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Abstract
Gardens and arboreta most often begin as private places. Sound preservation and conservation principles are necessary to transform these gardens into protected and well-managed public gardens.

The goal of the Wakefield Charitable Trust is to open the Wakefield Estate as a public garden to further the mission of education and community engagement. Opening a public garden requires a landscape management strategy. The challenge of this process is to maintain the Estate’s character defining elements while allowing public access. The purpose of this thesis is to develop a preservation approach for the Wakefield Estate that will protect the historic character of the landscape and allow the property to adapt to the new use as a public entity. In order to achieve this goal a wide range of resources on cultural landscape preservation methodology were consulted. Research of the 300-year evolution of the Wakefield Estate was undertaken and an existing conditions survey was conducted. Site visits and interviews at public historic gardens and arboreta throughout the United States provided insight into successful preservation practice at other public institutions.

The results of this research is the creation of the Wakefield Estate landscape management plan. When implemented this plan will protect the historic resources of the property while allowing public access.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A public garden is a mission-based institution that maintains a collection of plants for the purpose of conservation, research, public enjoyment, and education. The making of a public garden implies a social need or purpose in sharing the garden with others. In the United States, public gardens have typically been formed when individuals bequeath large private estates to a public or private entity for public use and appreciation. These gardens often offer a variety of historic resources. Opening these properties to the public is a major undertaking that begins with a thorough understanding of the site and a management approach that ensures the preservation of historic character-defining elements while allowing public access to the landscape.

The Wakefield Estate in Milton, Massachusetts, is a unique cultural landscape that has been in the same family for more than three centuries. John Davenport of Dorchester, Massachusetts, purchased the Estate in 1706 and used it for farming. In 1794, wealthy Boston merchant Isaac Davenport, a descendant of the original owner, converted the Estate to a country seat when he built the Mansion house. The Estate remained in continuous ownership and occupation by descendants of John Davenport until 2004, when Mary ("Polly") M. B. Wakefield died. In 2004, the Mary M. B. Wakefield Charitable Trust took possession of the Estate.

Currently, the Wakefield Estate is in the process of deciding how best to fulfill the mission of education and community engagement using the natural and historic resources of the property. Educational programming ranges from science education for grade school students to graduate-level archival and horticultural research. Polly
Wakefield was the last descendant of the Davenport family to own the Estate. She was an avid plant collector and worked closely with the Arnold Arboretum at Harvard to develop a unique plant collection. She was also an accomplished amateur garden designer, having attended the Lowthorpe School of Landscape Architecture for Women. She created many of the designed gardens at the Estate while preserving historic features that represent earlier occupancy by her ancestors, including the Front Garden, the Orchard, original roads, and meadows.

Because of the Estate’s designed gardens, nurseries, natural areas, and collection of woody plants, the trustees and stakeholders plan to open the Estate to the public as an arboretum. Opening the Wakefield Estate to the public requires the prior development of a landscape management approach that will protect the historic resources while allowing for their new use. With a management plan in place, the Wakefield Charitable Trust can continue its mission and share a wonderful landscape with the public.

**Defining a Cultural Landscape**

Over the past century, the development of the concept of “cultural landscapes” has redefined the way preservationists pursue landscape preservation planning. Previously solely aesthetic perceptions of a “pleasing view of scenery,” landscapes have now begun to denote the interaction of people and place.¹ Prior to the recent development of the concept, the term “cultural landscape” was most often used in the fields of human

The most popular definition of the term is arguably the one proposed by geographer Carl Sauer, in his essay *The Morphology of Landscape*: The cultural landscape is fashioned from the natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, and the cultural landscape the result.

During the second half of the twentieth century, essayist, cultural geographer, and interpreter of the American-built environment John Brinckerhoff Jackson launched *Landscape* magazine to inspire Americans to write about the kind of local human geography he had discovered in France during World War II. *Landscape* was written for the general reader and featured articles without footnotes. The subject matter ranged from explorations of ordinary houses, yards, farms, and farmsteads to notes on ecology, and from the impact of automobiles, mobile homes, shopping centers, and rural and urban planning to philosophical arguments about the meaning of human space and arguments for and against (but usually against) preservation. Jackson edited and published *Landscape* through 1968. But Jackson’s reflections on cultural landscapes had an unexpected impact on the understanding of these places. According to Paul Groth:

> Jackson’s editorial and promotional skills sparked important interdisciplinary discussions about everyday American-built environments and popularized the term “cultural landscape” as a focus of study and reflection. His emphasis on “reading” or “decoding” the landscape resulted in overemphasizing the role of vision and threatened to bring landscapes back to an “image” rather than a result of an interaction between people and place.

---


Attempts to define the cultural landscape in a context appropriate for preservation planning were advanced in the late 1970s by a handful of planners and landscape architects familiar with the needs of preservation programs, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which outlined in its programmatic goals for 1973 the importance of “directing national attention both to the need for preserving this historic and cultural rural landscape and how that can be accomplished.” It provided the following definition:

The historic and cultural rural landscape is that part of rural America that exemplifies its regional historic and cultural pattern and values. Villages, market towns, county seats, farms and countryside are equal parts of it. It includes what people do as well as where they live, what they work at, how they travel and how they live.6

The National Park Service, one of the most active participants in the cultural landscape preservation movement, defines such landscapes as: “A geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals herein, associated with the historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic value.”7

According to the National Park Service’s Guide to Cultural Landscapes (Preservation Brief 36), cultural landscapes include:

- Residential gardens and community parks, scenic highways, rural communities, institutional grounds, cemeteries, battlefields and zoological gardens. They are composed of a number of character-defining features, which, individually or collectively contribute to the landscape’s physical appearance as they have evolved over time. In addition to vegetation and topography, cultural landscapes may include water features, such as ponds, streams, and fountains; circulation

---

5 Tishler, The Landscape, 10.
features, such as roads, paths, steps, and walls; buildings; and furnishings, including fences, benches, lights and sculptural objects.

The National Park Service guide further categorizes cultural landscapes into *historic designed landscapes*, *historic vernacular landscapes*, *historic sites*, and *ethnographic landscapes*:

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.

Historic Vernacular Landscape—a landscape that evolved through uses by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm or a collection of properties such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include rural villages, industrial complexes, and agricultural landscapes.

Historic Site—a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and president’s house properties.

Ethnographic Landscape—a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, religious sacred sites and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components.\(^8\)

---

The Evolution of Cultural Landscape Preservation Practice

Cultural landscape studies are instrumental in helping preservation broaden its focus to broader more complex pieces of territories than buildings … it has even come to mean places that are not green or planted including industrial landscapes. To develop a cultural landscape preservation plan for a historic property, it is important to gain an understanding of the evolution of preservation planning in the United States. The preservation planning approach can have a significant impact on the future of a historic place; therefore, understanding the changes in landscape preservation planning over time can provide a strong foundation for the chosen preservation approach.

Interest in historic garden preservation began in the United States in 1856 when the State of Virginia granted a charter to the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, establishing the first preservation legislation in the United States. The charter enabled the association to purchase, preserve, and maintain the estate of Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington. The establishment of the Ladies’ Association and the efforts at Mount Vernon set the stage for the preservation of historic gardens, for they were interested not only in preserving the house but also in restoring the gardens and agricultural land of the estate. The Ladies’ Association sought help from Charles Sprague Sargent. The first director of the Arnold Arboretum at Harvard University, Sargent remained active in the preservation of Mount Vernon’s landscape for the rest of his life.9

Charles Eliot, son of the president of Harvard University and partner in the Olmsted firm, is often called the father of landscape preservation.10 Eliot was a regular contributor of professional articles to Garden and Forest magazine. On March 5, 1890,...

---

9 Phyllis Anderson, “Charles Sprague Sargent and the Preservation of Mount Vernon Landscape,” in Design with Culture, 45.
10 Birnbaum and Hughes, “Landscape Preservation in Context,” 2.
he published a landmark article entitled “Waverly Oaks,” defending a stand of virgin trees in Belmont, Massachusetts, in the process making a plea for preservation of the oaks and outlining a strategy for conserving other areas of scenic beauty. This article resulted in a conference held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1890 on the preservation of scenic beauty.

In 1891, a group of private citizens including Eliot obtained a charter from the state legislature as a corporation by the name of the Trustees of Public Reservations. The organizers were disturbed by the rapid expansion of cities and towns and the consequent destruction of the natural countryside and landscape. They proposed the following:

Because “The existing means of securing and preserving public reservations are not sufficiently effective, lovers of nature will rally to endow the Trustees with the care of their favorite scenes, precisely as the lovers of Art have so liberally endowed the Art Museums”; the organization “will be able to act for the benefit of the whole people, and without regard to the principal cause of the ineffectiveness of present methods, namely the local jealousies felt by townships and the parts of townships towards each other”; and the Commonwealth “can no longer afford to refrain from applying to the preservation of her remarkable places every method which experience in other fields has approved.”11

In the spring of 1891, the Trustees of Public Reservations were empowered to acquire, maintain, and open to the public “beautiful and historic places and tracts of land within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.” The legal organization, with a private body empowered to accept gifts of land or property (which from the beginning the trustees required to be endowed and which were thereafter tax exempt) established an important

---

precedent for the preservation of gardens as well as natural landscapes. The Trustees of Public Reservations served as a model for the British National Trust.12

In the 1920s and 1930s, the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg drew national attention to preservation issues and set a high aesthetic standard for such work around the country. Arthur Shurcliff, a consulting landscape architect on the project, pioneered the methodology for documenting and treating historic landscapes that became influential nationwide.13 The National Trust continued the effort to preserve nationally recognized landscapes. An effort to broaden preservation with government backing, which was chartered by an act of congress, the National Trust was created in the United States in 1949 as a private nonprofit organization to help unite preservation leadership and expertise on a national scale. Once established, the National Trust grew in membership and expanded its services and property holdings. It provided professional management assistance of historical resources. In 1966, it became the recipient of a federal funds matching grant program. By the 1970s membership was over 100,000 and included wealthy amateurs and individuals more focused on a broader range of planning issues. Through its programming, the National Trust became the first large organization to address the issue of landscape preservation.14

Today, organizations such as the Garden Conservancy, established in 1989, play an important role in the preservation of private gardens. The Garden Conservancy’s mission is as follows:

To preserve gardens by harnessing the power of communities and the expertise of horticulturists, landscape designers, historians, and preservationists. To share

magnificent spaces and gardening ideas with the public through educational programs and garden visiting programs. To raise public awareness of the important role gardens play in America’s cultural and natural heritage.\textsuperscript{15}

This organization works extensively with small properties, focusing on opening them to the public in order to provide more support and awareness of these historic landscapes. But the strength of this organization lies in it’s understanding that managing a historic landscape is a continuous process that must change and adapt to existing conditions that include changes in use and the challenges of funding a public garden. Although preservation of these gardens is their mission, making sure these places are sustainable and useful public entities is a major priority.

The National Park Service played a highly influential role in the development of cultural landscape preservation when the federal government set aside Yellowstone in 1872 to protect curiosities and wonders reported by early hunters and trappers in the area.\textsuperscript{16} The National Park Service was established by the 1916 Organic Act, which recognized the importance of landscape preservation. As outlined by the enabling legislation, the purpose of the Park Service is “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life there in and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”\textsuperscript{17} In the beginning, the conservation and protection of natural resources was the primary concern of the Park Service. By the 1930s, as additional authority was given to the agency by the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, the historic component of its responsibility began to take shape. In the years since, tension has developed within the National Park Service between conserving natural

\textsuperscript{15} The Garden Conservancy Mission Statement, 1989.
\textsuperscript{17} The National Park Service Organic Act 1916. \url{http://www.nps.gov/legacy/organic-act.htm}
resources and preserving history, or “cultural resources” in the Park Service’s terms, through the protection of historic sites, structures, collections, and other historical materials. While other industrial countries have seen these two as lying on a continuum, in the United States they are often viewed as distinct competing interests.18

In 1960, the cultural landscape values of scenery and history in U.S. National Parks were seriously threatened by the Leopold Report, a result of increased interest in protection of the environment and ecology. The report states: “As a preliminary goal we would recommend that the biotic associations within each park be maintained, or where necessary recreated, as nearly as possible in the direction that prevailed when the area was first visited by the white man. A national park should represent a vignette of primitive America.”19 No exceptions were made for historic sites or cultural landscapes. Early National Park Service policy classified historic gardens as structures to receive the same degree of study as a building, but few professionals were interested in championing that cause. Unfortunately many historic gardens and landscapes, including battlefields, were abandoned and reclaimed by nature because of the Leopold Report. By mid-century, the conservation and preservation of landscape, which had been laid out in 1916 as having equal status with the conservation and preservation of natural and cultural resources, was viewed by policymakers as only a marginal interest. Many gains in landscape preservation planning were lost during this time and the National Park Service one of the leaders in landscape preservation suffered losses in the field of landscape preservation and the actual protection and conservation of many of our countries important historic resources that were part of the National Park Legacy.

Meanwhile, a group of historic preservationists was working to alert the public to the loss of national heritage. In 1966, the culmination of their efforts was the creation of the National Preservation Act. It required that every federal action “take into account” its effect on historic properties worthy of preservation. The implications of this law stunned National Park managers. The parks’ natural mandate no longer allowed the demolition of significant historical structures without thorough research and study and consideration of alternative actions. Quite suddenly, the National Park Service was faced with the issue of how to maintain thousands of historic structures on limited budgets that had only been most recently swept aside by the Leopold Report.

In 1985, the Olmsted Historic Landscapes Heritage legislation was passed. This bill preserved all Olmsted landscapes through federal intervention and enforcement, and through initiatives established by the National Park Service itself. Because of this development the National Park Service became an important leader in historic landscape preservation developing important publications, training and research programs.

The National Park Service further promoted the practice of cultural landscape preservation by solidifying and defining the format and content of Cultural Landscape Inventories (CLIs) and Cultural Landscape Reports (CLR). Developing an inventory or landscape report involves the following steps: (1) Site History, Existing Conditions, and

---

22 Allen, The Olmsted National Historic Site, 111.
Analysis and Evaluation; (2) Treatment; and (3) Record of Treatment. This process acts as a guide for cultural landscape preservation work in the National Park Service and is not intended to be a rigid doctrine. It can help define what category the landscape falls into whether it is a historic designed landscape, a historic vernacular landscape a historic site or an ethnographic landscape. Yet it is expected that the basic activities—conducting historical research, documenting existing conditions, defining period(s) of significance, and then assessing the integrity of landscape characteristics—form the conceptual backbone of the process. According to Priya Jain:

> While this process has enabled the much-needed initiation of cultural landscape preservation work at a number of NPS sites, it also has been criticized for a variety of reasons. The concept of integrity outlined in the process often places great importance on the present physical record of the past while not carefully considering the present intangible resources. Finally, the exclusion of existing user-groups from the cultural landscape documentation and management process raises concerns that it reflects the isolated views of a class of trained experts, rather than the views of the very people whose relationship to the land is being analyzed in the first place.24

Jain’s criticisms are justified and the National Park Service is working to change this perception by including stakeholder’s in the conversation about the management of these places. It is also important to consider financial implications of various management approaches. Cultural Landscapes have the capacity to impact the surrounding areas financially whether it is through tourism, land use and protection or exploitation of natural resources. A more practical planning approach for the preservation of cultural landscapes is a combination of the National Park Service’s guidelines and a “values-based” preservation approach, outlined in the following chapter.

Historic Overview of Public Gardens

The making of a public garden implies a social need to share a garden with others. Public gardens offer the opportunity to enjoy a place at a variety of levels. Different kinds of public gardens serve a variety of purposes. Vegetable and fruit gardens serve provide produce; arboreta and zoological and botanical gardens are areas for study as well as enjoyment. Temple gardens and ceremonial spaces are designed for beauty, contemplation, and ritual. Cemeteries were often designed to be not only a place to bury the dead but a place to enjoy life, as well. Throughout history, the creation of gardens has involved the manipulation of the environment for the production of food, spiritual place-making, social discourse, and territoriality. Even the oldest surviving gardens from ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome are associated with religion and powerful symbolism. The forms of these gardens communicate the natural essence of the world as well as human-made order and represent the earliest examples of design of outdoor space. They represent both beauty and control, satisfying the human need to be part of something greater than ourselves.

From an American perspective, public gardens developed in two ways: large private gardens became public entities and public landscapes were developed in urban areas for the health and welfare of citizens. European gardens have been the greatest influence on the development of public gardens in America. Many of these gardens

began as private garden estates, and their design reflects surrounding societal, religious, and historical context at the time of creation.\textsuperscript{27} In North America, colonization quickly led to the discovery of new plants by botanist John Bartram. This period in the nation’s history was characterized by an interest in plant collecting and botanic gardens featuring taxonomic collections. Bartram, along with Benjamin Franklin, promoted this interest by founding the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia in 1743. Bartram’s own garden, established around 1728, is America’s oldest surviving botanical garden; it became a public garden in 1891.

The Boston Common, one of the oldest public parks in the United States, was established in 1830 when cattle were banned from the park. The space was first dedicated to public use in 1634. Rapid growth in the creation of public gardens occurred first after the Revolution, and then again with the formal founding of the Boston Public Garden in 1837, the U.S. Botanical Garden in 1850, the Missouri Botanic Garden 1859, and the acquisition of land for New York City’s Central Park between 1853 and 1856.

Frederic Law Olmsted, preeminent landscape architect of the nineteenth century, played an important role in the development of public gardens. According to Dwight T. Pitcaithley:

\begin{quote}
Olmsted presented more than a theory of use; he articulated a philosophy of leisure based on nature’s regenerative powers for an urbanizing society. He believed, this builder of Central Park in New York City and countless other urban parks throughout the country, that the essence of park land should be in establishing a contrast to the pace of the modern world. Anchoring his thinking at the conclusion of the Civil War and amid the burgeoning Industrial Revolution, Olmsted envisioned a need for ordinary citizens to maintain perspective in their daily lives by being exposed to, and encouraged to contemplate, the natural rhythms of the natural world.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. 21.
As urban places continued to grow, public gardens and parks offered a refuge from the ills of city living. “Miasma” or poisoned atmosphere was thought to be a result of the lack of trees; parks and gardens had the capacity to correct this problem. Public gardens and parks were also created to provide green space to all social classes. Both Olmsted and Downing encouraged the creation of these spaces to lift up the lower classes and raise the level of moral behavior that open green space represented. Olmsted noted that Central Park exercised a “distinctly harmonizing and refining influence over the most unfortunate and lawless classes in the city— an influence favorable to courtesy, self control, and temperance.”

Public gardens also function as reservoirs and generators of knowledge by contributing to the study of plant science. They preserve social memory and sense of place. Gardens have the capacity to represent a living legacy of place making, contrasting different times, social norms and priorities in United States history.

Today the concept of a public garden implies the enjoyment of the garden by the public at large. Public gardens provide an aesthetic respite especially in urban areas and democratize the experience making the value of the garden environment available to citizens of all stations and circumstances. Yet this becomes complicated, as some gardens charge admission, thereby limiting who has access to the garden. Such gardens often offer free-admission days to mitigate this.

The future presents a myriad of challenges for public gardens. The recent 2008 recession was an indicator of the competition for financial resources for the management

---


of public gardens. Important environmental issues must also be addressed in order to ensure a sustainable future. Public gardens will play an important role in the future by reminding individuals and society that plants and gardens are a necessity to sustain life as we know it.

Management of Public Gardens

Mission statements and priorities for land use often drive the management of public gardens. The vision of the various stakeholders determines the relationship between garden management and mission. There is a remarkable diversity among public gardens and the roles they play in society. Most public gardens fulfill many roles simultaneously.

Historic landscapes rely on management more than any other heritage sites, because of their dynamic nature: organic material is the major component of landscapes and it can change very rapidly. Thus, the management approach often requires a high level of intervention and stewardship in order to yield results. For example, the trees and shrubs in a designed garden grow, mature, and eventually die and gravel paths become compacted and their edges erode. As with buildings, it is preferable to retain as much of the original fabric of a historic landscape as possible; change is inevitable, however, and often occurs rapidly. Important historic elements can be lost in a short span of time, and historic landscape elements may be lost through the years.31

The management of the public garden will be more successful with strong leadership and a clear vision for the garden. The success of the public garden often depends on engaging wide range of stakeholders in the decision making process. The failure of

public gardens often results from creating gardens in isolation from the surrounding community. If the local community is engaged along with other stakeholders the garden is more likely to be successful. Once these have been established then short-term and long-term goals can be set and conducted.

The financial condition of public gardens often plays an underestimated role in the management of these places. Many public gardens face financial challenges that require making decisions that can have lasting impact on the gardens. Often these decisions may have less to do with the preservation of historic fabric and more to do with the sustainability of these places as public entities. If the garden has a clear mission and strong leadership it will be more successful in reckoning difficult financial situations and allow for a greater level of success.
Chapter II

METHODOLOGY FOR PRESERVATION PLANNING AND TREATMENT

Preservation Planning

Exceptional gardens and arboreta most often begin as private places, the life’s work of talented gardeners and plant enthusiasts. Sound preservation and conservation principles are put to the task to find ways to transform these gardens into protected and well-managed public entities. 32

Only a select number of these landscapes will be capable of thriving for generations as public gardens. According to Donald Rakow, Director of Cornell Graduate Program in Public Garden Leadership: “A public garden is a mission-based institution that maintains collections of plants for the purposes of education, research, conservation and/or public display. Further it must be opened to the public and provide accommodations for access to all people.” 33

The Mary Wakefield Charitable Trust in Milton, Massachusetts, is a cultural landscape that has evolved for more than three hundred years into a mission-based organization that focuses on public education and community engagement using the natural resources of the Estate. The best approach for the preservation of this unique landscape while providing public access requires careful consideration and planning.

To conduct a successful garden preservation effort, it is necessary to have a clear purpose in mind. Start by asking why the garden should be preserved. To answer this question, begin by defining the garden’s qualities that contribute to its significance. Being able to articulate the garden’s importance will help persuade others to support its preservation. Using significance and feasibility criteria to help assess the viability of converting a private garden into a public garden will offer objective measures for determining the likelihood of successfully creating a public garden.  

Preservation Maintenance versus Standard Landscape Maintenance

While determining the proper treatment for a cultural landscape, it is important to ensure that the landscape is stabilized to prevent further deterioration. According to Margaret Coffin and Margaret Regina Bellavia, preservation landscape maintenance must follow a different set of guidelines than standard landscape maintenance:

The difference between landscape preservation maintenance and landscape maintenance is that landscape preservation maintenance focuses on preservation of materials and the character of the landscape. The highest priority for preservation maintenance is to preserve and protect the historic authenticity of the landscape while standard landscape maintenance focuses on aesthetics, cost effectiveness, and contemporary techniques and equipment.

The process of acquiring, stabilizing, and treating a historic landscape is referred to as the landscape preservation process. The process comprises two major facets: preservation maintenance and preservation planning. The term “preservation

---

35 Margaret Coffin and Regina Bellavia, *Guide to Developing a Preservation Maintenance Plan for Historic Landscapes* Cultural Landscape Publication no. 7 (Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation 1999 ), 17.
maintenance” describes “the practice of monitoring change controlling growth replacing in kind and minimizing disturbance in the landscape to ensure that features such as vegetation paths, walls and other landscape furnishings are not and the character of the place is not compromised. The guiding philosophy is that all existing landscape features should be preserved until the history of the landscape is fully researched and documented.”36 The process of preservation planning is “researching, documenting and planning on how to treat the landscape.”37

The Olmsted Center’s Guide to Developing a Preservation Maintenance Plan for Historic Landscapes divides the process into stages:

During first stage prior to accurate research a preservation maintenance plan should be prepared which focuses on stabilization and protection of features. Second stage involves the development of an in-depth history of the landscape historic and existing conditions base maps site analysis and analysis of landscape significance and authenticity. This also involves treatment decisions on whether to preserve, rehabilitate or to restore the historic elements. Third stage preservation maintenance plan should be revised to include new features. A Plan should include information about history and origin of features, long-term preservation initiatives and maintenance procedures that will ensure preservation objectives will be met.38

Careful planning and the implementation of appropriate preservation tools can help identify historically significant landscape characteristics, develop a preservation treatment approach, and decrease the rate of deterioration. The preservation of the property’s essential elements and sensitive adaptation can help to retain the overall character and integrity of a landscape.39 The development of a historic landscape preservation plan is critical to the protection of a historic landscape. The lack of proactive

37 Coffin and Bellavia, Guide to Developing a Preservation Maintenance Plan, 17.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
planning can pose a serious threat; even small, incremental changes—the death of a few trees, the removal of a failing stone wall, the deterioration of a fountain in a formal garden—can have a profound impact on a landscape’s character.

**Historic Research and Inventory of Existing Conditions**

To understand the significance of a particular garden and its evolution through time, historic research and an inventory of existing conditions are necessary. To understand the development of a landscape over time, it is necessary to conduct a thorough review of historic documentation, such as historic plans, plant lists, photographs, newspaper articles, town records, and published histories. These findings will help identify a landscape’s historic period(s) of ownership, occupancy, and development, and allow for greater understanding of the associations and characteristics that make the landscape significant. The results of this historic research provide a foundation for educated decisions, and can also facilitate ongoing maintenance and management operations, interpretation, and eventual compliance requirements.  

An inventory of existing conditions can be conducted using the National Park Service Guidelines for Understanding Cultural Landscapes. Landscape characteristics, as defined by the National Park Service’s (1998) *Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports*, are: “the general distinguishing traits and qualities of the landscape, both tangible and intangible. The term refers to culturally derived and naturally occurring processes or to cultural and natural physical forms that influenced the development of the landscape.”  

A detailed inventory of the landscape’s features, including topography, spatial relationships, vegetation, circulation systems, and structures, will help determine the

---


41 Ibid.
landscape’s current condition. These need not be purely physical features, but could include the historical use of the landscape or its association with a particular group of people.  

Analysis of Integrity and Significance

According to the National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 36:

The overall landscape and individual features noted in the landscape inventory will help define the integrity and significance of the garden. Historic significance is the recognized importance a property displays when it has been evaluated. A landscape may have several areas of historical significance. An understanding of the landscape as a continuum through history is critical in assessing its cultural and historic value. In order for the landscape to have integrity, these character-defining features or qualities that contribute to its significance must be present.

The significance and integrity of a property will inform the choice of treatment, as will its current use, the organization’s mission, and financial restraints. With landscapes, more than any other type of historic resource, the preservation approach must be designed to accommodate change. It is important to develop a preservation plan that goes beyond significance and integrity to include the values that current stakeholders place on the property. A values-based preservation approach may better provide the community with a cultural landscape that not only protects its past but also reflects the values of those who currently use it. According to Randall Mason:

Values-centered preservation establishes a process by which preservation practitioners can track the changing meanings of a particular place—as culture continues to shift, evolve, create, and destroy meanings—and incorporate them in policies and plans for conservation, interpretation, protection, and investment. The approach is defined by the central role of significance (comprised of some

---

43 Birnbaum, Protecting Cultural Landscapes. 9.
44 Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation, Massachusetts Heritage Landscapes, 8.
number of different values) in decision-making, and the participation of a number of different parties—not just “the experts”—in decisions.\textsuperscript{45}

To gain a clear understanding of what is valued by current users, stakeholder surveys should be conducted. These interviews should include board members, trustees, staff members, educators, and community members and students. Once these interviews are complete, this information can help in formulating the landscape’s significance.

Once the property’s significance has been determined, an approach for landscape preservation maintenance and treatment can be devised. According to the National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 36:

Treatment may be defined as work carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal it cannot be considered in a vacuum. There are many practical and philosophical factors that may influence the selection of a treatment for a landscape. These include the relative historic value of the property, the level of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, its historic significance and integrity, historic and proposed use (e.g. educational, interpretive, passive, active public, institutional or private), long- and short-term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g. accessibility, fire, security) and costs for anticipated capital improvement, staffing and maintenance.\textsuperscript{46}

Therefore, a cultural landscape’s preservation plan and the treatment selected will need to consider a broad array of dynamic and interrelated considerations.\textsuperscript{47}

**Development of Treatment Plan**

Information gathered through research, inventory, and analysis forms the basis of the preservation approach. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of


\textsuperscript{47} Birnbaum, *Protecting Cultural Landscapes*.10.
Historic Properties identify four possible treatment approaches: (1) preservation, (2) rehabilitation, (3) restoration, and (4) reconstruction:

**Preservation** is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

**Rehabilitation** is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical or cultural values.

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

**Reconstruction** is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location. 48

Because landscapes are constantly changing and evolving this set rigid treatments outlined by the Secretary of Interior is often hard to apply. The recommended treatment for the Wakefield Estate does not conform to the rigid approaches laid out by the Secretary of the Interiors’ standards. Instead the standards are used as a basic guide for the chosen preservation approach.

Again, the significance and integrity of a property will inform the choice of treatment, as will its current use, the project’s objectives, and cost considerations.

48 Ibid.10.
Garden visits

To gain a greater understanding of garden preservation efforts, it is important to visit public gardens to witness firsthand some of the challenges managers of these gardens face. In-depth interviews with staff members at public gardens and arboreta can reveal useful information about preservation efforts that have been successful or problematic. Lessons learned from these experiences will help in the preservation effort for the garden under consideration. (See Appendix A)

Plant documentation

To manage and preserve a historic landscape it is necessary to develop a documentation system of the landscape’s historic plant material. The National Park Service recommends that the identification of existing plants should be specific, including genus, species, common name, age (if known), and size. The woody, and if appropriate, herbaceous plant material should be accurately located on the existing conditions map. To ensure full representation of successional herbaceous plants, care should be taken to document the landscape in different seasons, if possible.

To maintain the Wakefield Estate plant collection, for example, it is necessary to document as many of the woody plants as possible. The methodology for this process begins with the research of various plant records database systems. Gardens and arboreta all over the world use the BG Base plant documentation system. BG Base has the capacity to integrate vast amounts of data; however, it is very expensive and

49 BG-BASETM is a collections management database for botanical gardens and arboreta. See http://www.bg-base.com/.
requires frequent software updates and staff training. For a nonprofit institution with limited technical and financial resources, this system is not currently affordable. Instead, a simple, customized plant database using Microsoft Access and Excel spreadsheets can be implemented. The plant data can be linked together and later used with Arc GIS when time and resources become available. This plant records database can also prove useful as a template for smaller gardens and arboreta looking to document their own collections without the financial burden of BG Base.

Currently, the Wakefield Estate plant collection lacks accurate documentation. Mary (“Polly”) Wakefield worked closely with the Arnold Arboretum to acquire most of her plant collection. However, clear documentation has not been discovered in Polly’s papers. Correct plant accessioning is based on clear documentation of the history of the plant. If historic documentation can be found to correctly identify the provenance of the plant, then that plant can be accessioned as part of the collection; otherwise the unique ID identifies the plant for proper care and further research. Much of the plant material at the Wakefield Estate has been identified to the genus but not always to the species or cultivar. This is particularly true with many of the dogwoods. If historic documentation becomes available, this information can be added to the database. Plants are provided with tags that contain all available information. Plant specimens are documented using the following process.

1. Take several photographs. Context photo, individual specimen, leaf detail, and bark detail, and list significant damage or dieback.

2. Fill out documentation form. Research and note any potential disease issues or crowding problems. Write a paragraph interpreting plant’s significance to the collection.

3. Identify the specimen on the existing conditions map.

4. Take a leaf sample for pressing and documentation.
5. Provide the plant with a number and temporary tag.

6. Input all information into the database.50

On-site observations

The opportunity to spend a significant amount of time maintaining and researching the plant collection was an extremely important experience in developing the preservation plan. Having the opportunity to work on the Estate through different seasons over a two-year period provided a strong basis for understanding how the collection adapts to various environmental conditions.

Observing various programming at the Estate allowed me to make decisions about how various character areas would be impacted from different levels of use.

Finally it was very informative to meet with many of the stakeholders and the day to day users of the property to gain an understanding of how they viewed the property and how it could better serve the local community.

Early Settlement and Development pre 1636

Milton encompasses thirteen square miles overlooking the Neponset River to the north and lying below the Blue Hills just south of the Wakefield property. The landscape is hilly with views of the Neponset River. Milton is part of the geologic system known as the Boston Basin, which was created by four major geologic processes:

1. Volcanic action formed the Blue Hills four hundred million years ago in the Ordovician period.
2. Heavy accumulation of sedimentary rocks (slates, clays, conglomerates and sandstones) lay down by water action in the Boston Basin caused the area to sink off from the Blue Hills on a geologic fault running along the northern base of the range.
3. Compression of the sedimentary rocks caused the basins layers of sedimentary rocks to buckle into wavelike folds called anticlines (up-folds) and synclines (down-folds).
4. Four successive ages of glaciations over 1 million years. The last ice sheet retreated from New England fifteen thousand years ago drastically modifying the existing geologic forms.

The oldest rocks were slate formed over five hundred million years ago. Four
hundred million years ago, volcanic eruptions during the Ordovician period broke through the slate producing diorite, a dark coarse-grained rock containing feldspar and hornblende, and Quincy granite, which contained quartz crystals, feldspar and iron blends. These two plutonic rocks were the bedrock of the Blue Hills.

As the lava cooled, the hardening of the plutonic rocks caused the Boston Basin to sink and create an inland sea, ringed by ridges of hardened igneous rock. Erosion carried debris from the slopes to the sea, which then hardened into hundreds of feet of rock Roxbury conglomerate commonly called Roxbury puddingstone. There were small outcrops of Roxbury conglomerate in Milton near Dorchester. About three hundred million years ago the current topography of Milton began to take on its current contours when the folding of this rock created an anticline in Milton under Milton Hill, which sloped down to the Neponset River. The remaining rock on the ridges was granite, which formed the foundation of the Blue Hills. The Boston Basin sunk further and split off from the Blue Hills creating geologic faults along their bases. One million years ago, glaciers scoured the terrain rerouting rivers and further remodeling the topography. The end of the Ice Age, fifteen thousand years ago, the result was:

1. Blue Hills were rounded off, northern slopes flattened and southern slopes made steeper.

2. Glacial debris built low rounded elliptical hills called drumlins. Milton Hill and Brush Hill were drumlins.

3. Kettles holes created ponds and lakes from melting ice beneath glacial debris Houghton's Pond was formed from a spring fed kettle hole.

4. Glacial debris hardened into boulder clay under Brush Hill and Milton Hill.
5. Rising ocean level created wetlands along the rivers, including the Neponset River. The Neponset River is very winding, having taken the path of least resistance, which had important implications for the development of Milton.51

The Wakefield Estate is located at a foothill of Great Blue Hill known as Hayward Hill. The landscape gently rolled north toward Fowl Meadow and the Neponset River. There is evidence on the Estate of glacial deposits in stonewalls, made of rounded boulders, characteristic of those found in glacial till, and in the composition of the soil.

Native Americans

Documentary evidence of Native American occupation from 7000 B.C. was discovered in a quarry near the Wakefield Estate. The Native Americans around Blue Hills were the Neponset tribe of the “Massachusetts” who derived its name from the Native American name for Great Blue Hill “Massachuseuck” The Native Americans called Milton Unquity-Quisset (Unquity) “Head of the Tidewater” where the salt water from the ocean met the fresh water of the river. The hills of Dorchester and Milton the Neponset River were the gathering places and mustering grounds of the tribe. Unquity was forest interspersed with large stretches of open fields just south of the Neponset.52

European Settlement

The first European settlers came into possession of the land in 1636. Charles I granted “Unquity” to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. To ensure clear title, the land was also

51 William J. Loughran, Town of Milton, Topography and Indian Prehistory (Milton: Milton Historical Commission, 1988), 1-10.
purchased from the Native Americans for twenty-eight fathoms of wampum.Originally Unquity was part of Dorchester, but because of the inconvenience of attending religious meetings in distant Dorchester Village, Unquity incorporated in 1662 and the named was changed to Milton (probably after Milton, England).

Between 1675 and 1775, Milton transformed from a small, sparsely settled town to a prosperous area with increased industrial development and expanded agricultural activities. In 1700, around the time when the Davenport line came to settle in Milton, the population of the town was just under 400 people housed in approximately 60 dwellings. By 1770, when a third generation of Davenports had made Milton their home, the town numbered nearly 1,000.

Because of its proximity to Boston, Milton became an industrial center that included gunpowder manufacturing, iron slitting, sawmilling, and paper milling along the Neponset River.

By the mid-nineteenth century, Milton’s reputation as a desirable place to live drew prosperous Bostonians looking to establish “country seats.” Many of these country places were “gentleman farms,” which served both as seasonal residences and hobby farms for agricultural and horticultural experimentation. After the Civil War, Milton continued to prosper.

The majority of the high style, architect-designed country estates and houses for which Milton is noted were built between 1870 and 1915. The Wakefield Estate was

---

53 Ibid. 17.
54 Ibid. 18.
typical of Milton estates of this era, with its sweeping lawns, curved entrance drive, orchards, meadows, and views of the Neponset River.

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, many Bostonians who had established summer homes in Milton converted them to year-round homes, as Milton became a “bedroom community” for Boston businessmen. The train commute to Boston was only twenty minutes. Residential development continued around the Blue Hills with continued division of farmsteads.

Milton continued to grow as a wealthy suburb with many large estates, and by the early twentieth century Milton was the commonwealth’s second most affluent town. As Boston expanded and population increased in its surrounding suburbs, Milton used zoning ordinances to restrict the construction of multiple family homes. Although the automobile accentuated the migration to the suburbs after World War I, it had little effect on Milton.57 The middle of the twentieth century saw substantial private and public institutional development around the Wakefield Estate.

The Wakefield Estate

Located in Milton, Massachusetts, the 22.5-acre site of the Wakefield Estate is situated between Brush Hill and the Blue Hills, within a landscape that was historically dominated first by farmsteads and later by grand estates of Boston-based families. Much of the land that surrounds the Estate that was previously associated with the property has been subdivided into smaller residential lots. Known formerly as the Davenport Estate, the property’s current configuration represents only a portion of the former landholdings.

57 Maureen T. O’Brien, Cultural Landscape Report for the Front Garden at the Mary B. Wakefield Trust (August 2009), Wakefield Archives, 12.
during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{58} The Wakefield Estate has remained in the possession of one family longer than any other in Milton, from its purchase in 1706 by John Davenport until Mary Wakefield passed away in 2004 and the property was transferred to the Wakefield Estate Charitable Trust.

The property is composed of buildings and landscapes used for residential, agricultural, and horticultural purposes from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. The major buildings on the Estate include an eighteenth-century farmhouse, a late eighteenth-century mansion, and a mid-nineteenth-century carriage barn.

The Farmhouse, located to the south of a lane running southwest off Brush Hill Road, was originally oriented to the south toward what is now Blue Hill Avenue. The stonewalls that once bordered the access route from the Farmhouse to Blue Hill Avenue stand in what is now dense woodland. (See Appendix B Figure 3.1)

The construction of this two-story, central-chimney farmhouse is traditionally associated with John Davenport, founder of the Davenport family line in Milton. John Davenport first appears in Milton’s tax records in 1707, which suggests that the house was built in the first decade of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{59} The most recent research, however, suggests that the construction of the Farmhouse may be associated with John Davenport’s son Samuel’s ownership of the property, beginning in the mid-eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{60}

The second important building on the Estate, hereafter referred to as the Mansion house, is sited facing Brush Hill Road near the current eastern edge of the

\textsuperscript{58} Erin Doherty, \textit{The Davenport Estate: Land Use, Agriculture, and Architectural Display}, Wakefield Archives (September 2011), 3.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} Claire Dempsey, Annie Rotner, Shelby Graham, Leo Greene, and Dayl Cohen, “Title History of the Wakefield Property, in Milton and Canton, MA” (August 2009). Quoted in Doherty, \textit{The Davenport Estate}, 3.
property. Documentary evidence suggests that initial construction on the house began between 1792 and 1794. The house appears on a 1794 map in the Wakefield Estate Archives. However, the first appearance of the Mansion house in town records is in the Direct Tax of 1798.61 (See Appendix B Figure 3.2)

The Carriage House, probably the work of William Pitt Preble Longfellow, was constructed in 1860.62 (See Appendix B Figure 3.3)

These structures and their surroundings evolved considerably over time in response to changing family needs. During the course of the past 300 years the Wakefield Estate evolved from an agricultural property to a country house for a wealthy Bostonian family to the home of an amateur landscape designer and avid plant collector. The current formal gardens and extensive plant nurseries that surround the Mansion house are attributed to the last owner, Mary B. Wakefield.

**Davenport Farm (1707–1793)**

Thomas Davenport (d. 1685) was born in England and came to Dorchester, Massachusetts, before 1640. He left his homestead to his son John Davenport (1664–1725).

On May 2, 1706, John purchased 36 acres in Milton, Massachusetts, which included the present Estate, from Thomas Gofs, and was on the tax rolls by 1707.63 Over
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61 The 1794 map showing Isaac Davenport’s purchase of the land from the church of Dorchester has not been fully considered. This document in the collections of the estate illustrates, in three dimensions, two buildings closely resembling the mansion house and farmhouse. Because the identity of the building has not been confirmed, its implications have not been fully considered. The document may be the source of the 1794 date. Quoted in Zachary Violette, “Isaac Davenport House, Milton, Mass.” (draft, Boston University, June 2008), 15.

62 Ibid., 40.

the course of 19 years as a landowner in Milton and raising his family in Dorchester and possibly in Milton, John accumulated 114 acres of land in Milton, making his farm four times the size of the average land grant in the town. According to previous research, upon his death in 1725 John Davenport divided his estate into three parts, with one-third given to his widow, one-third to his unmarried sons Stephen and Benjamin, and one-third to his four children Samuel, Ephraim, and Joseph. His remaining son, John, had prior gifts confirmed in the will; he is believed to have already established a homestead on Cherry Hill in what later became the town of Canton. John’s wife Naomi outlived him for nearly 15 years. Sons Ephraim and Joseph are believed to have lived in Stoughton and in Newton Lower Falls, respectively, and Benjamin died young. Stephen and Samuel remained in Milton.64 However, recently discovered transcriptions of deeds completed by Henry Cunningham65 suggest that Davenport divided the land differently, leaving only the sons Stephen and Samuel the property.66 There is also some ambiguity as to whether John Davenport or Samuel his son built the Farmhouse. Notably, the 42-acre parcel inherited by Samuel, according to the will by which he received it from his father, contained no buildings.67 According to documentary evidence, Samuel Davenport never lived on the Milton estate, residing instead in Dorchester and Mendon until his death in 1773. He left a 42-acre parcel to his son Samuel Davenport, Jr., who had been living on the land since his marriage in 1741. Samuel Jr. greatly expanded his landholdings surrounding this 42-acre parcel. Between 1753 and 1785, Samuel purchased six parcels in Canton, totaling 28 acres, from William Royal and various members of the Clap family.

64 Shelby Graham, Annie Rotner, and Claire Dempsey, Biographies of Wakefield Property Owners, Wakefield Archives, 2.
65 Henry Cunningham conducted extensive research on the deeds for the Estate.
66 Doherty, The Davenport Estate, 12.
Two of the parcels were described specifically as woodland. According to Erin Dougherty’s *Land Use History*: 

Samuel purchased at least two other properties during this period, the locations of which have not been determined at this time, including a six-acre piece of cranberry bog in Milton and an eight-acre piece of swampland in Canton. These parcels may or may not have been contiguous with the Davenport Farm. Samuel’s land thus doubled in size from 1753 to 1785, reaching 84 acres. Though portions of this land are in Canton and thus not counted in the Milton tax record, these purchases represent a significant expansion of his landholdings and a significant monetary investment in expanding the family’s farming operations. (See Appendix C, Map 3.2)

**Isaac Davenport**

Born in Milton in 1753 as the youngest child of Samuel Jr., Isaac lived part of his adult life in Boston, and in 1787 wed Mary May, a daughter of well-known Bostonian Samuel May. The couple had two children, Mary May and Louisa, in 1795 and 1807, respectively.

Isaac Davenport speculated in real estate and had businesses on Long Wharf and Washington Street in Boston. He was a business partner of John McLean, doing business in the West Indies and New England. In the late eighteenth century, tax and documentary evidence suggests that though Davenport’s estate had grown to be above average in income and property holdings, the Milton property remained primarily an agricultural operation.

68 Doherty *The Davenport Estate*, 3.
69 Ibid.
70 Samuel Joseph May (September 12, 1797–July 1, 1871), a Unitarian minister, was one of the greatest social and educational reformers of the nineteenth century. He advocated and organized on behalf of freedom and civil rights for blacks, emancipation and voting rights for women, and just rights for workers. Because he was many decades ahead of mainstream acceptance of the policies he fought for, he was often at odds with his ministerial colleagues, church members, and the public at large.
71 John McLean was a prominent molasses importer and resident of Milton.
72 Although information regarding the family’s involvement in the agricultural operations of the Estate under Isaac and his widow Mary May Davenport is limited, by 1846 there is indisputable
Between 1792 and 1794, Isaac Davenport built the Mansion in Milton. Originally the Mansion was a two-story double pile colonial. At this juncture the Estate took on a secondary, recreational character and transformed from farm to country seat.\textsuperscript{73} Although several additions were made to the mansion over the years, the landscape remained largely unchanged.

Isaac Davenport died a wealthy man in 1828 and left a personal estate worth more than $120,000.\textsuperscript{74} His estate inventory lists the Mansion, over 240 acres in Milton and Canton, 26 acres of salt marsh in Scituate and Cambridge, buildings on Beacon Hill, the North End, and waterfront in Boston, and over 2,000 acres of land in Bangor, Maine.\textsuperscript{75} After Isaac Davenport's death, letters indicate that his widow Mary May Davenport (1769–1853) lived in the mansion year-round.

After the death of Isaac Davenport, the Estate was managed by Davenport's trustees: his son-in-law Joseph Hens Hayward (1789–1853), a businessman married to his daughter Mary May (1795–1843); and Thomas Wigglesworth, a lawyer, the brother-in-law of his daughter Louisa (1808–1859).\textsuperscript{76} After the death of Davenport's wife and daughters, a partition deed of 1865 divided the land among Isaac's six grandchildren, the children of Mary May Davenport and her husband Joseph Hayward.\textsuperscript{77} (See Appendix C Figure 3.1)

In 1862, Isaac Davenport Hayward (I. D. Hayward), the grandson of Isaac Davenport, purchased the Mansion house from his sisters, who had inherited the house evidence that tenanting of the farm had begun, meaning that the Davenport family itself no longer farmed as their full occupation.

\textsuperscript{73} Doherty, \textit{The Davenport Estate}. 4.
\textsuperscript{74} Norfolk County Probate Docket no. 5215,1828, Isaac Davenport.
\textsuperscript{75} Davenport Family Papers, Wakefield Archives.
\textsuperscript{76} The Estate at this time included farmland, orchards, meadow, and swampland. Davenport Family Papers, Wakefield Archives.
\textsuperscript{77} Dayl Cohen, \textit{Massachusetts Historical Commission Form} (January 2007), Boston University Preservation Studies Program.
through their aunt. Isaac Davenport Hayward retained the services of William Pitt Prebles Longfellow, cousin of architect Alexander W. Longfellow, to design a series of updates to the Mansion and build the Carriage House.\textsuperscript{78}

I. D. Hayward married twice and had three children, one by his first wife, Mary H. Griswold, and two by his second wife, Mary B. Vose. According to the 1860 Agricultural Census:

I.D. Hayward is listed as possessing 3 acres of improved land, 3 horses, 1 milk cow, and 1 swine. His land is recorded as producing 27 bushels of Irish potatoes and 4 tons of hay. The value of the orchard is listed at $10 and the value of the market gardens at $100. The farm is valued at $3000. These three acres of improved land make up only a portion of the total of ten acres he had acquired of the estate by 1860. His presumed tenant, E.E. Cowls, is attributed with 200 acres of improved land and 200 acres of unimproved land. The cash value of the farm is recorded as $32,000.\textsuperscript{79}

Following his death, I. D.’s widow occupied the 55 remaining acres of the Davenport Estate until her death in 1901, when the property was divided among the couple’s three children, George, Roland, and Mary. George Hayward, the oldest of the three children, sold his share in the property to his half-siblings in 1902. In 1906, Roland passed away, leaving his share in the Milton estate to Mary.\textsuperscript{80}

The Cunninghams

Mary Hayward married Henry Winchester Cunningham in 1899, an avid genealogist who collected and preserved documentation and papers regarding the Estate. During Mary (Hayward) Cunningham’s ownership, the use of the Estate for farming appears to have declined. Maps show a large barn near the Farmhouse disappearing sometime after

\textsuperscript{78} Violette, “Isaac Davenport House, Milton, Mass.,” Wakefield Archives.40.  
\textsuperscript{79} Massachusetts Agricultural Census, 1860, Massachusetts State Archives, Boston. As quoted in Doherty, The Davenport Estate, 33.  
\textsuperscript{80} Doherty, The Davenport Estate, 35.
1905 and some of the outbuildings being either moved or torn down. The Estate became Mary Cunningham’s summer residence with her husband Henry Cunningham. Mary and Henry are believed to have split their time between a residence in Boston and the Estate in Milton, though they are recorded as residents in Milton in the 1910 census. According to Henry Cunningham’s obituary, for the last 23 years of his life he spent his summers at “the old estate on Brush Hill, Milton.”

The Cunninghams called the Estate “Maryville Farm,” although according to documentary evidence they kept only a horse, a cow, and a calf.

**The Binneys**

Mary Cunningham’s will divided the property between her cousin Henry Prentice Binney and her nephew Griswold Hayward. Griswold received the eastern portion of the property at the corner of Blue Hill Avenue and Brush Hill Road, including the Farmhouse, and Henry Binney received the Mansion house and approximately 15 acres around it. Henry Binney was great-grandson of Isaac Davenport. Henry Binney married Alberta Elliot Sturtevant of Boston in 1904; they had two children, Henry Jr. born in 1911 and Mary May (Polly) born in 1914.

A letter written by Polly Wakefield to a friend provides some insight about the condition of the landscape when her father Henry Binney inherited the property:

> When dad inherited the place in 1931 a Victorian rose arbor graced the lawn, the flower garden by the stable contained bleeding hearts columbines, pink peonies, anemones, chrysanthemums, boxwood and a little comfit rose. It was enclosed with privet hedges at each entrance. The apple and pear trees had mostly old hollow trees and the terraces had been newly planted with Norway maples to replace huge handsome old cherry trees, only a few of which still survived. There were many beautiful shade trees but the 1938 hurricane did away with many of them. The American beeches near the road are sprouts from the roots. Dad

---

81 Claire Dempsey with Shelby Graham and Annie Rotner, “Wakefield Property Owners” (December 2008), 3–4. (Wakefield Estate Archives)
immediately had the Norways removed below the terraces for his cattle needed hay. But mother insisted on leaving the old granite steps to mark the original flower border that extended from the main house to the summerhouse, which used to overlook the salt marshes on the Neponset River.\footnote{Mary Wakefield Letters. Box 50. Wakefield Estate Archives.}

Beyond this reminiscence, we have little information about the state of the landscape when Mary’s parents inherited the property.

In 1936, Griswold Hayward sold his portion of the Estate to Alberta Binney, widow of Henry Binney. She then sold a small portion to an unknown abutter and kept the rest.

Over the years, some of the Isaac Davenport assets, particularly the Maine real estate, were sold and converted to stock. After Isaac Davenport’s death until at least 1930, the Farmhouse and related acreage was rented to a tenant farmer and used for livestock, orchards, timber, and haying. Documentary evidence suggests that a small vegetable garden was maintained for the Mansion.

The Wakefields

Mary (“Polly”) Wakefield was named after her great grandmother Mary May Davenport. Her interest in gardening began at a young age and was nurtured by Mary Sturtevant, wife of her uncle Roy Sturtevant. Mary Sturtevant went to the Lowthorpe School of Landscape Architecture for Women during World War I and designed Wakefield’s first garden, “Polly’s Garden,” which her parents built for her on their summer rental property in Wareham. The garden had balloon flowers, poppies, English daisies, marigolds, zinnias, snapdragons, and roses.\footnote{Mary Sturtevant served as a member of the Corporation of Lowthorpe while Mary Wakefield attended the school.}
Mary “Polly” Wakefield enrolled in the Lowthorpe School in 1935, where she studied horticulture with the landscape architect Ellen Shipman. Polly traveled extensively, visited many gardens, and most likely interacted with Fletcher Steele, who was on the Lowthorpe Board of Trustees at the time.\textsuperscript{86} Polly describes her experience at the school in a letter (1970) to the Garden Club of Milton:

Groton was a charming rural town set among rolling farmland and dotted with apple orchards. The school has extensive greenhouses and gardens and attractive buildings but in these depression days, a dearth of paying students, for it was intended to be a post graduate course and few wanted the expense of it on top of college. Nor did they want to bury themselves in the country year round. At one time there were only eleven of us spread over three years and a thesis. Run by two young heads who wanted to gain accreditation for the school, we worked extremely hard sometimes going from drafting table to breakfast. Many left, but those who stuck it out received excellent training and on our work came the desired recognition. Outside instructors came to teach by day and noted people in the field gave us evening lectures. The winter term was spent in Boston at MIT architectural school in the Rogers building on Boylston street. There we were taught by professors, saw a great deal of the sixth year city planners and attended the crits of the upper classes.\textsuperscript{87}

Polly Wakefield was keen on practicing the profession of landscape architecture. However, the illness and subsequent death of her father redirected her priorities. According to an undated letter written by Polly:

The next step professionally would have been an office job. I had several New York possibilities in mind, but dad’s illness and then death in 1940 made my path clear. It was to keep the home fires burning for the duration of the war. As the manpower departed, I assumed the duties with only occasional outside help grass cutting, haying, stoked coal furnaces, and directed the renovation and renting of cottages to officers in the Armed forces.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{86} References made by Polly in the Wakefield Archives show work by Fletcher Steele.
\textsuperscript{87} Mary Wakefield Letters, Box 50. Wakefield Archives.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.
Prior to graduation from Lowthorpe, Polly had little involvement with the grounds on the Estate except for a personal miniature garden to the north of the Mansion. After her marriage, she developed formal gardens by the Farmhouse. By the late 1950s, as Mary Binney’s health declined, Polly Wakefield became increasingly involved in the landscape of the Estate, beginning its transformation from a rural country estate to a designed arboretum for her specimen trees and plants.89 Her final thesis project was an elaborate formal garden for the Farmhouse. (See Appendix B Figure 3.5, 3.6)

Polly created formal gardens (much less elaborate than her Lowthorpe thesis) around the Farmhouse, using many features she would later use in the Front Garden and the greater landscape, such as axial design, unique diamond finials, and a trio of bear cub statues. Polly recalls the beginnings of the axial paths in the terrace gardens:

Mother had commented on the fact that Hector the caretaker wanted permission to remove the granite steps from the path down at the terraces he said the horses stumbled over them when dragging the mowing machine to cut the hay because they can’t see them into the long grass and he is afraid the horses will get hurt. This posed a serious problem. The step was all that were left to mark the path from the 18th century cherry orchard now that the last two remaining cherries had died. What a pity to destroy the last vestiges of what had once been such an important feature of the place! After thinking it over we decided to experiment. Why not try planting some of the young dogwoods that I had been raising from seed collected at the propagation classes at the Arnold Arboretum. By planting them at either end of each group of steps they were already tall enough to be seen above the hay and they might survive in this location. They did this was the beginning of a project that eventually extended the length of each terrace and into the fields beyond. I continue to this day! This all began in 1956 when I collected seed from a propagation class at the Arnold Arboretum.90

Polly married George Kennard Wakefield (1908–1988), a widower with four children, in 1952. In 1963, when Polly’s mother died, she and Kennard moved into the Mansion House and Polly began to focus her design efforts on the Terraces adjacent to

89 O’Brien, Cultural Landscape Report for the Front Garden, 18.
90 Mary Wakefield Letters, Box 50. Wakefield Archives.
the Mansion house.

The Wakefields enjoyed entertaining on the Estate grounds, hosting class reunions, weddings, family reunions, garden tours, and other events. Polly had many interests besides gardening, including stamp and decoy collecting, boating, painting, entertaining, and genealogy.\textsuperscript{91} She was also very active in philanthropy and advocacy groups, including the Colonial Dames, the Dendrology Society, the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, the Arnold Arboretum, the Noanett Garden Club, the Massachusetts Conservation Council, and the Blue Ribbon Highway projects, and she was a founding member of the Friends of the Public Garden. In 1983, she received the prestigious Amy Angell Collier Montague Medal for Civic Achievement from the Garden Clubs of America. Upon receiving the award, Polly stated: Once the officials and public understand the importance of preserving all the diverse components of their natural heritage and encouraging the creation and effective use of new improved types of plants, we will have progressed a long way toward the attainment of our dreams for the World of Tomorrow.\textsuperscript{92}

Polly also attended many classes at the Arnold Arboretum, where she became friends with Donald Wyman, a prominent plant propagator for the arboretum. Her connection to the Arnold Arboretum over the years benefited both parties. She attained most of her unique plant collection from the arboretum and she was an avid supporter of the arboretum’s archives. According to Sheila Connor, friend and archivist at the Arnold Arboretum:

Mary May Binney Wakefield, or Polly, applied all she learned at the Arboretum to the creation of a landscape that is as delightful and original as is its maker. Within her garden there are several acres of Chinese dogwoods grown in an

\textsuperscript{91} O’Brien, \textit{Cultural Landscape Report for the Front Garden}, 34.

\textsuperscript{92} Quoted in O’Brien, \textit{Cultural Landscape Report for the Front Garden}, 34.
orchard-like setting that celebrate her patience and hint at a certain stubborn single-mindedness. It was during her first Arboretum propagating class in 1956 that her fascination with this woody species began. By the 1970s she had introduced and patented several cultivars including “Greensleeves,” “Moonbeam,” “Moon-light,” “Silverstar,” and “Twinkle.”

In 1981, Polly established a book fund to benefit the Arboretum’s Library in Jamaica Plain. In 2000, she established the Horticultural Library Fund of the Arnold Arboretum, a large endowed fund that continued to support the library’s work. Finally, upon her passing in 2005, Polly left a very substantial bequest to support the operation, maintenance, and development of the Jamaica Plain Horticultural Library’s overall collections.93

As early as 1953, Polly was making plans to preserve her own Estate. Although her beneficiaries and ultimate dispositions would change, she told her trustees:

I love the place—its history and its family associations and wish it preserved for future generations, preserved as a country or suburban estate, orchard, pastures, and fine trees as long as possible. The Old Farmhouse built in 1707 I would like preserved also the old section of the mansion 4 rooms square. If my mother brother or his children want to make changes tear off a wing put up a new barn that is quite right we do not want to spoil their comfort and those are not of great beauty.94

Polly continued to modify her gardens and plant collections throughout her life. By the 1990s her health had begun to deteriorate; yet she continued to be involved in the maintenance and planning of her gardens. She often drove around the property in a golf cart, directing her gardeners in the care of the landscape. She held tours for local garden clubs and remained active in horticulture until her death in 2004.

Mary M. B. Wakefield Trust, 2004–Present

The M. B. Charitable Trust took over the management of the Wakefield Estate in 2004 and is managed as a 501c3. The mission states:

---

94 Mary Wakefield Letters, letter dated May 4, 1953, to her advisors, Wakefield Archives.
The Mary M. B. Wakefield Charitable Trust promotes lifelong participatory learning using the land and resources of the Wakefield estate. Through collaborative partnerships with schools and community organizations, the Wakefield Trust carries out this mission through providing educational opportunities, tours, presentations, workshops, hands-on training, internships, and other programs covering a variety of subjects, including local history, ecology, horticulture, agriculture, archival work, and historic preservation. Through fostering the connections between people, land, and history, the Wakefield Charitable Trust aims to create a living and accessible landscape that carries on the legacy of Polly Wakefield and her vision for an engaged and knowledgeable citizenry.

The endowment for the Estate is managed by a board of trustees. Currently there are three full-time staff members, an executive director, an educational director and a grounds keeper. A new position of landscape director has been recently created. The executive director is in the process of creating an advisory board that will consist of educators, historians, archivists, horticulturalists and community leaders. Mark Smith, executive director completed a strategic plan at the end of 2011 the focus of which will include opening the Estate as a public arboretum and increasing educational programming using the natural resources of the Estate.
Chapter IV
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Surrounding Landscape

Milton, Massachusetts, where the Wakefield Estate is located, is an affluent Boston suburb, bordered by Boston to the north, Quincy and Randolph to the south and east, and Canton and Dedham to the west. Milton is 13.28 square miles with a population of 27,000 and lies between the Neponset River and the Blue Hills.

The Wakefield Estate is oriented southwest to northeast, bordering Brush Hill Road on the northeast. The neighborhood is bucolic, with several large private residences and public and private institutional campuses. The Wakefield property abuts the Thatcher Montessori School to the south, several large estates on the west and north, and Brush Hill Road on the east. Directly across Brush Hill Road is Fuller Village, a sixty-acre assisted living facility set back from the road on landscaped grounds.95 (See Appendix C Map 4.1)

Blue Hills Reservation, a Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) property, lies across route 138 from the Wakefield Estate. This protected landscape comprises over 7,000 acres and stretches from Quincy to Dedham and Milton to Randolph, providing a green oasis in an urban environment. Rising above the Wakefield Estate and marking its southern boundary is Great Blue Hill, reaching a height of 635 feet, the highest of the 22 hills in the Blue Hills chain. At the summit of Great Blue Hill is the Blue Hills Observatory, a National Historic Landmark and part of the Blue Hills Reservation.
The Wakefield Estate

The Wakefield Estate has served as the seat of the same family for more than 300 years. The Estate is currently owned by Mary M. B. Wakefield Charitable Trust. The Trust operates the property as a lifelong learning and educational center using the land and other resources of the Wakefield Estate. Through collaborative partnerships with schools and community organizations, the Trust carries out its mission by providing various educational opportunities that include tours, presentations, workshops, hands-on training, internships, and other programs. Educational programs focus on a wide array of subjects including horticulture, history, archeology, preservation, ecology, and collections management.96

Existing Conditions

The Estate landscape includes lawns, meadows, woodlands, open fields, designed gardens, and buildings. Estate buildings include a Georgian mansion (1794), a repository for archives and artifacts, the Farmhouse (c. 1707), which serves as offices, and the red cottage or caretaker’s house (c. 1920). Outbuildings on the Estate include the Carriage House (c. 1861), Carpenter’s shed (c. 1917), Staff cottage (c. 1930), Farmhouse garage (c. 1955), Henhouse (c. 1930), Sheep house (c. 1930), and a Mist house (c. 1970). (See Appendix C Map 4.2)

The property’s current entrance drive is a classic, small-scale New England tree-lined road. The mature deciduous trees are essential features of the space and of the experience of being invited into the oasis of a rural estate retreat. The lane leads to the Farmhouse and red cottage. The circular mansion drive on the south side of the Mansion exits onto Brush Hill Road to the east and the lane to the south.

The landscape features of the Estate include formal gardens, orchards, fields, woodlands, nurseries, a pond, and a unique collection of woody plants. Formal gardens include the Witches or Dragon Garden, the Front Garden, the Rose Garden, the Garden Terraces, and the Dogwoods. Nurseries include the Zebra Nursery, the Striped Nursery, the Lattice Nurseries, and the Lower Dogwood Nurseries. A series of woodland trails marks the southeastern edge of the property. A high-density apple orchard was added to the property in 2010.  

The Wakefield Estate houses a considerable collection of woody plants, many that Polly Wakefield obtained from the Arnold Arboretum while maintaining a close working relationship with several staff members, including Donald Wyman, Arnold Arboretum plant propagator. Polly began taking classes at the arboretum in the 1950s and started experimenting with propagation techniques. She developed an interest in the studying the behavior of plants under a variety of conditions, using the landscape of the Estate as her laboratory.

Although Polly worked diligently to create an unusual plant collection, her record-keeping system lacked organization, making it difficult to interpret the existing character-defining elements in some of the gardens. The lack of written records documenting the collection is mitigated, however, by an excellent collection of photographs that can be used to identify plant material and the evolving spatial organization of the gardens over time.

According to existing maps, documents, and photographs, the site’s current spatial organization, comprised of its circulation (roads and paths) and location of

---

97 A high-density orchard is defined as any orchard with more than 150 to 180 trees per acre.

98 Donald Wyman (1904–1993) served as the Arnold Arboretum’s chief horticulturalist. He traveled throughout the world collecting plants and wrote the series “Shrubs and Vines” for American Gardens and Wyman’s Gardening Encyclopedia.
buildings, has remained the same for several hundred years. The gradual maturing of the untended nursery stock and general encroaching successional vegetation has reduced the interior views and altered the open landscape areas somewhat, but not irreversibly.99

Landscape Characteristics

As defined by the National Park Service, “Landscape characteristics are the general distinguishing traits and qualities of the landscape, both tangible and intangible. The term refers to culturally derived and naturally occurring processes or to cultural and natural physical forms that influenced the development of the landscape.”100 I used the National Park Service’s methodology for identifying the character-defining features of a cultural landscape to determine and identify the character-defining elements of the Wakefield Estate. Once these features have been carefully documented, this information can be used to determine the historic significance and historic integrity of the site.

The following definitions used in the documentation process are derived from the National Park Service’s 1998 Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports:

Topography: Three-dimensional configuration of the landscape surface characterized by features.

Spatial Organization: Arrangement of elements creating the ground, vertical, and overhead planes that define and create spaces.

Land Use: Organization, form, and shape of the landscape in response to land use.

---

Circulation: Spaces, features, and materials that constitute systems of movement.
Vegetation: Indigenous or introduced trees, shrubs, vines, ground covers, and herbaceous materials.
Views and Vistas: Features that create or allow a range of vision, which can be natural or designed and controlled.
Buildings and Structures: Three-dimensional constructs such as houses, barns, garages, stables, bridges, and memorials.
Constructed Water Features: The built features and elements that utilize water for aesthetic or utilitarian functions.
Small-Scale Features: Elements that provide detail and diversity combined with function and aesthetics.\textsuperscript{101}

\textbf{Character Areas}

I identified seven distinct character areas at the Wakefield Estate. They include: designed gardens, further delineated as: the Front Garden, the Upper Terrace Gardens, the Pelican Terrace Garden, the Grasshopper Terrace Garden, the Rose Garden, the Panel, the Dogwoods, and Dragon Garden; the Nurseries; the Orchard; the Locust Grove; the Farmhouse Gardens; the Agricultural Area; and the Woodlands. (See Appendix C Maps 4.4, 4.5)

\textit{Designed Gardens}

\textbf{Front Garden}

\textit{Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography}

The original construction date for the Front Garden is unknown, although it has been in

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
its present location and configuration since Mary Cunningham owned the property in 1904. Thus far no documentary evidence has been uncovered of a formal garden on the Estate in the location of the present Front Garden prior to that time.\textsuperscript{102} The Front Garden underwent many changes in its documented past. What remained constant were its location, footprint, and the present configuration of garden rooms: the flower garden on the east, the pattern garden in the center, and the so-called wildflower garden on the west. Many features were subtracted and added. Vegetation changed due to preferences of the owners, horticulture conditions, and periods of use by the owners. During the Cunningham ownership period, the Front Garden was a summer garden; during the Binney period, it was a year-round garden; and finally, during the Wakefield period, it was a spring garden.\textsuperscript{103} (See Appendix B Figure 4.1)

The Front Garden is located to the north of the Carriage House and off the southwest corner of the Mansion, west of the mansion drive. Deciduous trees shade the garden on the east and west in the summer months. The interior space of the garden is completely flat. Outside the garden, the land on the south drops off sharply for access to two large cellar doorways on the lower level of the Carriage House. On the east side, the land gradually slopes up to the mansion drive from an exterior footpath that runs along the perimeter hedge. The west and north edge of the garden are level with the interior of the garden.

A formal axial design and focal points delineate the Front Garden while paths and hedges define the architecture of the space. It is a 50 x 100-foot rectangle encompassing three garden rooms: the flower garden, the pattern garden, and the

\textsuperscript{102} Numerous reminiscences of Mary Wakefield, Wakefield Archives.  
wildflower garden.

The garden runs northeast to southwest along the northeast side of the carriage barn and paddock. The boundaries are clearly defined on the east, south, and west sides by a tall perimeter hedge, the Summerhouse, and gate. A shorter hedge defines the north border; its northwest corner boundary is blurred, however, due to the absence of a hedge and a curved path leading to the entry garden.\textsuperscript{104}

\textit{Land Use}

The Front Garden is used for entertainment, relaxation, and education.

\textit{Vegetation}

Deferred maintenance and alterations during the last two decades have left the plant material in poor condition and the planting plan in disarray. The walking paths currently paved with pea-gravel are defined by four redbud specimens (\textit{Cercis candensis}) are in severe decline. A large tulip tree (\textit{Liriodendron tulipifera}), one of the oldest specimens on the property, is in good health in the northwest corner of the garden. Browsing deer damaged the surrounding yew (\textit{Taxus baccata}) hedge, although recent efforts to improve its condition and fence it off in the winter months are beginning to reverse this trend.\textsuperscript{105} Patterned small boxwood (\textit{Buxus}) hedges outlining flowerbeds are in severe decline, but they still define the basic patterns of the garden and can be identified from comparison photographs. Other woody plant materials include Kousa dogwoods (\textit{Cornus kousa}), royal azaleas (\textit{Rhododendron schlippenbachii}), mountain laurel (\textit{Kalmia latifolia}),

\textsuperscript{104} For even greater garden detail, see O’Brien, \textit{Cultural Landscape Report for the Front Garden}.
\textsuperscript{105} After Polly died, much of the plant material was left unprotected from deer during the winter months. In 2010, a system of winter fencing was installed, which cut down on the amount of deer browsing. The plant material has been properly pruned and is beginning to return to better health and form.
rhododendron (Species), lilacs (*Syringa*), and tardiva hydrangea (*Hydrangea paniculata*). Perennials include hostas, golden rod (*Solidago*), Mayapple (*Podophyllum peltatum*), and tiger lily (*Lilium lancifolium*).

**Views and Vistas**

The three-foot-wide, six-foot-tall perimeter hedge and Summerhouse enclosing the east, south, and west sides of the garden imparts a sense of privacy and enclosure. A large tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) and yews (*Taxus baccata*) serve the same purpose on the northwest corner; however, to the east, a three-and-a-half-foot boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*) hedge exposes the garden to the outside and detracts from the sense of enclosure. Tall deciduous trees, both inside and outside the garden, including Carolina silverbell (*Halesia tetraptera*), silk tree (*Albizia julibrissin*), and oaks (*Quercus*) form a shady canopy over the east and west ends of the garden. According to historic photos, there used to be an excellent view of the orchard from the interior of the Summerhouse. A lovely hardy kiwi vine (*Actinidia arguta*) planted by Polly currently obstructs this view.

**Buildings, Structures, and Small-Scale Features**

The Summerhouse (c. 1938) is of post and beam construction, ten feet on each side and eleven feet high, screened in on all sides. The building is in very good condition. A copper sunflower ornament tops the cedar-shingle hip roof at its peak.

A large, custom-built birdbath constructed of rounded fieldstone with concrete dominates the east section of the garden. It serves as a focal point in the garden aligned with the Summerhouse. Other hardscape includes a deteriorating border fence, several sculptural back drops, several cement figures on pedestals, and one decorative gate made of linked iron circles. Many of the wooden features are in poor condition.
Grasshopper and Pelican Terrace Gardens

Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography

Polly Wakefield’s design for formal gardens adjacent to the mansion resembles her Lowthorpe senior thesis, which had envisioned a system of interlocking terraces extended from the Farmhouse on the property.106 Reworked using the Mansion, her design exploited an existing axial garden path that extended from the north face of the Mansion and cut across the descending terraces to the ruins of a former summerhouse. After emphasizing this initial axis by lining it with her dogwood seedlings, Polly created a long cross-axis that spanned the property from its eastern boundary wall adjacent to Brush Hill Road to the western boundary with the property’s lot line.107 She added terraces on either side of a path descending in a stepped fashion on a diagonal axis from the main fountain path to reintersect further west with the fountain allée. Each of these small gardens has a theme: the Grasshopper Terrace contains a large bronze sculpture of a grasshopper; and the Pelican Terrace at one time contained several small pelican sculptures and birdhouses. Garden paths of grass or stone are bounded by yew (Taxus baccata) hedges and a linden (Tilia cordata) hedge and feature some important woody specimens. In the late 1990s, Polly removed grass from this area to reduce maintenance and allow accessibility for her wheelchair.108 (See Appendix B Figure 4.2)

Land Use

According to Polly Wakefield’s notes, in the late nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth century, this area was filled with cherry trees. She reminisced how “her father recounted trips to Milton when the fruit was ripe and how he and his brothers could

107 Max, Catalogue of Features.Wakefield Estate Archives.
108 Ibid
hardly contain themselves in greeting their Aunt and Uncle who lived here, anxious to
dash into the orchard to pick and eat the delicious fruit.” 109 By the time Polly’s father
inherited the estate in 1931, these terraces had been planted with Norway maples,
replacing the old cherry trees as they died off. He had the maples removed in order to
grow hay for his cattle.

Polly created these gardens for entertainment and relaxation. Today these
gardens are used for educational purposes, occasional tours, and parties.

Views and Vistas
The Terraces were designed as individual rooms surrounded by hedges and trees to
create a feeling of intimacy and calm. The Grasshopper Terrace provides lovely views of
the dogwoods below, especially during spring bloom.

Vegetation
Vegetation in the Terrace Gardens includes large trees, honey locust (Gleditsia
triaconanthos), Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa), flowering dogwoods (Cornus florida),
Japanese Stewartia (Stewartia pseudocamellia), and curly willow (Salix matsudana).
Shrubs include red vein enkianthus (Enkianthus campanulatus), hamamelis (Hamamelis
mollis), yews (Taxus baccata), boxwood (Buxus sempervirens), a linden hedge (Tilia
cordata), and roses (Rosa cultivars). Perennials include lilies (Lilium columbianum),
foxfedge (Digitalis purpurea), and vinca (Vinca minor). Vines include a creeping
euonymous (Euonymus fortunei).

109 Mary Wakefield Letters, Box 54 Wakefield Archives.
Structures and Small-Scale Features

There are two fountains in the terraces: a sunken cement fountain that is plumbed, which is the main axis point between the Terraces and the Dogwood and a large bronze bowl that is situated in the Pelican Terrace. Four stone benches surround the sunken cement fountain. Several unique wooden gates are situated throughout the garden. A 12-foot-wide set of stairs leads from the cement fountain south to the Panel Garden. Garden ornaments include the bronze grasshopper and several broken ornamental houses on pedestals.\textsuperscript{110}

Upper Terrace Garden

Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography

Polly Wakefield describes the Upper Terrace Garden and its transformation in her garden notes:

There was a smooth grass terrace on the northern side of the house. Mother had her eye on it for a practice putting green and planted yew hedges on 3 sides but it soon became apparent that “Country Club turf” was beyond our capabilities and we settled for 5 specimen trees. There are now 1 Prunus serrula, 2 Lace Bark Pines (grafted by me in Plant Propagation class at the Arnold Arboretum). The last of 2 cherries has just died but the northern bank planting grows well, after some years of trial and failure. This terrace overlooks the dogwood terraces which block the view of the (neighbor's) brick house.\textsuperscript{111}

A large grass terrace that mimics the rectangular shape of the Mansion lies directly north of the house. A steep downward slope leads away from the Mansion to the terrace area, with steps leading down to the garden from the Mansion house porch.

\textsuperscript{110} The bird swing (see below, in the “Dogwoods” section) was most likely designed by Polly and placed at the end of the Dogwoods.

\textsuperscript{111} Mary Wakefield Letters. Box 54. Wakefield Archives.
The Upper Terrace Garden is flat with a slope to the next terrace below to the north and two nurseries to the east. Visitors enter the garden from the Mansion house side porch or from the driveway.

Land Use
Historically the Upper Terrace Garden was used for entertaining and putting practice. Currently it is used for entertaining, presentations, and tours.

Views and Vistas
The Upper Terrace Garden is directly below the former first-floor study of Kennard and Polly’s second-floor study. The garden was intentionally kept clear of many large plants so that the dogwoods below the Terrace Gardens could be viewed from the house without obstructions.

Vegetation
The Upper Terrace Garden is bordered by a five-foot yew (*Taxus baccata*) hedge to the east and west and a two-foot boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*) hedge to the north. The steep slope between the Mansion house and the turf is planted with cut leaf stephanandra (*Stephanandra incisa*) and Eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*). There are three signature trees on this terrace, two lacebark pines (*Pinus bungeana*) and a paperbark maple (*Acer griseum*). These trees are over thirty feet tall and dominate the garden’s design. One of the lacebark pines has been struck by lightening and is in very poor condition.
Structures and Small-Scale Features

Cement pavers have been set in the lawn to delineate patterns around the signature trees. At the west end of the garden a decorative gate separates the Upper Terrace Garden from the Lattice Nurseries. In 2010 a nine-foot-tall wood and metal fence was documented and removed from this area due to its deteriorated condition. Polly built this fence to keep her dogs from roaming the property.

The Dogwoods

Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography

Polly Wakefield describes creating this feature in her Garden Notes from 1979:

Seeking a place for some of my seedling dogwoods, I planted them beside each flight (of terrace steps) as markers … and that was the beginning of the Terrace Dog Wood, about 1954. These trees were grown from seed I collected in the Arnold Arboretum. The “floridas” were from the yellow fruited “xanthocarpa.” Only one of them produces yellow fruit so each autumn I collect its fruit and plant the seed in hope of creating a stronger strain with this characteristic. It lasts well into the winter when all the other trees are bare. The other trees here are kousa and chinensis seedlings in which there is broad variation in habit of growth, size of fruit and bracts, etc. Seedlings and vegetative propagants from them grow in the Nursery and Rose Garden for further comparison and experiment. Controversa and Alternifolia and others grow near by. 112

“The Dogwoods” refers to the lines of Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa) planted along the terrace paths in a linear pattern that begin at the property line near Brush Hill Road and run down the property to the sheep barn. The dogwood trees are planted linearly in patterns throughout the lower terraces. The spring bloom display is spectacular. These trees represent a unique divider of land as well as Polly’s interest in propagating dogwoods. (See Appendix B Figure 4.3)

112 Ibid
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Land Use

The Dogwoods are used for education, research, enjoyment, and occasional tours.

Views and Vistas

The views along the dogwood allée are particularly highlighted in seasonal displays of spring bloom and winter interest with delicate branching and camouflaged bark. The arching branches create a cathedral-like effect and draw the viewer’s eye to the end of the rows with hardscape features including a large vase, Polly’s bird swing, and custom-made gates.

Vegetation

A description of Polly’s Kousa dogwood collection appears in the Arnold Arboretum’s Silva magazine:

Polly experimented with many cultivars of Kousa dogwoods. Within her garden there are several acres of Chinese dogwoods grown in an orchard-like setting that celebrate her patience and hint at a certain stubborn single-mindedness. It was during her first Arboretum propagating class in 1956 that her fascination with this woody species began. By the 1970s she had introduced and patented several cultivars including “Greensleeves,” “Moonbeam,” “Moon-light,” “Silverstar,” and “Twinkle.” In the recently published “Dogwoods,” Polly’s “Greensleeves” is ranked as “one of the very best C. kousa cultivars available.”113

These dogwoods are currently being researched to determine each cultivar based on factors that include leaf, flower and fruit size, shape and color, and Polly’s handwritten notes and drawings.

Structures and Small-Scale Features

Hardscape features in the Dogwoods include small sculptural elements such as custom-made gates with hexagonal patterns and some wood and tin lanterns that are no longer

---

operational. Polly designed a bird swing complete with bells that was placed at the end of the Dogwoods as a unique landscape feature. Whether or not birds actually used it is unclear.

**Dragon Garden**

*Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography*

Polly’s interest in experimenting with “witches’ brooms” or sports was the inspiration for the Dragon Garden. She purchased white pines (*Pinus strobus*) as sports, but after several years they reverted to their original form and grew to their present height of seven feet. The pines are surrounded by a semicircle of Japanese maples (*Acer palmatum*) that Polly grew from seeds. The blending of green and red foliage creates a lovely effect. However, the trees have been severely damaged by top pruning.

The Dragon Garden is a small formal garden just north of the sheep shed and south of the Terrace Gardens. The garden is approached through a wooden arch that is highlighted by a dragon head at each end. The garden is semicircle, 40 x40 feet. Upon entering the space one feels that the garden is to be experienced independently of other spaces. It is surrounded by a metal fence and a seven-foot beautyberry (*Callicarpa americana*) hedge that enhances the feeling of enclosure and calm. (See Appendix B Figure 4.4)

---

114 Witches’ brooms grow on many different woody plant species, especially conifers. They are mutations that consist of tightly congested formations of twigs and foliage, and are generally caused by pathogens and insects. When cuttings are taken from these mutations, new plants can be propagated, usually by grafting, and generally, but not always, display the same characteristics as the original broom.

115 The plant material is currently being rejuvenated through careful pruning and protection from deer.
Land Use

Before Polly designed and constructed the Dragon Garden in the 1970s, this area was part of the orchard pasture. It is currently used for education and public enjoyment.

Vegetation

Polly purchased white pines (*Pinus strobus*) as sports, but after several years they reverted to their original form and grew to their present height of seven feet. The pines are surrounded by Japanese maples (*Acer palmatum*) that Polly grew from seeds. There are also several large cypress (*Chamaecyparis*) in the garden and a saucer magnolia (*Magnolia soulangeana*).

Small-Scale Features

At the center of the garden, a small house on a granite post accentuates the slightly Asian feel of the space. It appears to be replica of a small temple with a small pool of rounded stones below. The garden gate featuring the dragon heads is made of wood. The dragon heads are carved and painted in bright colors.

Rose Garden

*Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography*

According to historic photographs Polly created the Rose Garden between 1960 and 1970 and featured it in her garden tours starting in the early 1970s.

The Rose Garden is flat, 30 yards long and 10 yards wide. Originally, a double row of roses framed the western end of this formal garden’s principal east-west axis.

Polly Wakefield reinforced the allée with a double row of dogwoods. In a journal entry from 1974, Polly rhapsodizes about how delightful it is to sit in the Rose Garden and
catch glimpses of the sheep in the neighboring pastures. At that time, sheep grazed in the open pasture on either side. A row of white pines was later planted behind the southern row of dogwoods.\footnote{Max, \textit{Catalogue of Features.}} The Kousa (\textit{Cornus kousa}) dogwoods, now mature trees, heavily shade the roses to the extent that that only a few survive. (See Appendix B Figure 4.5)

\textit{Views and Vistas}

The long and slender form of the Rose Garden draws the viewer’s eye to the large terra cotta vase on a pedestal at the end of the garden. In the spring when the dogwoods are heavy with blossoms the effect is stunning. Views on either side of the allée are of dogwood nurseries that are overgrown. Many of the trees in this section are in poor condition and slated for removal.

\textit{Vegetation}

The existing roses do not receive enough sunlight to bloom and have not been identified. Boxwoods (\textit{Buxus sempervirens}) are scattered throughout the allée. Ground cover consists of pachysandra (\textit{Pachysandra terminalis}) and English ivy (\textit{Hedera helix}). Kousa dogwoods (\textit{Cornus kousa}) line the allée. There is a grouping of hollies (\textit{Ilex crenata}) at the terminus of the garden behind the large vase on the pedestal.

\textit{Small-Scale Features}
At the end of the Rose Garden there is a large vase on a pedestal and a wooden bench. A brightly colored custom gate is at the opposite end of the allée. A wire fence lines both sides of the allée but is badly damaged and missing some historic wooden features.

The Panel and Brook Garden

Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography

The Panel is an element of Mrs. Wakefield's design and provides the terminus of the fountain path. A large ginkgo tree is the focal point of the Panel, along with a foursquare planting of dawn redwood (*Metasequoia glyptostroboides*), and both sides are framed by a hedgerow of mountain laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*). On the north side of the Panel Garden is an old stone wall that defines the Brook Garden, a small garden that Polly planted in a vernal stream. (See Appendix A Figure 4.6)

The Panel and Brook Garden slope gently from the Terrace Gardens to the northern edge of the property.

Views and Vistas

The Panel and Brook Garden are situated at the bottom of the terraces. The fountain path above provides excellent views of these gardens. Views from the Panel to the Terraces above highlight the axial design of the garden.

Vegetation

This area affords some of the most interesting plant material on the property. Besides the dawn redwoods (*Metasequoia glyptostroboides*) there is a giant sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*)—a very unusual plant in New England, not considered very cold hardy—and a spectacular row of parrotias (*Parrotia persica*), in excellent
health. Finally, there is a unique and lovely dove tree (Davidia involucrata) specimen, obtained from the Arnold Arboretum. Other tree specimens include evodia (Evodia danielli), Carolina silverbell (Halesia carolina), paperbark maple (Acer griseum), Japanese tree lilacs (Syringa reticulata), and golden rain trees (Koelreuteria paniculata). There is also a fine collection of viburnums (Viburnum), rhododendrons (Rhododendron), kalmias (Kalmia latifolia), and leucothoe (Leucothoe fontanesiana).

Small-Scale Features

A stone wall delineates the Panel from the Brook Garden. There are also several large stone benches in this area of the garden.

Orchard

_Creation, Spatial Organization, Circulation, and Topography_

The Orchard predates Polly and is mentioned in several agricultural reports for the property beginning as early as 1780. Whether or not the Orchard was in its existing configuration cannot be confirmed before 1930.

The Orchard runs parallel to the lane from the Carriage House to the Striped Nursery. There are five rows of trees, each containing ten trees that are planted twenty feet apart. The orchard slopes slightly from the lane toward the wetland that borders it on the north side. (See Appendix B Figure 4.7)

Views and Vistas

---

Agricultural reports state that cider was being produced on the property as early as 1780. 1780 Massachusetts Valuation Massachusetts General Court Committees on Valuation. 1780. Massachusetts State Library, microfilm, box 375.
The Orchard can be viewed from the lane that accesses the Farmhouse and the Red Cottage. The Orchard represents a divide between the formal areas surrounding the Mansion house and the more informal areas around the Farmhouse and the Red Cottage. According to documentary evidence, the wetland just below the Orchard was maintained as a pond and used by Polly to water her plantings.

**Land Use**

Historically the Orchard was used for harvesting fruit and cutting hay. Currently the Orchard is used for grazing sheep and a llama.

**Vegetation**

Fruit tree varieties in the Orchard include apple (*Malus domestica*), pear (*Pyrus*), and crabapple (*Malus sargentii*). Originally, all of the pear, apple, and crabapple tree cultivars in the orchard were "standard" trees. Over the past ten years, dead trees have been replaced by dwarf fruit varieties, creating an orchard setting that lacks coherence. Many of the old fruit trees are in serious decline.

The Orchard is bounded by a row of large Norway maples (*Acer platanoides*) along the lane. The old wetland bounding the Orchard to the north is overgrown with invasives, with the exception of a large mulberry tree (*Morus alba*), native flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*), a katsura (*Cercidiphyllum japonicum*), curly willow (*Salix matsudana*), and redosier dogwood (*Cornus sericea*).

---

118 Standard apple trees—large old apple varieties—were the only choice of size before the smaller hybrids were developed. Standards require more space and are a bigger job to prune and harvest. They can grow to 25–30 feet or taller if left un-pruned. Standard fruit trees reach full size between 25 and 30 feet.
Buildings, Structures, and Small-Scale Features

Two buildings stand at edge of the Orchard, a small llama shed (2011) and a shed used for the storage of tools and animal feed. A post and rail fence installed in 2010 surrounds the Orchard.

Nurseries

Creation, Spatial Organization, and Topography

There are several nurseries throughout the property: the Lattice Nurseries, the Striped Nursery, the Zebra Nursery, and the Lower Dogwood Nurseries. Polly used these nurseries to grow stock before she planted it into the landscape. She put these nurseries in any part of the landscape that was not previously wooded. These included all of the fields that were formerly hay fields. Two of the largest nurseries are the Lattice Nurseries, just northwest of the Mansion house above the Terrace Gardens. Documentary evidence shows that these were some of Polly’s first nurseries, where she cultivated a large variety of unusual plants that needed special care. (See Appendix B Figure 4.8)

The Dogwood Nurseries were planted later on both sides of the Rose Garden. Initially, Polly Wakefield planted baby trees (one note from 1967 refers to “contracting a man to help plant 1500 trees”) to qualify as a tree farm in order to make the land less inviting to road builders (as eminent domain, probably in relation to the proposed Southwest Expressway). Documentary evidence suggests that Polly may have grown nursery stock for commercial growers, but ultimately she had some trouble surrendering
particular prized specimens, leaving large collections of trees to eventually mature beyond the appropriate age for transplantation. While the Nurseries represent a truly unique aspect of the landscape, most of the trees have grown beyond a transplantable condition, and many are poorly formed due to the cramped growing conditions.

Vegetation

The Lattice Nurseries contain a variety of woody plant material, including Japanese maple (Acer palmatum), black walnut (Juglans nigra), blue spruce (Picea pungens), holly cultivars (Ilex), silk trees (Albizia julibrissin), false cypress (Chamaecyparis pisifera), Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa), crabapple (Malus) varieties, lilac (Syringa vulgaris), and smoke bush (Cotinus coggygria).

The Dogwood Nurseries contain many unidentified Kousa dogwood (Cornus kousa) cultivars and some native dogwoods (Cornus florida). The Striped Nursery contains dogwoods (Cornus kousa), Korean maple (Acer koreana), castor aralia (Kalopanax septemlobus), magnolia (Magnolia soulangeana), and Korean evodia (Evodia daniellii).

The Zebra Nursery contains mostly Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa) in poor condition.

Small-Scale Features

A lattice fence surrounds the Lattice Nurseries, and a post and rail fence borders the Striped Nursery.

---

119 Max, Catalogue of Features.
Walnut and Locust Grove

Creation, Spatial Organization, and Topography

According to John Hurley, the planting of locust and walnut trees for harvest allowed Polly to apply to the state for an agricultural preservation restriction for the property.

A large flat field south of the entrance lane consists of trees grown for harvesting, and the layout clearly expresses that. Visually, this area is set off from the other areas near the house, separated by the entrance drive and fence. A series of dirt pathways leads to the mulch pile, and a trail along the back of the property running parallel to the Montessori school leads to the back of the Farmhouse and the Woodlands. (See Appendix B Figure 4.9)

Vegetation

This area consists of a variety of trees, including Norway maples (Acer platanoides) allee, spruces (Picea pungens), and several Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa); there are also rows of pines (Pinus strobus), black walnuts (Juglans nigra), locusts (Robinia pseudoacacia), and cork trees (Phellodendron amurense).

Land Use

The Walnut and Locust Grove was used as a growing area for nursery stock. Today the area is used to store mulch and compost. It is also used for educational purposes and special event parking.

120 John Hurley worked for Polly for more than forty years as the caretaker of the property. Interviews conducted and recorded by Liz Vizza. Wakefield Archives.
Structures and Small-Scale Features

The Walnut and Locust Grove is delineated from the lane by a post and rail fence. There is also an old barn foundation in this area.

Farmhouse Gardens

Creation, Spatial Organization, and Topography

Polly originally designed the Farmhouse Gardens in a formal pattern based on her work at the Lowthorpe School. Today these gardens are barely visible, with the exception of the delineation of pathways with cement pavers. While Polly lived in the Farmhouse, she focused her design efforts on these gardens. She created formal gardens, much less elaborate than her Lowthorpe thesis, around the Farmhouse, using many features she would later use in the Front Garden and the greater landscape, such as axial design, unique diamond finials, and a trio of bear cub statues. Most likely these gardens were never completed. When Polly’s mother died she and Kennard moved into the Mansion house and Polly’s design efforts were focused on creating the gardens there. (See Appendix B Figure 4.10)

Views and Vistas

Views and vistas from and toward the Farmhouse Garden are limited due to growth of surrounding plant material.

Vegetation

The vegetation surrounding the Farmhouse consists of lilac (*Syringa vulgaris*), several Kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*), honey locust (*Gleditsia triacanthos*), tulip tree
(Liriodendron tulipifera), oak (Quercus), and Carolina silverbell (Halesia carolina). There are also several red cedars (Juniperus virginiana) at the front of the Farmhouse.

**Buildings, Structures, and Small-Scale Features**

There are two buildings in the Farmhouse Gardens, the Farmhouse and the Garage. There are several spectacular stone walls extending from the original front entrance of the Farmhouse south toward Blue Hill Avenue.

**Agricultural Zone**

**Creation, Spatial Organization, and Topography**

The Agricultural Zone is a piece of land that runs between the Farmhouse and the red cottage down to the southern end of the property. This lot is delineated on several historical maps as a separate parcel.

**Land Use**

This area was used for farming since the purchase of the land in 1707. It was later leased to farmers. Polly and her husband Kennard lived in the farmhouse until her mother’s death in 1952 when they moved into the Mansion house. Currently this area houses the chicken shed, a high-density apple orchard, and raised garden beds. It is used for agricultural and educational purposes. Because the area contains a small pond it is often used for classes about ecosystems. (See Appendix B Figure 4.11)
Vegetation

Vegetation in this area ranges from large trees to shrubs and perennials. Plant material includes Kousa dogwoods (Cornus kousa) in several locations, a line of red cedar (Cedrus virginiana) trees along one of the old stone walls, honey locust (Gleditsia), Norway maple (Acer platanoides), oak (Quercus), and tulip trees (tulipifera). The row of cedars divides two northward sloping lawns to the woodland below.

Buildings, Structures, and Small-Scale Features

There are two buildings in the agricultural zone: the red cottage and the chicken barn. Hardscape includes a series of old stone farm walls separating the pasture areas. Hardscape and water features include a small brook that flows behind the Farmhouse leading to a small pond that is currently overgrown with invasive species and a few plantings surrounding it. Several intact stone walls that were built for the original farm line the now-closed original entrance to the Farmhouse from Route 130.

Woodlands

Creation, Topography, and Spatial Organization

The old roads that originally linked the Farmhouse to Route 30 (Blue Hill Avenue) are still visible. The Woodlands slope gently from the Farmhouse to the northwestern edges of the Wakefield property. The Woodlands contain a series of trails, stone walls, and a brook that runs south to north. (See Appendix B Figure 4.12)
Land Use

This area was probably a farm field at one time or used for grazing. The fact that it is often flooded in the spring and fall may have been the reason that it was allowed to lie fallow.

Vegetation

Vegetation in the Woodlands varies from large trees to native plants and invasives. Trees in this area include maple, Carolina silverbell (*Halesia tetraptera*), oak (*Quercus*), pine (*Pinus*), and eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*). Shrubs include honeysuckle (*Lonicera*), wild rose (*Rosa*), and bittersweet (*Celastrus orbiculatus*).

Buildings, Structures, and Small Scale Features

There is one building in the Woodlands: the staff shed, approximately 12 x 12 feet, made of wooden shingles with a tarpaper roof. There are many stone walls throughout the Woodlands, lining the edge of the property and the former road.

Significance and Integrity

The period of significance begins in 1706 with the purchase of the land by John Davenport and continues for three centuries into 2004 (when Polly died) and the present. The Wakefield Estate served as a family farm in a rural American landscape under the first three generations of Davenports. John Davenport established the property by purchasing several parcels of land and combining them to create the early representation of the farm. Under the succeeding two generations throughout the
eighteenth century, the property and its agricultural operations grew as the family gained more acreage and wealth. At the turn of the nineteenth century, wealthy Boston merchant Isaac Davenport developed stronger ties to the city of Boston and gained a more elevated social and financial standing. At this time the Estate developed into a country seat, as Isaac constructed a grand country house on the property that mirrored his increasing wealth and status as it eclipsed the Estate’s Farmhouse in style, size, and amenities.

Sometime after the addition of the Mansion house, the landscape began to change in relationship to the house. The formal Front Garden was added along with many large signature trees at the Mansion house drive and entranceway. Polly continued the tradition by adding several designed gardens and signature trees, many from the Arnold Arboretum.

Thus the Estate represents an early extant real property in Milton that remained in one family for almost three centuries. Its cultural landscape is characterized by a rich and often dense overlay of resources from individual periods. The complexity and diversity of the landscape is itself an important characteristic contributing to its unique historic value.

The Wakefield Estate maintains a high level of historic integrity according to the qualities of integrity outlined by the National Park Service. They are:

Location: The place where the cultural landscape was constructed.

Design: The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of the cultural landscape.

Setting: The physical environment of the cultural landscape.
Materials: The physical elements that were combined or deposited during the period of significance in a particular pattern or configuration to form the cultural landscape.

Workmanship: The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during the period of significance.

Feeling: The cultural landscape’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of the historic period.

Association: The direct link between the important historic event or person and the cultural landscape.\(^{121}\)

Location: Although the surrounding landscape has been altered over the years because of development, the Wakefield Estate has maintained the original configuration of land surrounding the Farmhouse and Mansion house since the land was purchased in 1707.

Design: Character-defining elements of the Estate that articulate its significance and these qualities of integrity include existing buildings: the Farmhouse (ca. 1707), Mansion house (1794), and the Carriage House (1860). Roads and paths include woodland paths lined with stone walls that represent the original entrance to the 1707 Farmhouse from the main road. These roads and paths are still intact although they are no longer used. The Orchard has maintained the same configuration for more than 100 years.

The grand entrance drive with specimen trees typical of many country estates in the nineteenth century and the lane have remained intact since their inception. During the Wakefield ownership, many elements of the landscape were consciously designed or laid out according to design principles by amateur landscape architect and horticulturist Polly Wakefield; these maintain their original configuration and plant material.

Setting: Although the Wakefield Estate has fluctuated during its 300-year history, the original parcel purchased in 1707 is extant in the current configuration. Milton has grown

up around the Wakefield Estate, yet the setting remains intact, strengthened by the buffer of wooded areas on all sides.

Materials: From the historic buildings on the Estate to the various designed landscapes the Wakefield Estate’s high level of workmanship and the preservation of that workmanship over time represents an important contributing factor to the landscapes level of integrity. The buildings maintain their original form with the exception of one addition on the Mansion house. The gardens maintain their original form although some of the plant material has changed over the years.

Feeling: Perhaps the most important quality of the Estate today is the historic feeling that is reflected in the layers of history that are revealed as the visitor circulates through the Estate; the historic character-defining features are present and dominate the overall sense that this place represents a passage through time that began three hundred years ago. Polly Wakefield made a conscious effort to protect these historic layers as she developed her designed gardens and nurseries in areas of the property that did not contain strong traces of her families past.

Currently the trustees, staff, preservation professionals and other stakeholders are grappling with the decision to apply for National Historic Landmark status. Until the programmatic goals are more carefully articulated for the future of the property a nomination form will not be submitted.
Chapter V

PRESERVATION MANAGEMENT AND TREATMENT PLAN

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the preservation management plan is to provide a detailed document for the care of the landscape of the Wakefield Estate. The plan sets standards for the care and maintenance of the plant collection and aims to maintain historic features, improve the condition of the existing collection, accession new plants and replace declining plant material. This preservation approach focuses on protecting the character identifying features of the landscape while allowing for new use: a public facility.

Management Approach

There are five landscape management areas identified in this document. They include The North Lot (1), The South Lot (2), The Farmhouse Lot (3), The West Lot (4) and The New Lot (5). (See Appendix C Map 5.1).

Management Priority

Zones are designated as “high”, “medium” or “low” priority based upon their current condition. Priorities may vary annually, depending on special projects, particular landscape issues (e.g., pest outbreaks, winter damage, etc.) and larger organizational needs. (See Appendix C Maps 5.2-5.6)

Management Intensity

The amount of resources (staff time, equipment and materials, team support, etc.)
needed to maintain a given zone at the desired standard is designated as:

High: Intensive care requirements stemming from history, design, visual prominence or care needs.
Moderate: Areas comprising tree collections.
Low: Natural areas requiring lesser amounts of care.

Area Profile

A general profile of each area describes distinguishing characteristics, unique resources, history and special challenges.

Annual Care Plan

All tasks needed to maintain an area are listed by season, in descending order of priority.

Treatment

According to Charles Birnbaum in *Protection of Cultural Landscapes*:

Treatment may be defined as work carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal--it cannot be considered in a vacuum. There are many practical and philosophical factors that may influence the selection of a treatment for a landscape. These include the relative historic value of the property, the level of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, its historic significance and integrity, historic and proposed use (e.g. educational, interpretive, passive, active public, institutional or private), long-and short-term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g. accessibility, fire, security) and costs for anticipated capital improvement, staffing and maintenance. The value of any significant archeological and natural resources should also be considered in the decision-making process. Therefore, a cultural landscape’s preservation plan and the treatment selected will consider a broad array of dynamic and inter-related considerations. It will often take the form of a plan with detailed guidelines or specifications.\(^{122}\)

As a significant cultural landscape, treatment recommendations should be consistent with the 1992 Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the treatment of historic properties. These standards specify four distinct, but interrelated approaches to the treatment of historic properties, Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction. The Secretary’s 1996 Guidelines for the treatment of cultural landscapes further defines the application of these treatments. Four alternative treatments are described below. Treatment is based on historic documentation, existing conditions, significance and integrity. Other considerations include feasibility, maintenance requirements, interpretation, public access and safety, environmental sustainability, cost, and operations.

All of the recommended treatments for the Wakefield Estate are a combination of preservation and rehabilitation. Minimal alterations consist of replacement of declining plant material with in-kind species. As noted by Birnbaum:

Preservation involves the least change, and is the most respectful of historic materials. It maintains the form and material of the existing landscape. Rehabilitation usually accommodates contemporary alterations or additions without altering significant historic features or materials, with successful projects involving minor to major change.123

**Long-Term Projects/Tasks:**

Projects and tasks to be accomplished by garden staff, within the annual operating budget, are listed for each zone within a three-year time frame. These include landscape improvements, plant acquisition, vegetation management, and pest and disease abatement.

123 Ibid.
Capital Projects:

These larger projects require capital investment outside the operating budget. They include hardscape design and construction, irrigation and other projects to be completed within 3-5 years.

Noxious Weeds, Pests and Diseases:

Extant weed species requiring management. The Wakefield Estate will use organic weed control whenever possible. Pests and diseases that are currently a problem or may be in the future. 124

North Lot (1)

Area Profile

The North Lot consists of the land surrounding the (1794 c.) Mansion house and Red Carriage house (1860). This landscape includes designed gardens, nurseries and the orchard. Many of the Wakefield Estate’s designed historic landscapes are situated in the North Lot. These areas are also home to many of the unique surviving tree specimens acquired from the Arnold Arboretum during Polly’s lifetime. (See Appendix C 5.2)

1.1 Entrance
1.2 Red Carriage house and paddock

124 For further details on the management of pest and diseases see: Deborah Merriam, Wakefield Estate Pest and Disease Management Chart, 2012 (Wakefield Estate Archives)
1.3 Front Garden
1.4 Upper Terrace Garden
1.5 Dragon Garden
1.6 Dogwoods
1.7 Pelican and Grasshopper Terrace
1.8 Nurseries
1.9 Brook Garden and Panel Garden
1.10 Rose Garden
1.11 Orchard
1.12 Brush Hill Road frontage

1.1 Entrance

*High Priority/High Intensity*

**Area Profile and History**
The property's entrance drive is a classic, small-scale New England tree-lined gravel road (the lane). A circular mansion drive connects the mansion house to the lane to the south and exits on to Brush Hill Road to the east. Mature deciduous trees are essential features of the space and of the experience of being invited into the oasis of a rural estate retreat.

**Special Priorities**
Visitors enter the Estate via the lane from Brush Hill Road. Visitors either proceed to the Farmhouse or parking lot on the south side of the lane. When entering the property via the main gate the entry provides the first glimpses of some of the designed landscape features of the Estate. This area is a high priority maintenance zone.

**Annual Care Plan.**

**All Seasons**
• Keep lawns mown and paths free of weeds.
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulch areas around signature trees.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Report needs for additional tags to plant records department.

**Spring**
• Fertilize rhododendron (*rhododendron*) by the Mansion house.
• Aerate all grass areas to prevent soil compaction. (Or Fall)
• Apply soil amendments, if needed.
• Remove leaf litter from shrub beds.
• Edge and apply mulch to shrub beds so as to provide uniform coverage at depth of 2”.
• Create mulch rings around trees. Apply mulch at a depth of 2” to all trees.
• Top dress and seed lawn areas where needed.
• Prune privet hedge to historic height of 3’.
• Add additional ground cover to pachysandra (*P. terminalis*) beds along the driveway.
• Prune forsythia (*Forsythia x intermedia*) hedge to 3’.
• Remove deer fencing and document deer damage if any.
• Spray oaks (*Quercus*) for winter moth and hemlocks (*Tsuga canadensis*) for wooly adelgid.
• Remove Carolina silverbell (*Halesia tetraptera*) seedlings in entranceway.

**Summer**
• Monitor soils for moisture.
• Preempt drought stress with irrigation, if necessary.
• Mow lawns surrounding mansion house weekly.
• Prune yews (*Taxus baccata*) to 6’.

**Fall**
• Wrap rhododendron(*Rhododendron*) and yews (*Taxus baccata*) with deer fencing.
• Aerate all grass areas.
• Apply soil amendments, if needed.
• Fertilize turf.
• Remove leaf litter from shrub beds and lawn.
• Top dress and seed lawn areas where needed.
• Cut back herbaceous material.
• Install pathway markers for snow removal.

**Winter**
• Prune deadwood.
• Snow removal when necessary.
• Prune Kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousas*) along the lane.
• Prune Norway maples (*Acer platenoides*) and red oaks (*Quercus rubrum*) along the lane.

**Treatment**

In order to provide better public access to the Wakefield Estate it is necessary to accommodate a bus turn-around near the Brush Hill Road entrance. Currently buses pull into the driveway, pull along side the fence then back up on to the busy street. This process is dangerous and is causing damage to the large deciduous trees along the lane.

Buses can enter through the main gate then proceed to the Walnut Grove where a bus turnaround can be implemented in the compost area. This area lacks important character defining features of the property therefore it is a good place to add necessary improvements.

Because of heavy compaction caused by cars and buses, the lane should be aerated and the lines of driveway should be reestablished. Understory plantings will benefit soil condition and keep vehicles away from the root systems of the historic deciduous trees along the lane.

**Long-Term Projects and Tasks**

• Remove damaged and dangerous barbed wire fencing that runs parallel to Brush Hill Road.
• Provide under story plantings in hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*) and beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) grove.
• Supplement entranceway plantings.
• Re-surface compacted driveway with gravel to prevent runoff and erosion.
• Replace deteriorated wood fencing along the road.
• Provide garden interpretation and entrance signage.
• Renovate lilacs (*Syringa vulgaris*) along Brush Hill Road. Replace specimens in poor condition.
1.2 Red Carriage House and Paddock

High Priority/Medium Intensity

Area Profile
The Red Carriage house and paddock are significant historic features of the Wakefield Estate. The Carriage house was built in 1860, is in excellent condition and is currently being considered as the visitor’s center and education building. It currently functions as the maintenance garage.

Located adjacent to the lane, at the rear of Carriage house, this area may have functioned as a paddock from the time the Carriage house was built. Beginning in the 1950’s Polly Wakefield used the paddock for her sheep. During the period that she raised sheep, she created two ramps so that the sheep could exit the rear of the Carriage house where they were kept in the winter months. Later, Polly used the paddock as a holding nursery for plants.

Today the plant material planted for temporary storage in the nursery has grown to maturity. There is a grouping of Japanese maples (*Acer palmatum*) at the front of the paddock along the lane that are in excellent condition. Some of the other plant material in the paddock is in poor condition.

Annual Care Plan

All seasons
• Keep turf well maintained and free of weeds.
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulch areas around trees.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.
Spring
• Document winter damage.
• Remove deer fencing.
• Mulch beds surrounding Red Carriage house.

Summer
• Keep area weed free.
• Prune privet hedge to height of 3’.
• Supply supplemental watering for nursery plants.

Fall
• Install deer fencing.

Winter
• Prune Japanese maples.

Treatment
Reestablish paddock’s historic use as a nursery for plant material that will be moved out into the landscape. It is an excellent site for a nursery, young plants will be shaded by mature trees, the paddock is protected from deer and close to a water source. Document and replace declining and misshapen trees with healthy specimens.

Replacement trees for the collection should be obtained and maintained in the nursery until they can be safely moved into the collection. These trees can be purchased from Arnold Arboretum sources and immediately tagged, accessioned and recorded.

Long-Term Projects and Tasks
Provide interpretive signage.

1.3 Front Garden

High Priority/High Intensity

Area Profile
Located between the Mansion house and the Red Carriage house the Front Garden is
the only significant formal garden component known to pre-date Polly Wakefield’s tenure. Although it has been called by different names and has been home to a variety of vegetation, the layout has remained consistent since the 1920’s.

**Annual Care Plan**

**All Seasons**

• Keep turf well maintained and free of weeds.
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulch areas around trees.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds and around base of trees.
• Report needs for additional tags to plant records department.

**Spring**

• Document winter damage.
• Remove deer fencing.
• Install statues in the garden.
• Weed beds and clean paths of debris and weeds.
• Mulch beds with double ground mulch.
• Reset bricks.
• Fertilize turf.
• Redefine edges of garden paths.
• Fertilize rhododendrons and azaleas.
• Prune wisteria on summerhouse.

**Summer**

• Water as needed.
• Weed beds on a weekly basis.
• Prune yew (*Taxus baccata*) hedge to historic height of 6’.

**Fall**

• Rake beds and remove leaves.
• Install deer fencing.
• Place statues in storage.
Winter
• Prune dead limbs.
• Wrap boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*) in burlap.

Treatment
Documentation of the landscape was completed in 2010 as part of a Cultural Landscape Report. The recommended treatment for the Front Garden in the Cultural Landscape Report is rehabilitation.

Although this is a high priority landscape, the cost of a rehabilitation project is very expensive. Because the mission for the Estate prioritizes education, the rehabilitation project is of medium to low priority. Instead, this management plan focuses on the protection of some of the historic features while recommending the replacement some of the declining plant material with in-kind replacement. Specifically, the replacement of the declining redbud (*Cercis Canadensis*) specimens and some of the boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*) hedges. Recent attempts to renovate the historic yew (*Taxus baccata*) hedge that surrounds the garden has been successful. The hardscape features of this garden are in poor condition and housed in the barn to protect them from further deterioration. Decisions about hardscape treatment are currently being considered.

Long-Term Projects and Tasks
Use historic documents to reestablish this garden as a show garden. Provide interpretive signage.

1.4 The Upper Terrace

*Medium Priority/Medium Intensity*

Area Profile
According to documentary evidence Polly and her mother created the Upper Terrace Garden in 1950. Currently there are three specimen trees that are important to the
collection, a paperbark maple (*Acer griseum*), and two lacebark pines (*Pinus bungeana*).

According to a letter written by Polly:

> There was a smooth grass terrace on the northern side of the house. Mother had her eye on it for a practice putting green and planted yew hedges on 3 sides but it soon became apparent that “Country Club turf” was beyond our capabilities and we settled for 5 specimen trees. There are now 1 *Prunus serrula*, 2 Lace Bark Pines (grafted by me in Plant Propagation class at the Arnold Arboretum). The last of 2 cherries has just died but the northern bank planting grows well, after some years of trial and failure. This terrace overlooks the Dogwood Terraces which block the view of the (neighbor’s) brick house.¹²⁵

The cherry (*Prunus serrula*) has since died and was replaced by Polly with a paperbark maple (*Acer griseum*).

---

**Annual Care Plan**

**All Seasons**
- Keep turf well maintained and free of weeds.
- Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
- Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
- Chip brush on a weekly basis.
- Prune all dead wood within reach.
- Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds.
- Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.

**Spring**
- Remove deer fencing.
- Document winter damage.
- Heavily prune stephanandra (*Sephanandra incisa*) along the side of the mansion house.

**Summer**
- Supply supplemental water as needed.
- Weed beds on a weekly basis.
- Prune yew (*Taxus baccata*) hedge to historic height of 6’.

¹²⁵ Mary Wakefield Letters, Box 50 Wakefield Estate Archives
Fall
• Rake and remove leaves from all beds.

Winter
• Prune lacebark (Pinus bungeana) pines and paperbark maple (Acer griseum) in the Upper Terrace Garden.

Treatment
Recommend replacement of severely damaged lacebark pine (Pinus bungeana) in the garden. These slow growing trees are a unique feature of the landscape. Recommend renovation pruning of the yew (Taxus baccata) hedge that borders the Upper Terrace Garden to the east and west. This hedge has been severely deer browsed over the years and is currently misshapen. If renovation pruning does not improve hedge shape then replacement may be necessary.

Currently the stephanandra (Sephanandra incisa) and barberry (Barberis species) that adorn the hillside between the mansion house and the Upper Terrace Garden is overgrown. The stephanandra (Sephanandra incisa) should be removed and replaced with a suitable alternative.

1.5 Dragon Garden

Medium Priority/Medium Intensity

Area Profile
Polly Wakefield created this unique landscape feature: the Dragon Garden in the 70’s after she became interested in Witches Brooms. Her propagation classes and contact with Peter Ashton of the Arnold Arboretum and other specialists in this emerging field, spurred an interest in propagating her own collection. She planted her “broom” collection in an area she called “The Witches Garden”, adorned with a rustic wooden dragon head gate, which she most likely designed. This feature is comprised of a number of white
pine witches brooms, all of which have reverted to species, and/or suffered the
detrimental effects of poor pruning techniques. Several Japanese maples (*Acer*
*palmatum*), which Polly Wakefield grew from seed, provide the background for this feature.

**Annual Care Plan**

**All Seasons**

• Mulch beds as needed.
• Keep turf well maintained and free of weeds.
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulch areas around trees.
• Weed stone dust path.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds and around base of trees.
• Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.

**Spring**
• Document winter damage and remove deer fencing.
• Remove leaves from Dragon Garden.

**Summer**
• Provide water as needed.

**Fall**
• Remove leaves and debris from nursery and Dragon Garden.

**Winter**
• Renovation pruning of maples (*Acer palmatum*) in Dragon Garden.
• Prune pines in dragon garden.
• Prune beauty berry (*callicarpa*) in late winter or early spring for best berries and form.

**Treatment**
Maintain Dragon Garden in its current state with careful yearly pruning. Replace severely
damaged maples with in-kind specimens. Document and replace deteriorating fencing
and gates surrounding Dragon Garden.  

1.6 Dogwoods

*High Priority/Medium Intensity*

*Area Profile*

Many of the garden paths and axes were lined with Kousa dogwood (*Cornus kousa*) nursery stock Polly had grown from seed or cuttings. Eventually, much of the open pasture on either side of the main axis, extending from the Dogwoods to the Rose Garden, was used to accommodate the abundant propagated stock with the intention that it would be sold, moved or given away.  

Today these gardens are used for occasional functions and education.

**Annual Care Plan**

**All Seasons**

- Remove weeds from all display beds and mulched areas around trees.
- Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
- Chip brush on a weekly basis.
- Prune all dead wood within reach.
- Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.

**Spring**

- Document winter damage.
- Remove deer fencing.
- Remove leaf litter from all beds.
- Mulch beds as needed.
- Weed beds on a weekly basis.
- Prune winter damage.

---

126 Metal sheep fencing was added to this garden by Polly to prevent the sheep from entering the garden. It is not a contributing feature to the Garden.

**Summer**  
• Keep paths free of weeds.  
• Mulch beds.  

**Fall**  
• Rake and remove leaves from beds.  
• Set up deer fencing.  

**Winter**  
• Prune all dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*).  

**Treatment**  
The Kousa dogwoods (*Cornus Kousa*) in this area were planted too close together and have grown to maturity. Because many of these specimens are poorly formed they suffer from severe winter damage. Recommend immediate crown reduction to improve form.  
Develop a strategy for in-kind tree replacement.  

**1.7 Pelican and Grasshopper Terraces**  
*High Priority/Medium Intensity*  

**Area Profile**  
After graduating from Lowthorpe School and assuming residence with her mother in Milton, Polly Wakefield fashioned the existing terraces into a formal Italianate style of parterre with axial paths and terrace rooms.  

**Annual Care Plan**  

**All Seasons**  
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulched areas around trees.  
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.  
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.  
• Prune all dead wood within reach.  
• Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.
Spring
• Document winter damage.
• Remove deer fencing.
• Remove leaf litter from all beds.
• Mulch beds as needed.
• Weed beds on a weekly basis.
• Prune yews (Taxus) and apply lime.
• Prune winter damage.
• Move camellias (Camellia species) from camellia house to the gingko (Gingko biloba) circle.

Summer
• Supplemental watering of curly willow (Salix matsudana).
• Keep paths free of weeds.
• Mulch beds.

Fall
• Rake and remove leaves from beds.
• Set up deer fencing.

Winter
• Prune all dogwoods (Cornus kousa).
• Prune curly willow (Salix matsudana).

Treatment
The yew (Taxus baccata) in this area are severely compromised by deer browsing. Attempts to renovate them have not been successful.

Recommend replacement of yews (Taxus baccata) with in-kind plantings and careful protection from deer in the future. It may be useful to research potential replacements that are deer resistant. Polly often experimented with different kinds of hedges throughout the property. This may be a good area to experiment with different varieties of evergreen hedges. There are several unique tree specimens in this area. They include a curly willow (Salix matsudana) and several stewartias (Stewartia pseudocamillia) that Polly planted. Recommend replacing stewartias (Stewartia pseudocamillia) that are in
severe decline. Recommend careful pruning of curly willow (*Salix matsudana*) and monitoring for improvement. According to historic photos these terrace gardens contained a variety of perennials and roses. Recommend further research on use of perennials in these beds. Use research to make decisions about types of plantings.

### 1.8 Nurseries

**Area Profile**

Polly created many plant nurseries on the Estate. The Lattice Nurseries are between the mansion house and the Terrace Gardens and contain a wide variety of plant material. Other nurseries were created in former pastures and consist primarily of her Kousa dogwood (*Cornus Kousa*) collection.

**Lattice Nurseries**

*Medium Priority/Medium Intensity*

**Area Profile**

These nurseries were built to allow young plants to acclimate to their surroundings for a year or two before being moved into other gardens. The young plants could be carefully monitored and were less likely to be damaged by deer or neglect. As Polly grew older many of these plants were left in the nursery indefinitely. Currently there is variety of plants in these nurseries. Some of the plants are in excellent condition while others suffer from decline or unhealthy growth patterns because of overcrowding and deer browsing.

**Annual Care Plan**

**All Seasons**
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds and around base of trees.
• Report needs for additional tags to plant records department.

**Spring**
• Document winter damage.
• Aerate all grass areas. (Or Fall)
• Apply soil amendments, if needed.
• Remove leaf litter from nursery beds.
• Mulch nursery beds.
• Seed pathways.

**Summer**
• Monitor soils for moisture. Preempt drought stress with irrigation, if necessary.
• Remove weeds in beds.

**Fall**
• Apply soil amendments, if needed.
• Fertilize turf.
• Remove leaf litter from nursery, shrub beds and lawn.
• Top dress and seed lawn areas where needed.
• Cut back herbaceous material.
• Winterize irrigation system.
• Set up deer fencing.

**Winter**
• Prune deadwood and branches.
• Renovation pruning of dogwoods.

**Treatment**
Remove overgrown and declining plant material and add new nursery stock. Replace lattice fencing using historic photographs. Several very large trees should be documented and removed from this nursery. Currently some of this plant material is listed on the invasive list it includes Silk tree (*Albizia*) and Kalapanix (*Castor aralia*).
Lower Nurseries

Medium Priority/Low Intensity

Area Profile
These nurseries consist of Kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*), a row of cork trees (*Phellodendron amurense*) and Japanese maples (*Acer palmatum*).

Annual Care Plan

All Seasons
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Report needs for additional tags to plant records department.

Spring
• Document winter damage.
• Prune and chip broken limbs.

Summer
• Mow in July and August to control invasives.

Fall
• Mow in October to control invasives.

Winter
• Prune trees for health.

Treatment
Many of the dogwoods in these nurseries are contorted and poorly shaped.
Recommend selection and removal of these trees. Once these trees have been removed, several years of renovation pruning may restore them to health. If this effort is not successful recommend documentation and removal. Replant nurseries, leaving more space between specimens. The cork trees (*Phellodendron amurense*) currently listed as invasive are a unique landscape feature and should be properly maintained. Efforts
should be made to remove any cork saplings from the area.

Over the past few years this area is increasingly impacted by flooding from the Blue Hills. Because of the poor condition of many of the tree specimens, new plantings should be considered that are more adapted to wet conditions.

1.9 Brook Garden and the Panel

Medium Priority/ Low Intensity

Area Profile
Although documentary evidence suggests that Polly created the Brook Garden, it is not clear what the intent of the garden was or the plant material it contained. Currently the garden contains tree lilacs (*Syringa reticulata*), kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*), goldenrain trees (*Koelreuteria paniculata*) a few boxwoods (*Buxus sempervirens*).

The Panel Garden is an element of Polly Wakefield’s design and provides the terminus of the formal gardens. A large Gingko (*Gingko biloba*) tree is the focal point of the Panel, along with a four-square planting of Dawn redwoods (*Metasequoia glyptostroboides*) and both sides are frames with a hedge row of kalmias (*Kalmia latifolia*).

Annual Care Plan

All Seasons
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulched areas around trees.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds and around base of trees.
• Report needs for additional tags to plant records department.

---

128 The Brook Garden is mentioned in several letters written by Polly, however the letters do not provide details of the garden, instead it is mentioned as a point of reference.
Spring
• Document winter damage and remove deer fencing.
• Remove leaves from beds.

Summer
• Keep stone wall clear of weeds.
• Mow weekly.

Fall
• Deer fencing of tender plants.
• Rake and remove leaves from beds.

Winter
• Prune tree lilacs (*Syringa reticulata*) and boxwood (*Buxus sempervirens*).

Treatment
Maintain current state until further documentation is uncovered. Make treatment decisions based on historic documents. The Kalmia (*Kalmia latifolia*) hedges that line each side of the Panel are an important character defining element of this garden.

Currently some of the kalmias (*Kalmia latifolia*) are in decline. Attempts to improve health by careful pruning and soil amendments have not been successful. Recommend pursuing this treatment for two more years then consider in-king replacement.

Two of the most unusual tree specimens are located in the Panel Garden. They are the Dove tree (*Davidia involucrata*) and the Giant sequoia (*Sequoiadendron giganteum*). These specimens should be carefully monitored and maintained to ensure long-term health.

1.10 Brush Hill Road Frontage

*Low priority/Low Intensity*

**Area Profile**
This area is a buffer zone between the Estate and Brush Hill Road. It contains a variety
of woody plants and is minimally maintained.

**Annual Care Plan**
- Maintain deer fencing.
- Remove trash that accumulates along the road.
- Remove invasives including poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*) and barberry (*Barberis*).

**Treatment**
Remove dead hemlocks (*Tsuga canadensis*) and replace with disease tolerant species.

Remove all wire fencing along the road. The fencing is in poor condition and is dangerous.

1.11 Orchard

*Medium Priority/Low Intensity*

**Area Profile and History**
The Orchard is an important historic feature of the property. There are records of apple production on the estate as far back as 1780. Whether or not the Orchard has always existed is in its current configuration is not clear. Currently many of the trees are dead or in severe decline. Several dead trees have been replaced with dwarf fruit trees creating a disjointed landscape.

**Annual care**
- Keep fence line free of weeds.
- Clear around base of young trees.
- Maintain fencing on young trees.

**Spring**
- Document winter damage.
- Spray all fruit trees for winter moth.
- Weed bases of trees.
- Fruit selection.
• Fertilize with 10-10-10.

**Summer**
• Provide supplemental watering to young trees.

**Fall**
• Aerate turf in the Orchard.

**Winter**
• Prune for better fruit production.

**Treatment**
Recommend using the Orchard for education and fruit production while maintaining the historic character. Replace the dead trees with disease tolerant heritage varieties. Relocate all dwarf fruit trees to High-density Fruit Orchard and replace with heritage trees. Protect trees from sheep damage. The pond directly below the Orchard has been used for a dumping ground (for leaves branches etc.) for many years. Recommend removal of compost and invasive species, renovation of unique tree specimens that include katsura (*Cercidiphyllum japonicum*), Curly willow (*Salix matsudana*), paper mulberries (*Broussonetia papyrifera*) and red osier dogwood (*Cornus sericea*). Plant wetland plants and maintain as a wetland habitat.

**South Lot (2)** (Appendix C 5.3)

2.1 White Oaks and Pines Woodland
2.2 Compost and Parking Area
2.3 Norway Allee
2.4 Walnut and Locust Grove

2.1 White Oaks and Pines Woodland

*Low Priority/Low Intensity*
Area Profile
The White Oaks and Pines woodland is situated at the corner of Brush Hill Road and Canton Avenue. It is a woodland area with a few trails. It is currently used for education and acts as a buffer zone between the Estate and the busy intersection of Brush Hill Road and Canton Avenue.

Annual Care
• Keep area free of brush and weeds.
• Cut and remove dead limbs and trees.
• Chip brush on a monthly basis.

Spring
• Document winter damage.
• Clear paths of fallen branches.

Summer
• Mow paths

Winter
• Remove dangerous tree limbs.

Treatment
There are some lovely old oak trees in this section that would benefit from careful pruning. Continue clearing invasive species including Norway maples (*Acer platanoides*) and plant native understory species in this woodland.

2.2 Compost and Parking Area

Medium Priority/Medium Intensity

Area Profile
The Compost and Parking Area was created in 2004 to store wood, mulch and leaf litter. It is also used to store tractors and chipping equipment.
All Seasons
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.

Spring
• Remove invasive species

Summer
• Mow weekly

Treatment
Because of this zones high visibility from the lane it is recommended that the mulch and log piles be moved further back from the lane and organized into the compost system. Piles will be organized as fire wood, mulch compost and leaf litter. Equipment should be stored neatly and covered until a structure for equipment is built. All cement and non-compostable should be removed from the property. Recommend using this area for the bus turnaround.

2.3 Norway Allee

Medium Priority/Low Intensity

Area Profile and History
Notes and sketched maps suggest Polly Wakefield planted this allée of Norway Maples (Acer platenoides) as a deliberate design feature, unlike other tidy rows of single nursery stock. These trees have reached maturity and represent an important character defining feature of the landscape.

Annual Care
• Keep area free of weeds and brush.

Spring
• Record winter damage
• Remove leaf litter along the allée.
Summer
• Add mulch to prevent compaction from farm equipment.

Fall
• Aerate pathways.

Winter
• Prune Norways (Acer platenoides) for health.
• Chip brush on a monthly basis.

Treatment
Although Norway maples (Acer platenoides) are considered invasive species, the alee is a unique feature of the landscape and should be maintained in its current state. Once these trees are no longer viable they can be replaced with a native species.

2.4 Walnut and Locust Grove

Low Priority/Low Intensity

Area Profile
Documentary evidence suggests that the planting of locust (Robinia pseudoacacia) and walnut (Juglans nigra) trees for harvest allowed Polly to apply to the state for an agricultural preservation restriction for the property.

Annual Care
• Mow in July and August to control invasives.
• Remove dead trees.
• Chip brush on a monthly basis.

Treatment
Many of the trees in this area are in severe decline. Recommend removal of dead trees and reuse this area for experimental garden plots.
Long-Term Projects
• Remove cork stumps along the back of the property.
• Selective removal of Norway’s along the driveway replace with Kousa (*Cornus Kousa*) dogwoods.

Farmhouse Lot (3) (Appendix C 5.4)

3.1 Farmhouse and Farmhouse Garage
3.2 Red cottage
3.3 Agriculture zone
3.4 High-density Fruit Orchard
3.5 Red cottage Lane and Meadow

3.1 Farmhouse and Farmhouse garage Garage
*High Priority/High Intensity*

Area Profile
The residential landscape around the Farmhouse includes masses of lilacs (*Syringa vulgaris*) and some noteworthy trees such as tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) and honey locust (*Geditsia tricanthos*) and Kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*). The area behind the Farmhouse has many invasive trees and shrubs. The Farmhouse is currently used by staff for offices. This area is heavily used by school groups and staff members.

Annual care
• Keep turf well maintained and free of weeds.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Monitor newly planted accessions, investigate problems, and take appropriate action.
• Chip brush on a weekly basis.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds.
• Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.

Spring
• Document winter damage.
• Spray crabapples for winter moth.
• Remove dead limbs from area.
• Prune honeysuckle (Lonicera) and forsythia (Forsythia cultivars) along the fence.
• Mulch lilac (Syringa cultivars) beds
• Prune lilacs after flowering.

**Summer**
• Keep beds free of weeds.
• Mow weekly.

**Fall**
• Remove leaves from beds.
• Aerate turf.

**Winter**
• Prune crabapples (Malus).
• Prune dogwoods.

**Treatment**

Develop planting plan for Farmhouse Garden and implement.

**3.2 Red Cottage**

*High Priority/Medium Intensity*

**Area Profile**
The Red cottage was built in the 1930’s and currently functions as the caretaker’s house.

The surrounding landscape is used for educational purposes.

**All Seasons**
• Remove weeds from all display beds and mulched areas around trees.
• Provide supplemental irrigation, as needed, to all plantings.
• Chip brush monthly.
• Prune all dead wood within reach.
• Remove all spontaneous woody weeds from shrub beds and around base of trees.
• Report needs for additional tags to the plant records department.

**Spring**
• Document winter damage
• Prune all woody shrubs in the area.
• Clean all beds of leaves and debris

**Summer**
• Mow weekly
• Keep beds free of weeds.

**Fall**
• Remove leaves from beds.

**Winter**
• Prune kousa dogwoods (*Cornus kousa*) and magnolias (*Magnolia soulangeana*) by the Chicken house.
• Place stakes to mark end of drive for snowplow.

**Treatment**
Develop and implement planting plan to improve privacy surrounding the Red cottage.

### 3.3 Agricultural Zone

**Medium Priority/Medium Intensity**

**Area Profile**
School groups use the agricultural zone for picnicking and studying plant communities.

The Chicken house and raised beds are all located in the agricultural zone.

**Annual care**
• Keep area weed free.
• Mow weekly
• Chip brush piles on a monthly basis.

**Spring**
• Record winter damage.
• Mulch beds.

**Summer**
• Remove invasives along the stone walls and below the High-density Apple orchard.

**Fall**
• Mulch raised beds

**Winter**
• Prune large Eastern red cedars (*Juniperus virginiana*) along the stone walls.

**Treatment**
Document and repair historic stone walls.

### 3.4 High Density Fruit Orchard

**High Priority/Medium Intensity**

**Area Profile**
The High-density Apple orchard was created in 2010 in an effort to expand the educational use of the Agricultural zone of the property.

**Annual Care**
• Keep area weed free.
• Mow weekly.

**Spring**
• Spray for winter moth.
• Add 10-10-10 fertilizer.
• Select fruit bloom.
• Prune basil sprouts.

**Summer**
• Weed and mow every two weeks.
• Check for moisture.

**Fall**
• Remove leaves from beds.
Winter
• Prune for maximum fruit production
• Put rabbit guards on trees.

Treatment
Continue to develop this area as a garden for education. Plant native species that attract birds and butterflies. Develop interpretive signage.

3.5 Red Cottage Lane and Meadow
_Low Priority /Low Intensity_

Area Profile and History
This area has many remnants from past including stone walls, a large meadow and a small pond that is currently used for educational purposes.

Annual Care
• Remove broken and dead limbs.
• Mow bi weekly.
• Chip all brush on a monthly basis.

Spring
• Document winter damage.

Summer
• Remove invasives along the stone walls and below the meadow.

Fall
• Remove leaves from beds.

Winter
• Prune red cedars (_Juniperus virginiana_) along lane.

Treatment
There are several large trees in this area that need to be heavily pruned or removed. Dead trees should be removed. Stone walls should be documented and repaired. The Eastern red cedar (_Juniperus virginiana_) trees need renovation pruning. Provide
interpretive signage for this area.

West Lot (4) (Appendix C 5.5)  
Low priority/Low Intensity

Area History and Profile  
The West Lot covers the northwestern and southwestern quadrants of the site. It provides a contrast to the majority of acreage that is garden and cultivated land. Large white pines (*Pinus strobus*) are the major species in the far western edge of the woodland, while red maple (*Acer rubrum*) is predominant in the southwestern woodland area. Remnant cedars in the woods suggest that the woodland was once open field. Stone walls are prevalent throughout the area. There is a brook that bisects the woodland area.

Treatment  

New Lot (5) (Appendix C 5.6)  
Low Priority/Low Intensity

Area Profile and History  
The entrance to the Farmhouse was originally the Old Dedham Road (Currently Canton Avenue). There are remnants of the road, which include several large standing dead sugar maples (*Acer sacharum*) and a stone wall.

Annual care  
• Check for down and dangerous limbs.  
• Chip all brush.
Spring
• Check for winter damage.

Summer
• Clear paths

Winter
• Prune dead limbs
• Chip brush

Treatment
Continue clearing trails. Document stone walls and remove trees that are in danger of causing further damage. Provide interpretive signage.
Chapter VI
CONCLUSION

Historic garden preservation management is a task that requires careful strategic planning. If a garden is going to become a public entity it must be managed in a way that will protect the historic character of the place while allowing public access. The Wakefield Estate is a cultural landscape with wonderful attributes. The goal of this nonprofit is to become publicly accessible to share these qualities, promote educational opportunities and community engagement.

Research for this project included visiting public gardens, parks and arboreta throughout the United States. Many of these public places started out as private estates and transitioned to public entities. The opportunity to speak to staff members about this transition and the management challenges that followed was an important and informative process that ultimately helped me make important and practical preservation decisions concerning the Wakefield Estate. Visiting many different gardens and seeing the implementation of preservation management strategies was also important in understanding how the act of landscape preservation functions on a daily basis. Studying preservation practice through preservation literature and academic discourse provided a strong basis for my understanding of the preservation decision making process however I felt that the garden visits provided an invaluable source of information and led me to think more practically about the management plan. The direct communication with people that are dealing with preservation management on a daily basis and seeing garden preservation management in action provided useful information
that allowed me to make decisions that consider the everyday aspects of management of historic landscapes and include them in my preservation plan. For example: treatment decisions involving some of the designed gardens on the Estate have been given lower priority because of the cost of rehabilitation and the decisions to focus attention on other areas of the property that will be more useful in supporting the mission of education and community engagement. The mission of the Estate prioritizes education over garden rehabilitation therefore the landscape management plan supports the chosen areas of focus while dictating a strategy to protect and manage the historic resources till funding is available for further research and preservation efforts.

Public gardens and arboreta face a multitude of challenges that include environmental, financial, maintenance, and public access just to name a few. Management of these places does not happen in a vacuum therefore it is necessary to develop a management plan that has the flexibility to deal with these issues. Managing a historic landscape adds the additional challenge of working to maintain something “historic” that is constantly growing and changing. New environmental challenges including global warming and invasive species require constant monitoring and adaptation. Plant species that once thrived easily in New England are being challenged by these threats. It is our job as managers of these landscapes to make decisions about how best to deal with these changes. Developing a landscape management plan that has flexibility to adapt to changes will better prepare a garden for these challenges.

The most important lesson learned from garden visits is that a public garden must be relevant to the community it serves and must adapt to changes within that community. The Wakefield Estate has the potential to be an important educational and natural resource for the large urban communities of Mattapan and Dorchester that are just to the north of the property. The decisions by management to focus on education using the
natural resources of the Estate instead of creating a showplace are important decisions that reflect the organization’s willingness to work to engage the local population.

An important element of managing historic landscapes that is not discussed in most of the landscape preservation literature is the financial challenge public gardens face that must also be dealt with strategically. Public gardens must offer something that is unique and sustainable. Over the past five years several organizations published information to begin to address these issues more directly and in greater detail. The Garden Conservancy, The Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation’s Historic Landscapes project are two organizations that are working to promote the understanding of the fiscal challenges that public gardens face. This landscape preservation plan is a result of careful academic research as well as a thoughtful understanding of creating a place that is relevant to the community at large.

The Wakefield Estate has many unique qualities that can appeal to many kinds of visitors. The fact that the Wakefield Charitable Trust’s goal is to open to the public as an arboretum focusing on horticultural experimentation and hands on learning presents unique challenges as well as opportunities. Mary (Polly) Wakefield was a great promoter of horticulture and experimentation. It is the goal of the Trust to continue Polly’s legacy by promoting experimentation on the property. The landscape management plan allows for this new use, using areas of the Estate that Polly used for experimentation to continue that tradition and protecting the designed areas created by Polly but working to improve the deteriorated condition of the plant material and hardscape by in-kind replacement or suitable species replacement.

After conducting a study of the development of the landscape and the existing conditions of the site it became clear that a landscape preservation management plan was necessary to protect the historic elements of the landscape while allowing for a new
use as a public garden. The implementation of the resulting plan will provide a sound background for the development of an overall strategic plan for the site. If the landscape is managed and maintained properly then other elements necessary to allow for public access will be easy to implement and work toward the success of the public entity.

As the new Director of Landscape I will personally be working to implement the landscape management plan to improve the conditions of the existing landscape while maintaining the unique historic qualities that one family created over the last three centuries.
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A. Garden Visits

Bartrams Garden, Philadelphia Pennsylvania
Interview and with Joel Frye, Historian and Archivist

Morris Arboretum, Philadelphia Pennsylvania
Interviews with Paul Meyer, Director and Sarah Levin, Intern

Arnold Arboretum, Boston Massachusetts
Interviews with Pam Thompson, Director of Education and Jen Kettell, Horticulturalist

Temple Ambler Arboretum, Ambler Pennsylvania
Tour and Interview with Grace Chapman, Director of Horticulture

The Woodlands, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Interview with Courtney Allen, Intern

Hay Honey Farm, Gladstone, New Jersey
Interview and tour with Manager, Michael Clayton

Bloedel Reserve, Bainbridge Island, Washington
Tour with docent

Butchart Gardens, Vancouver Island
Tour with docent

Haverford College Arboretum Haverford, Pennsylvania
Tour with Martha Van Artsdalen, Plant Curator

Chanticleer, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania
Tour with docent

Vizcaya Gardens Miami, Florida
Tour and interview with Director of Landscape, Ian Simpkins

Polly Hill Arboretum, Martha’s Vineyard, Massachusetts
Tour with Executive Director Timothy M. Boland

Longwood Gardens Kennett Square, Pennsylvania
Self Guided Tour

Elk Grove Garden, Portland Oregon
Tour with docent

Mt Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge Massachusetts
Tour with director of landscape

Hunnewell Estate, Wellesley, Massachusetts
Tour with Director Walter Hunnewell

High Line New York, New York
Tour with Mike Lampariello Park Operations Manager

Wave Hill, New York
Tour with Scott Canning, Director of Horticulture

Maine Botanical Garden
Self guided tour

Hoyt Arboretum Portland, Oregon
Self guided tour

Lyman Estate, Historic New England, Waltham, Massachusetts
Tour with Lynn Ackerman

Gore Estate, Waltham Massachusetts
Self guided tour
B. Photos
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Figure 4.1 Summer House and Front Garden 1975

Figure 4.2 Terrace Gardens 2011
Figure 4.3 The Dogwoods 2011

Figure 4.4 The Dragon Garden 2011
Figure 4.5 Rose Garden 2012

Figure 4.6 Panel and Brook Garden 2011
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Figure 4.8 Lattice Nurseries 2011
Figure 4.9 Walnut and Locust Grove 2012

Figure 4.10 Farm house Gardens 1955
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Map 3.1
Undated plan of the Estate in Milton and Canton of the heirs of Isaac Davenport showing land on both sides of Brush Hill Road.
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