Memorial Garden?

There were two distinct epochs of design activity in the Founders Memorial Garden: pre-war and post-war, formal and informal, and, frustratingly, undocumented and documented. Of course, the one constant factor throughout the ten years of development was Hubert Owens. Documents indicate that Owens employed both faculty and students in the preparation of plans.

A c.1938 concept plan is unsigned and does not appear to be in the hand of the department head. Frederich W.G. Peck (B.A. - Penn.), a faculty member from September, 1937 to December, 1939, is known to have prepared "two attractive water colors of the Memorial." 109 The presentation of the above-mentioned concept to the Garden Club of Georgia for approval and funding had been made in November, 1938, "by Messrs. Hubert B. Owens and Frederick Peck...with the added sanction of the University's President, Dr. Harmon Caldwell." 110 Mr. Peck left the university during the first phase of garden construction involving the courtyard and boxwood gardens, but Nell Hawkes (BFA '40) remembered Peck as "the creative individual on that faculty...who probably did the design." 111

No drawings known to have been prepared by Frederich Peck have been found, nor has a single construction drawing for any portion of the formal units of the garden. No construction photographs have been located, a curious void given the obvious educational value these images would have provided (not to mention the photographic penchant of landscape architects). For this portion of the garden it is therefore impossible to perform any kind of comparative analysis that might determine the degree of design involvement of specific individuals. It has been widely reported that Owens assigned various faculty members specific design problems within the garden. An initiative to replace the front steps of the Lumpkin House involved John A.C. Shulte (BFA - Illinois) who was on staff for one year beginning in September, 1941. Owens reported that "Prof. Shulte, my assistant in the Landscape Architecture Department, and I both feel that it would be best to use plain iron uprights in this rail" (proposed for the steps). 112 Alumni recall that "Mrs. Weir joined the faculty and tried to do the (perennial) garden in all white." Hershel Webber's disapproval of terrace wall construction methods has also been noted. 113 Wolfgang Oehme was given charge of the perennial garden during his four months with the department (Sept. - Dec., 1965). His plan for the serpentine beds, utilizing ornamental grasses,
The contribution of Brooks Wigginton to the development of the garden began in 1945, well after the completion of the formal units. Many alumni remember Owens and Wigginton as the designers of the garden. This does appear to be the case in the design of the Arboretum. Wigginton's plans for the South Arboretum, North Arboretum, and the iron fence and steps extension along Lumpkin Street all survive. It is also known that he designed the Herb Terrace and received friendly criticism from the students regarding its drainage characteristics. 114

It is clear that many individuals were involved in the ten year development of the Founders Memorial Garden. It is equally clear that Hubert Owens provided the vision, gave it voice, marshaled the resources, and directed the construction and planting. Recalling those days, former students state that Owens always had the final word or simply that "Hubert ran things." 115 Robert Hill, former director of the garden stated that Owens never claimed to have designed the memorial. Perhaps, being the educator that he was, he provided a forum for students to participate in and observe what he considered an example of "the best in the landscape architect's art." 116
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(Type all entries - complete applicable sections)

1. NAME

Common: Garden Club of Georgia Museum - Headquarters House, Founder’s
Memorial Garden.

2. LOCATION

Street and Number: Lumpkin Street, University of Georgia campus.

City or Town: Athens

State: Georgia

3. CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY (Check One)</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACCESSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>Yes: Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unoccupied:</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Public Acquisitions</td>
<td>Preservation work in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present Use (Check One or More As Appropriate):
- Agricultural
- Government
- Park
- Transportation
- Other (Specify)
- Comments

4. OWNER OF PROPERTY

Owner’s Name: Regents of the University System of Georgia

Street and Number: 21/2 Washington Street, S.W.

City or Town: Atlanta

State: Georgia

5. LOCATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Courthouse, Registry of Deeds, etc.: Clarke County Courthouse, Deed Book B, pages 83 and 87

City or Town: Athens

State: Georgia

6. REPRESENTATION IN EXISTING SURVEYS

Title of Survey: Athens Historic Survey

Date of Survey: 1968

Federal: □  State: □  County: □  Local: X

Depositary for Survey Records: Special Collections Division, University of Georgia Library

City or Town: Athens

State: Georgia

- A small complex of gardens and buildings
Sitting high above Lumpkin Street on the campus of the University of Georgia is a house, complete with out-buildings, now known as the Garden Club of Georgia Museum - Headquarters House. Originally constructed in 1857 as a home for university professors, the house is now leased by the Garden Club of Georgia from the University endowment and dedicated as its State Headquarters in 1963. Subsequently, the Garden Club of Georgia restored the main house, furnished it with period furnishings, and now operates it as a house museum open to the public without charge. Initial construction in 1857 included the house, a kitchen building, and a smokehouse. As originally constructed, the house consisted of two stories with two rooms and a central hall on each floor. Soon after, a 20 by 40 foot room was added to the rear at the end of the hall. Later additions included two small one-story wings, one of clapboard and one of brick on the sides of the main structure. With exception of the one clapboard wing, all other construction is of red brick. The main house, kitchen building, and smokehouse enclose a space which has been developed as a courtyard as a part of the two and one-half acre Founder's Memorial Garden developed as a living memorial to the twelve founders of the first garden club in America. (The Ladies' Garden Club, founded in Athens in 1891, was America's first garden club.) The garden is actually a series of gardens including a formal boxwood garden, a gravel terrace garden, a sunken formal garden enclosed with a serpentine wall, and several informal gardens as a display of plant materials of Georgia's Piedmont Area. As a part of the garden development, there is a Belgian block court at the entrance of the main house.

Exteriors: (1) Main House - a low-pitched gable roof with a simple cornice crowning the major two-story portion of this red brick structure. An interior chimney punctuates the roof at the two gable ends of the house. The one-story addition at the rear has a chimney at the end. All windows are shuttered and are twelve-over-twelve. The simplicity of the front facade is relieved by a one-story gabled porch which is ornamented with cast-iron columns and a balustrade with twin staircases which sweep out from both sides of the porch. The triparted doorway opening features the typical Greek Revival treatment with sidelights and those above the door. (2) Out-buildings. The kitchen and smokehouse buildings are of red brick with low-pitched gable roofs. The kitchen building has two doorways leading into two interconnected rooms. Interior chimneys are located at the gable ends of the roof. Windows are six-over-six. The smokehouse has a door opening onto the courtyard and on the rear facade, a bay window of later addition.

Interiors: (1) Main House. The entrance hallway features a simple, yet beautiful, stairway to the upper floor. A sitting room and dining room are located on either side of the hall. The rear of the hall features a doorway, matching the main entrance and complete with sidelights and those above, which

(Cont.)
opens into the 20 by 40 foot ballroom. Two windows are located on the sides of the room with the fireplace as focal point at the far end. The small upstairs balcony-like hall provides access to two bedrooms, each with a fireplace. All floors are heart pine. (2) Kitchen building. This building is divided into two rooms, each with its own fireplace and simple mantle. Due to the large opening, the kitchen room is easily identified. The second room was used as a summer dining room. Brick floors and stark white plaster over brick walls symbolize the utilitarian nature of this structure. (3) Smokehouse. The smokehouse has been converted from its original use to that of a memorial to the founders of the first garden club. This small one room structure has brick floors and white plastered walls. A bay window with window seat below has been added for light and provides a view of the formal box garden.
When the University built this house in 1857 as a home for professors, it was expected that teachers would live on campus to monitor student activity and apply discipline as needed. Special inducements were offered professors to board students in this house, thereby assuring the maximum direction of the student's activities. With the development of the University, these policies changed, as did the use of this building. Through the years, the house was used for a dining hall, offices, and classrooms. Later, it was selected for a home by Miss Mary Lyndon, the first Dean of Women of the University when women were granted admittance to the University. After Miss Lyndon's death, the structure was used as the chapter house of Phi Mu Sorority, the first sorority established at the University, and, in turn, became the location of the Department of Landscape Architecture. In 1939, Dr. Hubert B. Ovens, then Head of the Dept. of Landscape Architecture, suggested the development of the Founder's Memorial Garden as a cooperative project between the Garden Club of Georgia and the University in honor of the founders of the first garden club. When the Dept. of Landscape Architecture moved from the house in 1956, the Student Placement Office occupied the structure. Needing a state headquarters, the Garden Club of Georgia obtained the use of the kitchen building and restored it for that use in 1959. Soon, the Garden Club was able to acquire use of the main house in 1961 and selected Mr. Edward Wade of Augusta as restoration architect. Dedicated in 1963, the house is now decorated and furnished with choice antiques which reflect the period of the structure. Founder's Memorial Garden, developed 1939-1946, together with the Garden Club of Georgia Museum-Headquarters House, is now recognized nationally and internationally, not only as a memorial to the birth of the garden club movement, but to the culture which made that birth possible.

The garden, the house, and outbuildings are all adjacent to Old North Campus and together constitute part of the historic fabric of the college campus. Each day hundreds of students pass through this complex and thus receive a glimpse of an orderly environment with continuity from the earliest days of the college. Thus in a symbolic sense the house and its grounds do "monitor student activity and apply discipline as needed."

William R. Mitchell, Jr.

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>33° 57' 19&quot;</td>
<td>83° 22' 35&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>33° 57' 19&quot;</td>
<td>83° 22' 31&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>33° 57' 13&quot;</td>
<td>83° 22' 31&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>33° 57' 13&quot;</td>
<td>83° 22' 35&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</table>

11. FORM PREPARED BY

John C. Waters, President
Athens-Clarke Heritage Foundation
P.O. Box 5671
Athens, Georgia

12. STATE-LIAISON OFFICER CERTIFICATION

As the designated State Liaison Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the National Park Service. The recommended level of significance of this nomination is:

National [ ] State [X] Local [ ]

Name: Mary Gregory

Title: State Liaison Officer

Date: June 23, 1971
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Garden Club of Georgia Museum-Headquarters House, Founder's Memorial Garden, University of Georgia Campus, Athens.
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**FOUNDERS MEMORIAL GARDEN**

Plant Inventory List  2/10/92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREES (58)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer buergeranum</td>
<td>Trident Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. campestre</td>
<td>Hedge Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. ginnala</td>
<td>Amur Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. griseum</td>
<td>Paperbark Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. palmatum</td>
<td>Japanses Maple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. platanoids</td>
<td>Norway Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Deborah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. truncatum</td>
<td>Purplebloe Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier arborea</td>
<td>Serviceberry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>Strawberry Tree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dwarf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carya illinoiensis</td>
<td>Pecan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedrus SPC</td>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtis occidentials</td>
<td>Hackberry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercis canadensis</td>
<td>Redbud</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldrastis lutea</td>
<td>Yellowwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. drummondii</td>
<td>Roughleaf Dogwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotinus obovatus</td>
<td>American Smoketree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus phaenopyrum</td>
<td>Washington Hawthorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptomeria japonica</td>
<td>Cryptomeria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evodia danielli</td>
<td>Evodia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo biloba</td>
<td>Ginkgo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamamelis mollis</td>
<td>Chinese Witchhazel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. virginiana</td>
<td>Common Witchhazel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koelreuteria paniculata</td>
<td>Goldenrain Tree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td>Crapemyrtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclura pomifera</td>
<td>Osage-orange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. macrophylla</td>
<td>Big Leaf Magnolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. x soulangiana</td>
<td>Saucer Magnolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. virginiana</td>
<td>Sweetbay Magnolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus spc.</td>
<td>Flowering Crabapple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metasequoia glyptostroboides</td>
<td>Dawn Redwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrya virginiana</td>
<td>American Hophornbeam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxydendrum arboretum</td>
<td>Sourwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrotia persica</td>
<td>Persian Parrotia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus taeda</td>
<td>Loblolly Pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populus deltoids</td>
<td>Eastern Cottonwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus campanulata</td>
<td>Taiwan Cherry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. caroliniana</td>
<td>Carolina Cherry laurel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. x yedoensis</td>
<td>Yoshino Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. falcate</td>
<td>Southern Red Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. glauca</td>
<td>Blue Japanese Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. imbricaria</td>
<td>Shingle Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. nigra</td>
<td>Water Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. palustris</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. phellos</td>
<td>Willow Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. prinus</td>
<td>Chestnut Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. shumardii</td>
<td>Shumard Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. stellata</td>
<td>Post Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinia pseudoacacia</td>
<td>Black Locust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Founders Memorial Garden

**Plant Inventory List 2/10/92**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophora japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Pagodatree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxodium distichum</td>
<td>Baldcypress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuga Canadensis</td>
<td>Canadian Hemlock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulmus alata</td>
<td>Winged Elm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. parvifolia</td>
<td>Chinese Elm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitex agnus-castus</td>
<td>Chastetree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**shrubs (126)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abelia x grandiflora</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. x grandiflora ‘Sherwoodi’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acanthopanax sieboldianus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculus parviflora</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucuba japonica</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxus microphylla</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. japonica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callicarpa americana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calycanthus floridus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia japonica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. sasanqua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaenomeles speciosa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaecyparis spc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimonanthus praecox</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinonanthus virginicus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clethra alnifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corylus avellana ‘Contorta’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations:* spc. = species, var. = variety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotoneaster horizontalis</td>
<td>Rockspray Cotoneaster</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. salicifolius</td>
<td>Willowleaf Cotoneaster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne odora</td>
<td>Winter Daphne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutzia gracius</td>
<td>Deutzia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaeagnus pungens</td>
<td>Thorny Elaeagnus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euonymus alatus</td>
<td>Winged Euonymus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. americanus</td>
<td>Strawberry Bush</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. europaeus</td>
<td>European Euonymus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatsia japonica</td>
<td>Fatsia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsythia x intermedia</td>
<td>Forsythia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fothergilla gardenia</td>
<td>Dwarf Fothergilla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardenia jasminoides</td>
<td>Cape Jasmine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus syriacus</td>
<td>Althea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypericum frondosum</td>
<td>Golden St. Johnwort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex x attenuatta ‘Foster’</td>
<td>Foster Holly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. x attenuatta ‘East Palatka’</td>
<td>East Palatka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. cassine</td>
<td>Dahoon Holly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. cornuta</td>
<td>Chinese Holly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. cornuta. ‘Burford’</td>
<td>Burford Holly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. cornuta ‘Carissa’</td>
<td>Carissa Holly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. crenata ‘Convexa’</td>
<td>Japanese Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. crenata ‘Helleri’</td>
<td>Heller Holly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. glabra</td>
<td>Inkberry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. glabra ‘Compacta’</td>
<td>Dwarf Inkberry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. latifolia</td>
<td>Lusterleaf Holly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. x meservaeae ‘Blue Prince’</td>
<td>Blue Prince Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex x meservea</td>
<td>‘Blue Princess’ Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. x B'Nellie R. Stevens</td>
<td>Nellie R Stevens Holly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. opaca ;Auburn'</td>
<td>Auburn Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. pernyi</td>
<td>Perny Holly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. verticillata</td>
<td>Winterberry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. vomitoria</td>
<td>Yaupon Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. vomitoria ‘Nana’</td>
<td>Dwarf Yaupon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. spec.</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bot. Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicium parviflorum</td>
<td>Anise-tree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itea virginica</td>
<td>Itea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. virginica</td>
<td>‘Henry Garnet’ Itea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasminum nudiflorum</td>
<td>Winter Jasmine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkwitzia amabilis</td>
<td>Beaty bush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucothoe Lontanesiana</td>
<td>Drooping leucothoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. populitola</td>
<td>Florida Leucothoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquistrum japonicum</td>
<td>Japanese Privet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. japonicum Rotundilolium</td>
<td>Curly leaf Liquistrum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. lucidum</td>
<td>Waxleaf Privet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. vulgare</td>
<td>Common Privet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonicera Fragranissima</td>
<td>Winter Honeysuckle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. maackii</td>
<td>Amur Honeysuckle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. pileaia</td>
<td>Privet Honeysuckle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. serolina ‘Florida’</td>
<td>Florida Honeysuckle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loropelalum Chinese</td>
<td>Loropelalum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahonia au'quifolium</td>
<td>Oregon Hollygrape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. mbealei</td>
<td>Leatherleaf Mahonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. fortunei</td>
<td>Chinese Mahonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrica cerifera</td>
<td>Southern Waymyrtle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. cerifera ‘Compacta’</td>
<td>Dwarf Waxmyrtle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandina domestica</td>
<td>Nandina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. domestica ‘Harbour Dwarf’</td>
<td>Harbour Dwarf Nandina</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmanthus heterophyllus</td>
<td>Holly Osmanthus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. americanus</td>
<td>Devilwood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. fortunei</td>
<td>Fortune’s Osmanthus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. fragrans</td>
<td>Fragrant Tea Olive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persea borbonia</td>
<td>Redbay Laurel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphus coronaries</td>
<td>Sweet Mockorange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillyrea anqustifolia</td>
<td>Phillyrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photinia serrulata</td>
<td>Chinese Photina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieris japonica</td>
<td>Japanese Pieris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinus mugo</td>
<td>Mugo Pine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podocarpus macrophyllus</td>
<td>var. maki Chinese Podocarpus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus laurocerasus</td>
<td>‘Schipkawnsis’ Laurel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. laurocerasus</td>
<td>‘Otto Luyken’ Laurel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphiolepis indica</td>
<td>Indian Hawthorn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. umbellate</td>
<td>Yeddo/Indian Hawthorn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhododendron catabiense</td>
<td>Catawba Rhododendron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. calendulaceum</td>
<td>Nataive Azalea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. eriocarpum</td>
<td>Gumpo Azalea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. indicum</td>
<td>Indian Azalea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. obtusum</td>
<td>Kurme Azalea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodotypos scandens</td>
<td>Black Jetbead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribes odoratum</td>
<td>Clove Current</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa banksiae</td>
<td>Lady Banks Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa laevigata</td>
<td>Cherokee Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. multiflora</td>
<td>Multiflora Rose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. spc.</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruscus aculeatus</td>
<td>Butcher’s Broom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcococca humilis</td>
<td>Sarcococca Dwarf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiraea x bumalda</td>
<td>‘Anthony Waterer’ Spirea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. nipponica</td>
<td>‘Snowmound’ Nippon Spirea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. x vanhouttei</td>
<td>Vanhoutte Spirea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa laciniata</td>
<td>Cutleaf Lilac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. vulgaris</td>
<td>Common Lilac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxus cuspidate</td>
<td>Japanese Yew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternstroemia gumnanthera</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachycarpus fortunei</td>
<td>Windmill Palm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum acerfolium</td>
<td>Mapleleaf Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. ‘Alaska’</td>
<td>Alaska Viburnum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. x burkwoodii</td>
<td>Burkwood Viburnum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. dilatatum ‘Erie’</td>
<td>Erie Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. x juddi</td>
<td>Judd Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. opulus ‘Sterile’</td>
<td>European Snowball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. plicatum var. tomentosum</td>
<td>Doublefire Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. x pargense</td>
<td>Pragense Viburnum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. setigerum</td>
<td>Tea Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. utile ‘Chesapeake’</td>
<td>Chesapeake Viburnum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. utile ‘Eskimo’</td>
<td>Eskimo Viburnum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca gloriosa</td>
<td>Mound-Lily Yucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINES (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akebia auinata</td>
<td>Fiveleaf Akebia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ampelopis brevipedunculata</strong></td>
<td>Porcelain Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var. maximowiczii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artstolochia durio</strong></td>
<td>Dutchman’s Pipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clematis paniculata</strong></td>
<td>Sweet Autumn Clematis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ficus pumila</strong></td>
<td>Creeping Fig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gelsemium sempervirens</strong></td>
<td>Carolina Jessamine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lonicera sempervirens</strong></td>
<td>Trumpet Honeysuckle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parthenocissus henryana</strong></td>
<td>Silvervein Creeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. tricuspidata</strong></td>
<td>Boston Ivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P. quinquefolia</strong></td>
<td>Virginia Creeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polygonum aubertii</strong></td>
<td>Silver Lace Vine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smilax lanceolata</strong></td>
<td>Lanceleaf Greenbriar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trachelospermum jasminodes</strong></td>
<td>Confederate Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitis spc.</strong></td>
<td>Grape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisteria sinensis</strong></td>
<td>Chinese Wisteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUNDCOVERS-PERENNIALS-HERBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acanthus mollis</strong></td>
<td>Bear’s Breech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aegopodium podograria</strong></td>
<td>Bishop’s Weed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ajuga reptans</strong></td>
<td>Ajuga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anemone x hybrida</strong></td>
<td>Japanese Anemone</td>
<td>3 clumps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspidistra elatior</strong></td>
<td>Aspigastra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baptista australis</strong></td>
<td>False Indigo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crocosmia masononum</strong></td>
<td>Montpretlas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euonymus fortunei ‘Ragicans’</strong></td>
<td>Wintercreeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedera canariensis</strong></td>
<td>Algerian Ivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. helix</strong></td>
<td>English Ivy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heileporus niger</strong></td>
<td>Christmas Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. orientails</strong></td>
<td>Lenten Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemerocallis hybrids</td>
<td>Daylily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuchera sanquinea</td>
<td>‘Purple Palace Heuchera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosta spc.</td>
<td>Hosta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberis sempervirens</td>
<td>Evergreen Candytuft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris spc.</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamium galeobaolon</td>
<td>Lamium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriope muscari</td>
<td>Liriope/Lily Turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. muscari ‘Variegautus’</td>
<td>Varigated liriope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. spica</td>
<td>Creeping Lily Turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa officinalis</td>
<td>Lemon Balm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentha spc.</td>
<td>Mint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscanthus sinensis</td>
<td>Decorative Grass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiopogon japonicus</td>
<td>Mondo Grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origanum vulgare</td>
<td>Oregano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmunda cinnamomea</td>
<td>Cinnamon Fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. regalis</td>
<td>Royal Fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paeonia spc.</td>
<td>Peony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlox paniculata</td>
<td>Garden Phlox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycladon acrostichoides</td>
<td>Christmas Fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. officinalis ‘Santa Barbara’</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudbeckia tulgida</td>
<td>Black-eyed Susan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia x superba ‘Big Blue’</td>
<td>Salvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santolina virens</td>
<td>Green Santolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedum spc.</td>
<td>Sedum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stachys byzantina</td>
<td>Lamb’s Ear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphoricarpus officinalis</td>
<td>Comfrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymus spc.</td>
<td>Thyme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradescantia virginiana</td>
<td>Spiderwort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinca major</td>
<td>Bigleaf Periwinkle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V minor.</td>
<td>Common Periwinkle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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