LANDSCAPE AND SOCIETY IN TWENTE & UTRECHT:
A GEOGRAPHY OF DUTCH COUNTRY ESTATES, CIRCA 1800-1950.

Elyze Agnes Charles Smeets

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
School of Geography

September 2005

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own work and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the School of Geography at the University of Leeds for funding this research project and for its academic support. In particular, I would like to thank my supervisors Robin Butlin and Martin Purvis for their advise, encouragement and critical discussions over the last four years. It has truly been a wonderful experience working with such an amazing team.

Thanks also to the many people who have helped me with gathering information. The estate owners in Utrecht and Twente for allowing me to visit their homes and go through their personal archives. The archivists and librarians for making the search for documentary evidence easier, particular the people at Kadaster Overijssel. The scholars of various disciplines for our interesting discussions on historical geography and landscape aesthetics, especially Hans Renes (my former supervisor at the University of Utrecht) and Adriaan Haartsen (my boss and colleague at Bureau Lantschap).

I would like to thank my fellow students Alison and Hazel for the cups of tea and the talks about geography, PhD’s, and life in general. Thanks for being such good friends.

To my family and friends, thank you for your friendship, encouragement and interest. Special thanks to my parents Jos and Gerdie for always supporting me and believing in me. It is in my childhood, travelling with you, Alexandra and Mervyn through the hills and valleys that I first discovered my love for landscape and history.

I want to dedicate this work to my best friend and husband, Martijn. Thank you for always being there for me, for keeping me calm in hectic times and most of all for your love.
Abstract

The thesis presents new insights into the development, organisation and spatial distribution of country estates established between 1800 and 1950 in the province of Utrecht and the region of Twente in the Netherlands. During this time period numerous country estates were built: in Utrecht almost 100 and in Twente over 80, the majority of which were built for newly wealthy whose origins lay in commerce, finance and industry. In Utrecht the new landowners were largely financial businessmen from Amsterdam, while in Twente the majority were textile industrialists from the region itself.

The emergence of such a group of ‘nouveaux riches’ who chose to invest parts of their new money in the acquisition of land was not confined to the Netherlands, but was apparent in many western European countries, including Britain, Belgium and Germany. The study of Dutch individuals thus represents a particular dimension of a broader change in European society during the nineteenth century, a society that was increasingly marked by processes of industrialisation and urbanisation. The thesis therefore incorporates an international comparison between the textile industrialists in Twente and their counterparts in West Yorkshire, England.

Three key themes structure this thesis, namely ‘landownership’, ‘estate building’ and ‘landscape design’. The first theme deals with who the new landowners were, what enabled them to invest in land and what their motivations have been for such investments. The second theme focuses on the spatial patterning of the new country estates and the manner in which they have been established. The third theme is related to the use made of the land and how the new landowners laid out their properties. Through a geographical approach this thesis aims to bring new insights into the themes and reveal the ways in which they have influenced each other.

This geographical approach is largely based on Dutch and Anglo-American historical-geographical traditions of landscape study, incorporating a variety of methods, techniques and ways of seeing. This meant that the estate landscapes have been studied both as physical entities that can be mapped and as representations of a culture group or individuals. As such the thesis also presents a framework for future research on country estates.
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Chapter 1.
The Geography of Landownership and the Aesthetic Landscape

INTRODUCTION
For many centuries the cultural histories and landscapes of Europe have been influenced by the presence of great landowners. Their landed estates and country houses with parks and gardens formed key points of intersection between practical aspects of economic management and aesthetic landscape design (Figure 1.1), and as such dominated much of the countryside. The power and privileges deriving from landownership often ensured a social and political importance for estates and their owners, and consequently the influence of this kind of landownership was not confined to the borders of the estates. Frequently, great landowners invested in transport improvements, stimulated changes in agriculture and field systems, and restored, built or planned urban settlements, churches, schools and alms houses.

Figure 1.1: One of the statues of the Temple of the Four Winds in the gardens at Castle Howard, East Yorkshire, overlooking the agricultural estate.
Photo by author, July 2002.
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During the course of the nineteenth century many western European countries, including the Netherlands, Great Britain, Belgium, Germany and France, witnessed the rise of a new class of wealthy borne of finance, commerce and industry. These individuals, often referred to as ‘nouveaux riches’, were people for whom land was not their main source of income. It was nevertheless not uncommon that they invested their riches in the acquisition of land, creating a country estate with parks and gardens, sometimes also with agricultural land. Compared to the established elite their landed property was generally less extensive, in part reflecting a change in attitude towards landownership. Country estates of these newly wealthy were more likely to be predominantly recreational in character and often were designed to illustrate the owner’s new status. The nouveaux riches possibly even desired to emulate greater landowners through the creation of fashionable parks and gardens. Economic functions like agriculture, forestry and mining were of less importance; their source of money lay elsewhere, in financial, commercial or industrial enterprises in urban centres. As such these individuals represent one dimension of a broader change in the social, economic and political life of Europe, greatly marked by industrialisation and urbanisation.

Different disciplines like garden history, social-economic history, architectural history, genealogy and geography, have studied the emergence of the newly wealthy and their country estates, asking questions of scale, location, aesthetic design, ownership, economic profit, and recreation. Usually, a particular discipline focuses on a specific aspect of country estates and estate ownership, offering much detailed information of great value. However, such an approach can also result in the fragmentation of knowledge, which is unfortunate as issues of landownership, as mentioned above, are often related. A geographical approach, however, can overcome this problem as ‘(historical) geography is, above all, a hybrid discipline’ (Heffernan, 1997, p. 2), ‘an integrative discipline’ (Hart, 1982, p. 1) that has a tradition of synthesis, of bringing things together. The value of a geographical approach, therefore, lies in the fact that it can combine approaches and data from different disciplines, thereby adding new insights through a spatial view. It focuses upon the ways in which different actors and forces interact in particular places, shaping the character of these places yet at the same time being shaped by them. Furthermore, it explores how developments in a particular place are influenced by wider processes at a regional, national and even international level.

Therefore, by taking a geographical approach, this research will not only look at particular places, but also at the space in which these places appear: the social, economic and political contexts of the region. It furthermore analyses the spatial distribution of various aspects of nouveaux riches landownership, including the developing chronology of country estates’ locations, the employment
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of particular designers and the availability of land. A geographical viewpoint thus enables the researcher to deal with such issues at various scales: from international to local.

1.1 THESIS THEMES AND QUESTIONS

This doctoral project focuses on three broad themes, namely Landownership (the nature and origin of nouveaux riches landowners), Landed Estates (creation, distribution and location) and Landscape (aesthetics and functionality). The thesis’s structure is based on refining these themes and linking them together. For each theme a series of questions have been posed, which will be answered through the course of the thesis.

**Landownership:** Who were the nouveaux riches landowners? What were the means and opportunities that allowed these landowners to invest in land? What were their motivations and aspirations for land investment? How did the emergence of a new elite change the distribution of landed estates? The rise of a new class of landowners (their backgrounds, motivations and opportunities) will mostly be dealt with in Chapter 5.

**Landed estates:** Where were the nouveaux riches estates located? How can this spatial and temporal distribution pattern be explained? What mechanisms have driven changes in this pattern? In what manner did the newly wealthy obtain their own country estate (i.e. by purchasing an existing property or by creating it themselves)? How can the various processes of estate building be explained? These questions are focused upon in Chapter 6. It comprises the regional study and mapping of continuity and change in the spatial and temporal patterns of landownership and landed estates.

**Landscape:** What is the appearance of the estates? Was there a uniformity in design either because land was devoted to different uses within the estate or because particular parts of the estate carried the imprint of landscape design fashions of particular eras? How were new garden fashions diffused? Who were the key players in designing and diffusing new fashions? What choices of designers and designs did the nouveaux riches landowners make? How did these choices relate to broader trends in garden design and to their own social network? Chapter 7 elaborates on these questions.

How was the designed landscape used and experienced by the new landowners? Did the nouveaux riches landowners resemble the established elite in their conspicuous consumption or were they distinctive in a particular way? These issues of landscape use are dealt with in Chapter 8.
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These questions challenge existing ideas about the location, use and appearance of nineteenth and twentieth-century estates by combining issues of landscape, society and taste at different geographical scales. The incidence of newly-created estates and aspects of their landscape design and conspicuous consumption will, for instance, be explored in relation to broader trends in national and international garden design, but also to the diversity in landscapes and the character and social network of the estate owners. Furthermore, instead of only identifying well-known histories of fashions in gardening on a national level, this thesis will also examine the various spatial and temporal patterns of how these new ideas circulated through the different regions and social groups of landowners.

1.2 STUDY AREA

For this doctoral project two particular regions of the Netherlands have been chosen in which new estate development occurred in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, namely the region of Twente and the province of Utrecht (Figure 1.2; Chapter 5). This new estate building was initiated particularly by newly wealthy families with fortunes based on finance, industry and commerce. Whereas in Utrecht the majority of nouveaux riches came from banking and trade, in Twente this group was predominantly from the local textile industry. By choosing these particular regions, this thesis thus incorporates the study of two different kinds of newly wealthy. Another reason for focusing on Utrecht and Twente was that these regions include areas of important estate development within a diverse series of environments (upland, woodland, pastoral agriculture and lowland arable). The differences in landscape, economy and the nature of new landowners, as evident in the two regions, will be explored in more detail throughout the thesis, investigating whether such issues played a role in determining the character and location of nouveaux riches estates.

The Twente industrialists will be further investigated through the comparison with a similar social group in the present-day county of West Yorkshire in England (Figure 9.1; Chapter 9). This comparison aims to explore the motivations, actions and taste in landscape aesthetics of these individuals, revealing whether the Twente industrialists were unique in their actions and choices or whether they resembled other newly wealthy in Europe.

As such the newly wealthy in these Dutch regions are not only interesting in their own respect, but also as a representation of a new group of landowners seen throughout nineteenth-century western Europe. The discussed processes of industrialisation and urbanisation that invoked changes in terms of society, wealth, ownership and political power in these regions also occurred in countries like
Great Britain, Belgium and Germany. The rise of a new landowning elite borne of finance, commerce and industry is therefore an European phenomenon, which gives value to a comparison between different countries. Through the study of Dutch examples and the comparison with an English example this thesis gives detailed insights into the backgrounds, motivations and tastes of such individuals, allowing analyses of the impact of their presence on landscape and society.

It has to be noted, however, that the landed property of *nouveaux riches* landowners was generally less extensive than that of the existing landed elite (both nobility and non-titled estate owners), and that between various European countries the average size of a country estate differed greatly. Within British studies, for instance, an estate has often been described as ‘any land holding of at least 3,000 acres [or 1200 hectares]’ (Bettey, 1993, p. 11). Rubinstein (1981, 1987, 1992) and Cannadine (1990, 1994) have used similar typologies and criteria, and it seems that British research on country estates and landownership focuses largely on landed properties of those proportions. By doing so these scholars exclude from consideration any exploration of the importance of smaller country estates created by the newly wealthy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In particular,
the country estates of merchants, bankers and industrialists who did not rely upon their estate for income, could be relatively small. Yet despite their modest size, these entities had a great impact on the landscape and society as representations of wealth, power, and taste and demonstration of aesthetic value. In general Dutch landed estates were much smaller than their British counterparts, and it appears that the country estates created by the Dutch newly wealthy were particularly small in size, often not bigger than 10 hectares (which has been used as a minimum in this thesis).

The great majority of the estates discussed in this thesis were created by people who have been dubbed ‘nouveaux riches’. This term - and the way it is used in this thesis - needs to be explained. The term originates from France. Simply put, it means ‘newly wealthy’ or ‘new money’. However, in society the term often has a negative undertone, referring to these individuals as vulgarly ostentatious or lacking in social graces. This research distances itself from such a notion that the *nouveaux riches* were necessarily deficient in taste and manners. Instead the term will solely refer to individuals of financially modest means who – over a short period of time – became wealthy through successful business enterprises. In many instances their wealth was not of the same magnitude as that of the landed establishment, but they were certainly much richer than before and much richer than the average businessman.

1.3 INTELLECTUAL CONTEXT: LANDSCAPE IN LAYERS

In studying the development of *nouveaux riches* country estates and their particular aesthetic landscape this research draws on existing approaches to landscape that derive from various schools of historical geography. The field of historical geography has a long tradition of landscape study; indeed, initially it was argued that ‘the purpose of geography [is] to explain the landscape’ (Darby quoted by Williams, 1989, p. 92).

*Landscape as a physical entity*

A fairly traditional engagement with the landscape is still present in the morphological-oriented approach, which puts much emphasis on the cultural landscape as a physical entity that has been made through human agency (Muir, 1998, p. 269). Changes within this landscape were often explained as the result of environmental transformation motivated chiefly by the prospect of economic gain, i.e. taming ‘wild’ landscapes and making them economically more productive and more easily manageable, for example the reclamation and cultivation of fenland, heath and woodland. Within Anglo-American historical geography this approach to landscape was rooted in the pioneering work of such scholars as H.C. Darby, W.G. Hoskins and C.O. Sauer, which will be briefly discussed here.
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The Darby school of thought was identified with an approach in which ‘historic methods and geographic views were organically connected’ (Gottschalk, 1964, p. 37). It heavily relied upon a critical engagement with primary historical sources and fieldwork, and was distinguished by its use of cartography as a source and a way of presenting data (Baker, 1988, p. 8). This was particularly evident in Darby’s seven volumes on the reconstruction of England’s geography in the late eleventh century based on the so-called Domesday Book (1952-1977), his Drainage of the Fens (1940) and the edited books on the historical geography of England (1936, 1948, 1951, 1973). A similar approach is apparent in Lambert (1982) The making of the Dutch landscape: an historical geography of the Netherlands, Baker & Harley (1973) Man made the land and Prince (1967) Parks in England. Of particular interest to this thesis are the works by Lambert and Prince.

Lambert was the first to write a historical geography of the Netherlands in English. She argued that ‘there is much in the country’s past geography to interest students intrigued by the complex interrelationships of man and the land’ (1985, 2nd edition, preface). The study specifically focused on the economic geography of Dutch history. At the time the book was not well-received in the Netherlands and Lambert was much criticised as an outsider who did not understand the processes that had altered the Dutch landscape (ex. inf. Renes, 2004). This is very unfortunate, as the book – despite some faults it might contain – brought Dutch historical geography to a wider, international public. The book’s value in this respect was illustrated by the publication of a second edition in 1985. Since then no textbook in another language than Dutch has appeared about the cultural landscape and geographies of the past in the Netherlands.

An early geographical approach to landownership appeared in Prince’s booklet on the private parks in England since the sixteenth century, in which he noted that ‘parks have become relict features in the present landscape and to account for their survival we must study their history’ (1967, p. 12). His spatial analysis of the parks was largely based on historic maps and the available archival information on professional designers such as Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, Humphry Repton and Richard Woods.

As said earlier, the strength of the Darby approach was the extensive use of archives and fieldwork for geographical interpretation, illustrated by numerous maps. Some points of criticism, however, are the fact that the extent and nature of such analysis depended greatly on the nature of the surviving documentary sources and field evidence, and that the processes of improvement are not being questioned through a broader theoretical engagement with the past, i.e. the analyses of certain
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Landscapes are not situated in productive frames of reference and have not opened up a discussion to more complex readings. Little attention is paid to the so-called ‘dark side of the landscape’ (Barrell, 1983), the fact that some social groups did not profit from these cultivation schemes and that in making new landscapes and new communities you were also destroying older landscapes and communities. Critical notes aside, H.C. Darby and his studies of the English landscape have been of great scientific value and inspired many others to do research in this genre and still continue to do so, although less so today. Students and colleagues of Darby who were influenced by him included A.R.H. Baker, H. Prince, T. Coppock and H. Clout.

The material landscape as a prime focus was also evident in the local or landscape history, advocated most strongly by W.G. Hoskins in his famous book The Making of the English Landscape (first published in 1955), that was followed up by a series of books on the making of the landscape in the various English counties (e.g. The West Riding of Yorkshire by A. Raistrick, 1970).

The various developments that have shaped the English landscape were described in chronological order, using that landscape as the foremost source of information. Fieldwork (landscape as evidence) played an important role and instead of analysing broader geographical patterns (as evident in the Darby strand) landscape history primarily focused on the local features of landscape. Taylor argued that whereas ‘the historical geographer will tend to be interested in sites as illustrations of particular broader principles, […] to the landscape historian the site is in itself sufficient subject for study’ (Taylor quoted by Muir, 1998, p. 264). Landscape history involved detailed analysis of a particular place and often scholars wrote about places they had affection for. Although this ensured detailed knowledge of the place, it could also lead to personal and nostalgic opinions. A critique on Hoskins’ work in particular is that he clearly had a strong dislike for the modern changes in the landscape, and consequently wrote rather negatively about processes of urbanisation and industrialisation: ‘every single change in the English landscape has either uglified [the landscape] or destroyed its meaning, or both’ (Hoskins, 1978, p.8).

We can observe a somewhat different approach to the material landscape in the Berkeley School (University of California) led by Sauer, who drew strongly upon ideas from the German Landschaft geography (Jackson, 1989, p. 10-14). In an early and important paper The morphology of landscape (1925) Sauer argued that ‘the cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, and the cultural landscape is the result’ (quoted by Leighly, 1963, p. 34). The real objective of Sauer’s work on the cultural landscape was to analyse how particular social groups have created distinct forms of landscape. As such it was often preoccupied with regional landscapes and cultural regions, although Sauer did make some
important general statements about the nature of cultural and historical geography (Jackson, 1989; Butlin, 1993; Baker, 2003). The preoccupation with specific landscapes and cultures underpinned various studies in cultural geography, including Meinig (1963) *Shaping of America* and Wagner & Mikesell (1962) *Readings in cultural geography*. At a later stage the morphologic approach of the Berkeley School ‘has been widely assumed by its critics to mean a narrow, atheoretical focus on physical objects in the material landscape. In fact, it refers to a concern with phenomenological shape or form and with the way the world is shaped as place’ (Olwig, 2003b, p. 872; also see below, p. 11).

Modern Anglo-American historical geography in general tends to emphasise ideological and theoretical perspectives upon the past (e.g. Graham & Nash, 2000) and landscape study within this tradition developed important new interests in the immaterial landscape (e.g. Daniels, 1999; see below). However, the study of the interaction between human society and the natural environment is a recurrent theme to this day, as can be seen in the work of contemporary scholars such as Muir (1997, 1999, 2001), Taylor (1998), Williamson (1995, 2000b), Hooke (1998, 2000) and Whyte (2002), and in journals like *Landscape History* (since 1979) and *Landscapes* (since 1999). In fact Williamson occupies a special place within the school of landscape history, as he examines the influence of economic, social and political processes on the development of garden fashions in general and individual gardens in particular. In this manner his work compares to studies by cultural historical geographers including Seymour, Cosgrove and Daniels (see below).

There appears an even stronger traditional landscape approach in continental Europe, notably in Germany (e.g. Nitz, 1974, 1989; Jäger, 1987, 1994) and the Netherlands. Naturally, as a Dutch researcher, I have strongly drawn upon the Dutch tradition. Landscape has formed the main theme in Dutch historical geography for many decades, with a dominating focus on the study of the economic, residential and agricultural functions of the material landscape, for example water management, cultivation schemes and land consolidation by act of parliament (Gottschalk, 1964; Borger, 1975, 1981, 1997; Harten, 1973, 1997; De Bont, 1991; Vervloet, 1984, 1998; Barends et al, 1986; Renes, 1999, 2004). Borger (1981, p. 4) has argued that historical geography should deal with the question of how humans have sustained themselves in a particular environment by investigating the possibilities and limitations of the natural landscape and the alterations within this landscape through human activities. Dutch historical geography thus strongly resembles the Darby school of thought.
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Within this approach particular emphasis is placed on identifying different landscape types, as evident in the textbook *Het Nederlandse landschap. Een historisch geografische benadering* (The Dutch landscape. An historical geographical approach; Barends et al, 1986), and the protection of the various elements and structures within these landscapes that are under threat from urban, industrial, agricultural and recreational developments. Reflecting a national concern to protect the Dutch cultural heritage much applied research has been undertaken since the 1980s to identify and value cultural historic features in the present landscape (e.g. Oversticht, 1999-2002; Renes, 1999; Blijdenstijn, 2005). Such applied research is crucially important for protecting the country’s cultural heritage and for influencing spatial development. The study of landscapes and the elements within it is further exemplified by the journal *Historisch Geografisch Tijdschrift* (HGT; Historical-Geographical Journal) that has been described as ‘the leading magazine on the history of our cities, villages and landscapes’ in the Netherlands (HGT, 2004, www.matrijs.com/). Issues that frequently appear in the magazine are landscapes of cultivation, cultural heritage, (changes in) field systems, the morphology of cities, and the study of landscape elements. One of the magazine’s standpoints is that ‘our natural landscape has in the course of time been changed into a landscape with valuable cultural historical elements’ (HGT, 2004, www.matrijs.com/). The study of such elements - i.e. mapping the distribution, identifying types and analysing the present-day condition - has been present in various articles in the HGT, including research on duck decoys, river dykes, castle ruins, and tram tracks.

In contrast, there has been and still appears to be a lack of interest among Dutch historical geographers in the aesthetic and symbolic landscape, and few have researched issues concerning landownership (e.g. Harten, 1992, 1998; Van Tent, 1972; Renes, 1994). In his two accounts of the spatial distribution of castles and country estates in the post-medieval period, Harten studied the choices for particular locations in respect to the changes in the functions of the estates, which were increasingly used for recreation and entertainment and made a careful examination of the impact of landed estates on the physical environment (and vice versa). Despite their value, however, the studies pay little attention to motives for investment, and Harten furthermore fails to recognise that choices for a location, a particular garden style or designer were not solely determined by national processes but also by personal attitudes and aspirations of the landowner. Estates in Harten’s work are thus researched as elements in the landscape, and not as expressions of ostentation or power.

The fact that only a small number of scholars have sought to explain the appearance of country estates and the aesthetic landscape, might be due to a traditional Dutch attitude towards landscape, which above all needed to be practical and functional. This tendency may have been reinforced by a
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rather strict division between different disciplines. A general notion exists amongst Dutch academics that issues of aesthetics should be studied by art, architecture and garden historians, although among these scholars are individuals who would welcome dialogue with (historical) geographers with knowledge of the aesthetic landscape, to offer a wider perspective on that landscape (ex. inf. Albers, 2004).

Only recently a few geographers have identified the need for new ideas within Dutch landscape research. In 2003 members of the human geography department of the University of Utrecht wrote a collection of cultural geographical essays on the Netherlands, focusing on three particular issues: identity; images and perception; and landscape iconography. The scholars noted that ‘introducing these concepts in a Dutch context will shed a new light on the Netherlands,’ thereby taking ‘a refreshing look at spatial phenomena through … new cultural geography’ (Van Gorp, Hoff & Renes, 2003, p. 11). In their essay on the Dutch landscape, Van Gorp and Renes ‘introduced the specific cultural geographical way of looking at landscapes: reading the landscape as a text’, exploring how different actors have (re)written the Dutch landscape ‘by conscious design or as a by-product of spatial planning’ (Van Gorp & Renes, 2003, p. 61). Their collaboration can be seen as a first step within Dutch (historical) geography towards a new kind of landscape study. At the 21st PECSRL conference in Greece in September 2004, Renes furthermore reflected upon the way in which landscape elements of the Roman period were experienced and regarded in the post-Roman period in the Netherlands, thus analysing the afterlife of historic elements in changing societies. In her doctoral thesis Van Gorp (2004) investigated the perception of Dutch cultural heritage by a particular social group, namely tourists. In the same year, Spek published his extensive thesis on the cultural landscape of the Dutch province of Drenthe, in which he advocated the study of landscape of imagery, meaning and representation. Hopefully initiatives like these will lead to the creation of a new strand within Dutch historical geography, namely one that takes the immaterial and symbolic landscape into account that has been shaped by the perceptions and attitudes of humans.

Landscapes of meaning and representation

Issues about studying landscapes have been rethought and re-valuated within a series of different arenas. This took place at an early stage (some twenty to thirty years ago) among young American geographers, who criticised such scholars as Sauer for their focus upon the physical traces left in the landscape by a certain culture group. Instead scholars like J.S. Duncan, R.C. Harris and D. Lowenthal started analysing the spatial dimension of cultures, which – in their opinion – were not homogenous entities, and investigated the multi-layered landscapes these cultures seem to have regenerated.
Lowenthal (1961, 1985, 1991) was among the first to regard what he called a geographical and historical imagination. In his eyes the landscape and space in which we live were constructed by people who related certain emotions, memories and meanings to this landscape. In other words, ‘geographic attitudes of a culture group are composed of a variety of views expressed by young and old, rich, poor and middling folk’ (Bunkse, 2003, p. 882). This meant that there was no simple story about how the landscape was made, and that in fact there were layers of meaning within the landscape. In 1965, Lowenthal co-authored with H. Prince a geographical study of English landscape tastes. The study looked at garden and park design in England in a wider context, investigating the changing taste among elite society and the meaning of certain elements within the aesthetic landscape (e.g. the Temple of British Worthies at Stowe), and seeing how particular styles from the past have been used to make a statement (e.g. the construction of a Roman temple in an eighteenth-century garden as a reference to the mighty Empire of the past). In 1985, Lowenthal developed the aspect of geographical and historical imagination further in his major work *The past is a foreign country* (republished in 1993). He introduced the notion that the past is not simply ‘what happened’, but that ‘in large measure [it is ] a past of our own creation, moulded by selective erosion, oblivion and invention’, and that therefore different individuals and societies gave divergent meanings to the past (Lowenthal, 1985, quoted by Baker, 2002, p. 151).

Whereas Lowenthal brought forth insights into the dynamic compositions of geographic attitudes and perceptions, other geographers have discussed the need to read landscapes as ‘biographies’ (Ley & Samuels, 1978) or as ‘deeply-layered texts’ (Duncan & Duncan, 1988; Daniels & Cosgrove, 1993) instead of only treating them as something to view. These scholars have argued that landscapes ‘as the visible material surface of places’ may ‘ evoke powerful images and sentiments’ and can be read as ‘texts which are transformations of ideologies into concrete form’ (Duncan, 2001, p. 387; Duncan & Duncan, 1988, abstract). Inspired by the work of such American geographers, the British scholars S. Daniels and D. Cosgrove were leading actors in securing a cultural turn in British historical geography, providing an innovative approach to landscape study. Together, they edited the influential book *The iconography of landscape. Essays on the symbolic representation, design and use of past environments* (Cosgrove & Daniels, 1988), which focused on a different way of viewing landscape, challenging contemporary ideas based on the material landscape and hence contributing greatly to the development of the fields of historical and cultural geography.
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They argued that landscape cannot be understood solely in material terms, but also requires reference to ‘a cultural image, a pictorial way of representing, structuring or symbolising surroundings’ (Cosgrove & Daniels, 1988, p. 1). Landscapes could be explained as manifestations of what Cosgrove has named ‘cultural production’ (1984, p. 54-65). Contemporary representations of landscape are a way of understanding, a way of seeing what the maker chose to depict, as Daniels demonstrated in his works on the paintings of Turner (1993) and on the landscape designer Humphrey Repton (1981, 1999). The latter works revealed the social and political statements woven into the landscapes Repton had designed and discussed the influencing processes of industrialisation that had left their mark on the landscape around Leeds and other industrial towns.

In the second edition of Dodgshon & Butlin’s An historical geography of England and Wales (1990, p. 487-520) Daniels co-authored with S. Seymour a study of landscape design and the idea of improvement in the early eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, emphasising that ‘landscape design is integral to historical-geographical development, not a superficial embellishment of it’ (p. 517). Their ‘ways of seeing’ the landscape highlighted an engagement with ideas deriving from the study of visual art, landscape painting, politics, economics and sociology. Duncan (1995, p. 415) argued that this painterly tradition in landscape geography ‘is good at showing us that the landscape is a way of representing the world and that representations have very real political consequences’. In effect, the link with art history was a factor encouraging a more political perspective on the landscape, revealing the potential to read landscape like a text that can inform us about social, political and economic events and ideas. The danger of this approach, however, is that one can lose the link with the physical landscape and with documentary sources like archives and historic maps. This does not mean to say that scholars such as Daniels, Cosgrove and Seymour ignore such traditional methods of data retrieval; in fact their work is concerned with material as well as representational issues.

These developments in the field of historical geography also encouraged ‘reviews of the representational qualities of traditional geographical tools, most notably maps’ (Seymour, 2000, p. 193). Probably the best demonstration of this point is the work by historical cartographer J.B. Harley (1988, 1989, 1990). He advocated the treatment of ‘maps as a text rather than as a mirror of reality so that we can understand how their rhetoric has narrowed the practice of historical geography’ (1989, p. 80). Maps, among the foremost geographical sources and tools, can therefore not be seen as an unproblematic representation of reality, rather they are constructed documents with a particular set of purposes that are open to different interpretations. In fact, they need to be regarded as ‘social constructions of the world expressed through the medium of cartography’ (Harley, 1990, p. 4).
Layers of meaning

In recent years much debate existed between scholars who study the material landscape and those who study the symbolic landscape. The geographer Muir noted that ‘landscape study has become divided between, on the one hand, a buoyant landscape history, now largely existing outside the confines of ‘establishment’ geography, and, on the other hand, a fragmented variety of approaches that are loosely associated under the banner of cultural geography’ (1998, p. 265). It showed Muir’s particular personal perspective against cultural geography.

Nevertheless, cultural geographers like Duncan (1995, p. 414) and Seymour (2000, p. 193) seem to strengthen this idea of a division by identifying two approaches to landscape, namely one that studies the landscape as a physical entity, and one that focuses on the symbolism and meaning of the landscape. The danger exists that followers of the two approaches remain at opposite sides, without much positive discussion of how the two approaches can be brought together to produce fruitful studies. That it is important to link the two types of landscape study is, for example, shown in Spek’s thesis (2004) and in the work of the landscape and garden historian Tom Williamson (1995, 2000). By using evidence from archival sources and fieldwork, Spek revealed, for example, that the romantic, idyllic image that society had of the cultural landscape in the Dutch province of Drenthe (i.e. a landscape dominated by heath and sheep and that had little changed since the Middle Ages) was not entirely consistent with reality and that the historic truth was in fact more complex.

In *Polite landscapes. Gardens & society in eighteenth-century England* (1995) Williamson linked the material landscape with the social and political processes reflected in that landscape. He argued that the gardens designed for landowners were not simply works of art, devised by professional designers, but that they were also the result of the owner’s interests and needs. His study on gardens and the way of life of the landed elite in eighteenth-century England has been an example for this thesis.

With this thesis I aim to combine elements of the approaches discussed above, as both the material and the immaterial landscape are of importance to fully understand aspects of country estates, such as location, size and appearance. The morphological approach – distinguished by an empirical richness, thorough fieldwork and a traditional engagement with maps as source and product – will help greatly to establish a sense of place. Although it is often unappreciated today (mostly because it is often free of explicit theoretical statements), the knowing and celebrating of place is a valuable and important dimension of landscape study. One cannot truly understand choices of location or the way in which an estate has been designed until the site itself has been visited and analysed. In the specific case of landscape aesthetics the researcher can ascertain whether a particular design has
been executed, how the physical landscape has influenced the design, how the park connects to the surrounding environment and how the family has used the estate. Recent developments in the field of G.I.S., furthermore, enable the portrayal of findings made in archives and on the ground (see Chapter 3).

This thesis can therefore be seen as part of a continuing interest in landscape as physical entity, yet it also conveys a different engagement with landscape. Embracing the notion that different culture groups and individuals have had a different perspective of landscape and that different meanings are imbedded in the landscape, this thesis will focus upon the society the *nouveaux riches* landowners came from. This helps us to understand their motivations, actions and tastes as they affected their roles as great landowners. It also gives us insight into the ways in which individuals were involved in the land market, in agricultural developments, in politics, and in landscape aesthetics. In this respect, these landowners will be viewed as a group and as individuals. Such an individual approach is common in the many sub-disciplines of history, whereas traditions of historical geography generally lack an interest in the spatial patterns of individuals. Daniels’s work (1981, 1999) on the famous English landscape designer Humphry Repton, is an exception. It is an exploration into the cultural geography of this extraordinary individual who contributed greatly to the development of garden design in late eighteenth-century England and had many followers throughout Europe. The persons central to this thesis were, however, not – like Repton – famous national figures who on their own had a great influence on society. Instead these individuals embodied a social group that collectively and individually brought change. The thesis will therefore be unique as it illustrates and analyses the spatial organisation of individuals who are not national celebrities, but instead representatives of a changing society.

By identifying the character of the landowners both as a culture group and as individuals, it has been possible to get a better understanding of the processes of estate building and landscape design. Furthermore, it links the aspect of place (the estate itself) to a wider context of society, economy and politics, in other words, the notion of space.

It has to be noted, though, that unlike the work by Daniels, this research does not entail the so-called painterly approach to landscape, meaning that there is no explicit focus on representations of landscapes in paintings. Instead, I look at the landscape itself (and its owners) as a representation of power, social status and taste.
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In a way this thesis, and the methods and approaches used within it, reflects my development as a researcher. Having done my undergraduate and master degree at Utrecht University I was strongly rooted in the Dutch tradition of detailed knowledge of areas, sources and landscapes. Already during my stay in Durham in 1996-97, working with Professor Dr. Brian Roberts, I noted differences between the Dutch and Anglo-American traditions of historical geography, but especially during the course of my PhD I became inspired by the work of such scholars as Daniels, Williamson and Lowenthal. Still valuating my Dutch roots, I longed to incorporate aspects of geographical imagination and landscape representation. In a way, my own journey through academia has brought me to a landscape of layers, a landscape that is built of physical artefacts that can be mapped, of different cultural meanings that can be read, and of representations of the studied landowners’ backgrounds (taste, social network and status) that can only be understood by combining the discussed approaches to landscape study.

1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE

Chapter Two reviews the multi-disciplinary literature available for the study of landed estates and garden design in the Netherlands, with the aim of amplifying and justifying the research themes and giving a context for the subsequent chapters. The chapter starts by evaluating current understanding of Dutch estate building and the nature of landownership since the Middle Ages. It particularly discusses the modest attention to issues of land availability and the division of waste lands in the 1800s as possible influences upon the location of new estates, the quality of the land, and the created layout. The chapter then concentrates on the chronology of Dutch garden design from 1600 to 1950 and how it has been influenced by foreign examples. Finally, the chapter presents a critique of existing perceptions that regard the issues of landownership, estate building and garden history as separate themes, instead of processes that influence each other.

Chapter Three begins with a detailed discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of source material available for the study of country estates in Utrecht and Twente. It also focuses on similar documentary evidence for West Yorkshire, which will be used for a comparison with Twente. The chapter then outlines the methods and techniques required to extract and interpret evidence, particularly the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS).

Chapter Four examines a number of contextual themes which may have influenced the emergence of a new landed elite and the development of estates in the study areas Utrecht and Twente in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The account is therefore selective, focusing upon the
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physical setting; changing agricultural systems; the existing pattern of landownership; and the processes of urban and industrial development.

Chapter Five to Nine present the empirical findings of the research. Chapter Five particularly deals with the emergence of a new class of wealthy who chose to invest in land. Before turning to the study areas, the chapter starts with an observation of such individuals in western Europe in general and the Netherlands in particular. By exploring the degree of wealth and investment in land, a number of individuals could be identified as part of the new landed elite in the selected study areas. The core of the chapter then focuses on who these new landowners were, the extent and origins of their wealth, their social network and their motives for investing in land.

Chapter Six explores the spatial distribution of country estates built in Utrecht and Twente between 1800 and 1950. First, it focuses on mapping and explaining aspects of change and continuity in the observed patterns, considering a wide variety of factors that might have been of influence, including land availability, existing landownership, communication and transport, physical landscape, and social network of the landowners. The chapter then deals with the various ways of estate building apparent in the research areas, from buying an existing estate to creating a landed property piece-meal over time. The general findings will be furthermore supplemented with detailed attention to specific estates.

Chapter Seven examines the aesthetics of estate landscapes seen at the new country estates. It begins with a discussion of seven case studies (including a noble estate) to explore the choices made by new landowners in contrast to the established elite, and to investigate the evolution (or the lack of it) of garden styles in Utrecht and Twente. Subsequently, the chapter focuses on how new trends in gardening were diffused by looking at various historical published materials (e.g. pattern books, text books and journals) and exhibitions, and who the key players were in designing and diffusing garden fashions. This is followed by a geographical focus on the employment of particular designers to explore the impact of landowners’ social networks.

Chapter Eight deals with the recreational use made of the estate landscapes, whether as conspicuous consumption or private recreation, and how this affected the layout of the estate landscape. It assesses how parks and gardens were experienced in the Netherlands during the research period. Particular attention is paid to hunting and shooting, investigating who hunted with who, the location of hunting grounds and how this altered the natural landscape. Finally, the chapter examines aspects
of ‘beauty and utility’ (how a landscape could be both aesthetically pleasing and economically valuable), and the price of laying out such landscapes.

Chapter Nine concentrates on a comparison between the industrial landed elite of Twente and individuals of a similar background abroad. Through an investigation of aspects of landownership and garden design in the present-day county of West Yorkshire in England, this chapter aims to illuminate the Dutch experience, revealing whether the Twente *nouveaux riches* stood out in their choices, motivations and actions as new landowners, or were simply illustrative of a European industrial class of *nouveaux riches*.

Chapter Ten concludes with a summary of the key findings in the two research areas Utrecht and Twente, and an evaluation of the extent to which the research aims have been achieved through a combination of Dutch and British historical geography. It furthermore offers some comments about potential avenues for future research.
has been done in this thesis. By linking data retrieved from the cadastral ledgers to topographic maps of the late nineteenth century, the GIS facilitated the reconstruction of use made of the land and the exploration of change and continuity in landownership since 1832. As such the thesis has extended and refined links between traditional historical research and modern techniques of computer-aided analysis.

The findings presented in this thesis and summarised above have enhanced the understanding of the development, organisation and regional distribution of Dutch country estates in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, during the course of the research a number of issues have been noticed that might raise possibilities and questions for future research. This research is based on the cross-checking of a large range of various sources, yet it proved time-consuming to obtain the documentary sources dispersed over numerous archives throughout the country. The setting up of an universal system that displayed the contents of individual archives would benefit and stimulate future research on country estates. Furthermore, as spatial elements country estates deserve more attention from historical geographers than they receive at present. Such geographical research could incorporate close cooperation with scholars from other disciplines, particularly garden history and art history, and could be aimed at gaining new insights into the development of landownership and landscape design in the past or at applying such knowledge to making plans for present-day problems such as the creation of twenty-first-century country estates (which forms an important problem in current Dutch spatial planning). Thirdly, despite several recent contributions to the study of the symbolic and representative landscape, this is still a minor approach in Dutch historical geography. On the other hand, Anglo-American historical geography tends to largely ignore the more traditional approach of studying the material landscape. However, the material landscape and the symbolic landscape cannot be seen as separate entities. They exist together, are part of each other. Both approaches to landscape have so much to offer, in terms of methods, perspectives and use of sources. This thesis aimed to show the value of combining these approaches, and hopes to have stimulated further research, both relating to the geographical study of landownership in particular and a combined historical geographical approach to a landscape of layers in general.
Chapter 2.
Landownership, Estate Building
and Garden Design

INTRODUCTION

The study of Dutch country estates and their parks and gardens has hitherto been represented by a literature that predominantly derives from various sub-disciplinary branches of history, including garden history, genealogy, social and economic history. This chapter draws upon this existing literature, with some additional reflections upon geographical perspectives to develop and justify the thesis themes introduced in Chapter 1. Existing studies are, therefore, reviewed here with the specific aim of creating a contextual framework for this thesis that will focus more deeply upon the three key issues of landownership, the founding of landed estates and landscape or garden design. In the existing literature the issues of landownership, estate building and garden history have largely been discussed as parallel but separate themes. This suggests the need for greater attention to the ways in which development in any one of these areas influence and are influenced by the others. More specifically, this review aims to identify existing knowledge on these key themes as they related to the geographical context of the province of Utrecht and the region of Twente in the period 1750-1950. Particular attention, too, will be paid to ideas and information that will illuminate the main focus of the thesis on the rise of a new group of landowners during the nineteenth century and its potential implications for the pattern of landownership and socio-economic structures, tastes in garden design and the way in which landscape was experienced. The methodological issues associated with a geographical approach to landownership and garden design are addressed in Chapter 3.

2.1 LANDED ESTATES AND THEIR OWNERS

The distribution and character of landed estates was likely to have been strongly influenced by the degree of continuity or change in land ownership per se and the social origins and character of landowners. Although neither the position of landowners within the Dutch social hierarchy, nor the degree to which such landowners formed a homogeneous social block has been subject to extensive previous study, there are indications that the social composition of the Dutch landowning class changed significantly in the post-medieval period (Buis, 1985, 1995; Van Luttervelt, 1943, 1944, 1949; Bijnouwer, 1946; Van Groningen, 1999; Van der Wyck, 1982; De Lange, 1966; Olde Meierink, 1995).
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Traditionally, estate building in the Netherlands was dominated by the aristocracy. Castles (locally called havezathe or ridderhofstad) found throughout the country are reminders of the political, as well as economic, power of this landed elite. Indeed, as Van Groningen (1999, p. 60) notes temporal and religious power were often intertwined in the person of major landowners; many of the castles and fortified houses found in medieval Utrecht were built by the Bishop of Utrecht and his followers (e.g. Figure 2.1). The castles generally marked the territorial boundary of the Bishop’s power and served to protect the district against the rival power exerted by the Counts of Holland and Gelre. Furthermore, by encouraging settlement on reclaimed land the Bishop hoped to extend his political power and territory (Te Boekhorst-Van Maren, 1981, p. 30-31). More detail on this can be found in Chapter 4, including an enumeration and mapping of medieval estates.

Figure 2.1: The medieval castle Oudaen along the Vecht
Source: D. Stoopendaal, 1791.

After losing their military function in the sixteenth century, these castles represented the earliest form of the patrician country house (Van der Wyck, 1982, p. 7). From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the possession of a havezathe or ridderhofstad meant political and territorial power, as it came with a certain status. For instance, it gave the owner the right to hunt and fish, it
enabled him to enter the provincial government, meaning that he was eligible for election if he so chose by virtue of owning property, and it ensured exemption from the house tax (*huisgeld*) (Mensema & Gevers, 1995, p. 12-13, Ten Hove, 1996, p. 85; Smeets, 2000, p. 25). It was not until the revolutionary annexation of the Netherlands by France at the end of the eighteenth century that these privileges were abolished. The possession of a noble manor, and its benefits, are explored further in Chapter 4.

From the seventeenth century onwards, however, country estates began to be created that were not military in character and they served a mixture of recreational and economic purposes from the start. As part of his thesis on the historical evolution of woodlands in the Netherlands, Buis (1985) evaluated the process of estate building as it came to be established in the early modern period. He argued that as a landed estate was seen, in part at least, as a status symbol for wealthy people, the establishment of new estates was most likely to occur with the rise of ‘new money’. Furthermore, the building, improvement and expansion of estates generally only occurred during times of peace and wealth, and ideally required the availability for purchase of extensive areas of land. Based on this he identified two major periods of estate building: the seventeenth century (known as the Golden Age), and the period 1780-1850.

The first phase of estate foundation, as identified by Buis, is related to the emergence as landowners of wealthy merchants who had supported the stadtholder of Holland in creating the Dutch Republic. Many such individuals established new mansions in the polder landscape of the Beemster and Diemermeer and along the rivers the Vecht (Figure 2.2) and Amstel. Various aspects of this development have been studied, including the architecture of the new mansions (Van Luttervelt, 1943, 1944; Van der Wyck, 1982), the location of the estates (Van Tent, 1972; Harten, 1992, 1998), the design of the gardens (De Jong, 1993), and continuity and change in estate ownership (Munnig Schmidt & Lisman, 1997), together with more contextual studies of the political history of the Low Countries (Van Deursen, 1999).

From these studies it becomes clear that this phase of estate building resulted from major changes in Dutch politics and economics at the end of the sixteenth century. During most of the sixteenth century the Low Countries (what are now the separate states of Belgium and the Netherlands) were ruled by the Catholic Spanish King Philip II. Resistance to Spanish rule culminated in rebellion amongst the Dutch, especially in the northern provinces. This led to the start of the *Tachtigjarige Oorlog* (The Eighty Years’ War) in 1568, with the outcome that in 1588 the Dutch Republic was founded and that the south and north provinces of the Low Countries were divided (Van Deursen,
1999, p. 143-144). Furthermore, the religious Reformation meant that in most northern provinces the number of Protestants rapidly increased over that period, and in some areas Catholicism was banned by law (Smeets, 2000, p. 26-27). The Protestant merchants who had helped to create the Dutch Republic replaced the old – often Catholic – nobility as the leading social class (Van Luttervelt, 1944, p. 30). Their new place in society also reflected the economic progress experienced in Holland following Amsterdam’s assumption of economic primacy at the expense of Antwerp (Van Deursen, 1999, p. 143-144). Eventually, within three generations, many of these families became ennobled and married into the old nobility. In effect, this earlier wave of new money became old money.

Van Tent’s study (1972, p. 4) is unusual in pursuing an essentially geographical argument that the country estates of this emergent group of urban patricians were a ‘spatial reflection’ of the processes that had given rise to social change in the Netherlands. This appears to represent the first attempt in Dutch academic research to consider the relevance of the particular pattern of estate locations in relation to underlying social, economic and environmental factors. Only a handful of subsequent studies, including Harten (1992, 1998), Olde Meierink (1984, 1987) and Renes (1994), have followed Van Tent’s example. In its attention to the character of the locations in which estates were established and their overall spatial distribution this thesis, therefore, aims to stimulate further interest in the geography of estate development.
The chronology and geography of estate development outlined by Van Tent (1972, p. 49) reveals that merchants were already establishing their own estates in the sixteenth century, particularly near Amsterdam, but the main concentration of estate building occurred in the seventeenth century, with clusters of new developments appearing along the rivers Vecht and Amstel. Other architectural (e.g. Van der Wyck, 1982), and geographical studies (e.g. Harten, 1992, 1998) have also contributed to the development of a more refined chronology than that outlined by Buis (1985). They note, for example, that as early as the sixteenth century the character of estate property was changing from military castles to recreational manors. The latter retained some of the architectural characteristics of a castle, including towers and a moat with bridge, yet possessed no defensive function. Harten (1998, p. 178-179) also observed that during a period of economic stagnation, from around 1670, the rate of foundation of new country estates declined, yet simultaneously more large landed estates were created. Harten considers this to reflect the benefit to wealthier new landowners of the fall in land prices experienced at this point. They were thus able to invest in extending their landed properties, with the expectation both of financial rewards and enhanced social status. However, the creation of such large landed estates in some parts of the country must also be related to changes that followed from religious Reformation. One outcome was that the landed property of Catholic monasteries was confiscated by the new provincial and national governments (Broekhoven & Barends, 1995). Economic stagnation during the second half of the seventeenth century seems to have encouraged the sale of much of this land to politically loyal members of the emergent bourgeoisie. In the municipality of De Bilt, Utrecht, for example, seven new landed estates were established as a result (see Chapter 4).

Whilst the accounts offered by Van Tent (1972) and subsequently Van Wyck (1982) and Harten (1998) set out a more detailed picture of the timing of estate development than given by Buis (1985), there is common agreement that activity was most common in the seventeenth century and during the decades after 1780. This does not, of course, mean that other times saw no such developments, or that all estates avoided destruction or demolition during these years of peak activity.

Buis (1985) further argued that during the second period (1780-1850) many country estates were created on former wasteland and adorned with gardens and parks fashioned in the landscape style. These parks were characterised by extensive areas of woodland, planted both for timber production and for their aesthetic contribution to the newly designed landscape. Such estates also incorporated farmland, including grazing for livestock. Buis’s stress on the two main periods of estate
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development, however, runs the risk of underestimating the extent to which estate development continued throughout the Netherlands after 1850. It is important that we recognise both this process and the accompanying changes in the character of these later estates and the nature of the landowners who created them. Just as was the case for earlier period these changes must be related to the broader course of economic and political change in the Netherlands from the late eighteenth century onwards.

From 1780 to 1795 the Dutch Republic faced the danger of an outbreak of civil war between the conservative forces of King William IV and revolutionary patriots (Van Deursen, 1999, p. 297-301). In 1795 the patriots received support from the newly formed French Republic. French troops occupied Dutch soil and the old Dutch Republic was replaced by the Batavian Republic, which acted as a French satellite state until the early nineteenth century when it was annexed into the French Empire of Napoleon. These developments meant that many old aristocratic privileges were abolished. The possession of a havezathe or ridderhofstad no longer gave the owner either status or the hereditary right to sit in the provincial government. This, in parallel with continuing economic decline since the 1750s forced many noble estate owners to demolish parts of their houses or to sell their property, as costly maintenance was now beyond their means.

The estates were subsequently purchased by either regional great landowners who extended their existing property or wealthy gentry patricians and newly wealthy individuals who had gained financially and politically during the French occupation by trading with the French, or through their appointment to a political position (ex. inf. De Bruin, 2003; Albers, 1998, p. 8). Research has not yet been undertaken to establish the national position, but from Wittert van Hoogland’s work on continuity and change in the ownership of ridderhoofteden in the province of Utrecht, it appears that between 1780 and 1820 approximately 35 noble estates were sold off, accounting for almost half the previous total (Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912). Sometimes the new landowners restored the former glory of the estate; sometimes they used the land they had acquired to establish new estates. Occasionally, new country estates were established on former wasteland (as suggested by Buis), but this phenomenon was more common after the 1830s (see below). Napoleon’s regime in the Netherlands fell in 1813 and the House of Orange returned (Van Deursen, 1999, p. 297-301). Under King William I the established nobility were restored to their titles – although not their old privileges – and many new landowners were ennobled (ex. inf. De Bruin, 2003). Equally significant, however, was the emergence of a further distinct group of newly wealthy families during the course of the nineteenth century. This new money was born of Dutch economic revival and represented an urban nouveaux riches with interests in banking, trade and industry. Despite the
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origins of their prosperity, many of these individuals chose to invest part of their wealth in landownership (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Investigation into political and socio-economic processes, and continued regional and local studies, including this thesis, can thus make further refinements to the phasing of estate building in the Netherlands. From 1780 onwards two overlapping phases can be distinguished. First, the period 1780-1820 when French occupation brought about change in the social composition of the ruling class and resulted in the creation of a new landed elite, wealthy citizens and collaborators with the French, who chiefly invested in the purchase of existing noble estates. Second, the period 1800-1950 during which processes of urbanisation and industrialisation led to the rise of a new urban elite, many of whom invested in creating new country estates. It is this second period that is the primary focus of this thesis. Compared with attention to changes in landownership before 1800, the emergence of new money in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a phenomenon with far-reaching social, spatial and environmental consequences has been much less studied. Indeed, in his book on gardens and country estates in the Netherlands, Bijhouwer (1943) did not mention the presence of the country properties created by the newly wealthy in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, focusing instead on the larger estates created prior to 1800.

Such neglect is not, however, universal. Van der Wyck & Enklaar-Lagendijk (1983) in their study of country estates include a chapter on the *nouveaux riches* of the region of Twente. Here they noted both the commercial background of many of the new landowners of the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, but also the close ties between them: ‘the Twente industrialists were predominantly of the Mennonite religion; [and] not only because of their religious beliefs, but certainly also because of their blood-relationship were they closely connected to each other; no marriages occurred outside their own circle’ (Van der Wyck & Enklaar-Lagendijk, 1983, p. 89). The chief focus of their study, however, is the history of individual families and the aesthetics of specific estates, rather than any broader analysis of the changing pattern of landownership. The social character of the newly wealthy in Twente has also been studied by Hammer-Stroeve (2001) and Van Heek (1945), both focusing upon the industrialists of the city of Enschede. Hammer-Stroeve (2001, p. 65-66) thus argues that the Enschede industrialist families had a series of values and characteristics in common that bound them together. First, they originated from Enschede itself and even after becoming wealthy the city remained their base. Second, the countryside of Twente was close to their hearts and they made regular visits to it. And finally, their wealth was based on the local textile industry, which operated as a series of family businesses. Hence, family, wealth and business were firmly connected. Van Heek (1945, p. 241), a member of the most influential family
of industrialists in Twente, also claimed that compared with industrialists from Germany and Britain those of Twente were much less concerned to forge social links with the established nobility. Instead they formed a strong social group of their own, reinforced by their business deals and intermarriages. Both Hammer-Stroeve (2001) and Van Heek (1945) offer informed sociological accounts of the world of the Twente industrialists, and their findings have been useful sources for this thesis. However, their specific focus upon Enschede means that they present only a part of the picture, excluding both industrialists from other parts of the region and those whose money derived from sources other than industry. Neither study, moreover, pays sustained attention to the landed properties of the *nouveaux riches* and the particular landscapes created on these estates.

More immediately relevant in the present context is the research of Olde Meierink (1984, 1985) and Olde Meierink & Van Dockum (1988), whose studies of the historical development of house and landscape design, and of the commercial aspects of land use have paid attention to the spatial distribution of *nouveaux riches* estates in Twente. Olde Meierink does not, however, link the observed geographical pattern to a sustained analysis of change in the land market, nor has he made any comparison with similar social groups to investigate their specific characteristics in more detail. Moreover, subsequent work inspired by Olde Meierink has largely concentrated on adding to our knowledge of the aesthetics of garden and landscape design (e.g. Van Beusekom, 1991; Jordaan-Jannink, 1993) or the family history of the newly wealthy (Jansen, 1996, 1997).

The preoccupation with the design of the houses and gardens on estates created between 1800 and 1950 is apparent in the work of Van Groningen (1999). Her study of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug is chiefly concerned with the architectural design, both exterior and interior, of the country houses, accompanied by some background information on the local environment and the various garden styles employed. However, the creation and development of estates is not put into a wider social, economic and political context, and the parks and gardens discussed are not considered as elements of the local landscape or as expressions of a landowner’s personal taste. Instead, particular gardens are used principally to illustrate national trends in garden design over time.

As recently as 2004, the historian Zeilmaker criticised the dominance of art history in research on Dutch estates and the limited attention paid to socio-economic developments, politics, historical geographical themes and the changing mentality of landowners (Zeilmaker, 2004, p. 11). This statement, however, served as an introduction to a future publication on estates in the province of Utrecht which has still to be published. Zeilmaker’s development of the logic of his own argument is thus as yet limited. However, the current thesis hopes to contribute what is beginning to be
established as a general call for a new approach to the study of Dutch estates. It is distinctive, moreover, in seeking to enlarge upon the geographical dimension of the work by Olde Meierink, Van Tent and Harten. It aims to show how a changing spatial pattern of landownership resulted from significant alterations in both urban and rural economies. It will also acknowledge the distinctive character of the interest in forestry, agriculture and especially estate design displayed by industrialists, which tended to set them apart from an older category of titled landowners. The pattern of Dutch landownership, as briefly described above, was not only related to periods of economic growth, political change and alterations in the social composition of the upper class, but also to issues of space and place, particularly to the availability of land. In this respect the division of wastelands was potentially of particular significant for the establishment of new country estates in the nineteenth century.

The division of wasteland

Dutch land markets and the related pattern of land ownership were altered significantly by the division and, in many instances, sale of former communal wastelands during the course of the nineteenth century. Since the Middle Ages the use of the wastelands (heath, marsh and woodlands) had been regulated by communal organisations. In the eastern regions of the Netherlands these communities were called *marken* (a title deriving from the word *marke*, meaning border), whereas in the central and southern regions they were known as *meenten* (commons; Demoed, 1987, p. 7) Chapter 4 addresses the specific regional characteristics of the *marken* in Twente and the *meenten* in Utrecht.

The impact of the division of wasteland upon estate building has received surprisingly little attention from researchers. Some reference is made to the process by Olde Meierink (1984) and Van Zuidam (2004), but these scholars have not investigated the link between land availability and estate foundation in terms of the geographical distribution of former common land, its quality and the ways in which the newly wealthy took advantage of this release of land on to the market. However, previous studies by social and economic historians and geographers of agricultural developments in the Netherlands have been used here to create a contextual framework for understanding the processes of wasteland division (Van Zanden, 1985; Pleyte, 1879; Demoed, 1987; Renes, 1998b). Further information has been extracted from archival sources, such as the cadastral ledgers, allowing the thesis to explore the impact of wasteland division upon estate building in the study areas of Twente and Utrecht (Chapters 4 and 6).
Initial plans for the division of communal lands were made at the end of the eighteenth century, for instance at Volthe in west Overijssel (Buis, 1985, p. 390-391). The Volthe report included procedures such as the grant of a tax-free period of 25 years to stimulate division and cultivation. Yet the plan was never executed. In fact, despite the issue being raised in many parts of the country, it was not until the early nineteenth century – when the Netherlands was a part of the French Empire of Napoleon Bonaparte – that national laws were introduced to divide communal lands throughout the Netherlands. These governmental initiatives sought to extend the privatisation of land, ensuring an increase in the cultivation of the wastelands, and therefore leading to economic growth and increased employment. Constitutional reforms in 1801, 1805 and 1806 eventually led to specific legislation promoting wasteland division in 1809/10 (Van Zanden, 1985, p. 153; Pleyte, 1879, p. 139; Demoed, 1987, p. 8). As a result of this law the various communal organisations in the Netherlands were downgraded from primary institutions of local government to civil law organisations. The importance and political power of these communities further declined as a result of the establishment of individual municipalities in 1811. The tax law of 1811 – which eventually also led to the creation of land tax registers, that is the Cadastre in 1832 – was also intended to stimulate the voluntary division of wasteland. Previously wastelands had been free of land tax, but under the new law such taxation was introduced, forcing the communal organisations to make large tax payments to the state. Should, however, the lands be divided and subsequently cultivated by the new owners, the former wastelands would enjoy a tax-free period of 50 years (Buis, 1985, p. 404).

Early divisions of communal land, based on the 1809/10 law, occurred chiefly in the southern parts of the Netherlands, where such lands were in the hand of municipalities. These institutions were generally more inclined to division than were communities formed of individual landholders, either because they regarded land privatisation as economically profitable, or decision-making effectively rested with a major local landlord who would benefit personally through the receipt of large tracts of land on division (Buis, 1985, p. 392; Renes, 1994, p. 48). However, in the eastern regions of Drenthe, Gelderland and Overijssel division of communal lands was much more difficult as marke organisations consisted of numerous smaller landowners, mostly farmers, who had to agree any plan by a majority. This was unlikely in a context where wastelands were valued by farmers as a source of grazing for their sheep, and for gathering fuel, honey and plaggen (heather, grass and wood humus mixed with dung from sheep for fertilising the sandy soils) (Vervloet, 1995, p. 10).

After the fall of the French Empire the Dutch government displayed no immediate interest in the pursuit of cultivation laws, and little more was done to divide the commons until the mid-1830s. In 1837 King William I reintroduced the 1809/10 law and the 1811 tax law, meaning that the
wastelands were taxed as they had been during the French period. The establishment of the Cadastre of 1832 meant that the government now had a comprehensive record of landownership as a basis for taxation. Depending on its quality, one hectare of heath land was taxed at between 40 and 100 cents per year (which would be approximately 2 to 12 euros at present). For instance the marke De Groote Boeren van Ambt Delden (The Great Farmers of Ambt Delden) owned circa 2200 hectares of land, in total taxed at approximately 1900 guilders (Cadastral ledger of Ambt Delden, Kadaster Overijssel. Equals circa 11,000 Euros nowadays).

Taxation of the wastelands forced many marke communities to dissolve, a process that was further accelerated by a stronger legal framework. Consequently, Van der Zanden (1985, p. 155) argues that two types of division can be distinguished; firstly, voluntary divisions dating from before 1837 and, secondly, divisions made after 1837 as a result of increased pressure and supervision from the provincial government. This view was echoed by Demoed (1987, p. 13, 76-79) who detected a substantial increase in wasteland cultivation between the 1830s and the 1880s. Demoed’s study does make clear, however, that decades could elapse between the publication of plans for wasteland division and the beginning of cultivation. No previous study of wasteland division has complemented this attention to the spread of cultivation with discussion of the ways in which communal wastelands entered the land market, its impact on existing patterns of landownership and the potential creation of opportunities for the establishment of new estates.

It should, of course, be acknowledged that the Dutch process of wasteland division had parallels elsewhere in Europe, including the Parliamentary Enclosure movement in Britain (Turner, 1984) and the abolition of the German Flurzwang (Haushofer, 1972). In these countries, however, there was not the same temporal coincidence between the abolition of communal landholding and the creation of a new social group of wealthy commercial and industrial families that was found in the Netherlands. It is this combination of factors which allowed wasteland division to exert a particular influence upon patterns of Dutch landownership, not least in the case study regions (see particularly Chapter 6).

2.2 GARDEN FASHIONS IN THE NETHERLANDS, 1750-1950

Alongside this reshaping of the pattern of landownership, the nineteenth century also witnessed changes in taste and style in garden design, which exerted an important influence upon the wider landscape of estates. Chapter 1 has already noted that estates created between 1800 and 1950 were predominantly recreational in character and hence gardens formed a substantial proportion of such landed property.
In the Netherlands academic debate concerning the nature and the development of garden styles was initiated by designers themselves during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (e.g. Springer, 1895-1898; Van der Swaelmen, 1906; Carelsen, 1923). Their commentaries often reflected strong personal opinions, as is discussed in Chapter 7. The first extensive academic study of garden history in the Netherlands was by Van Sypestein in 1910. Academic ideas and approaches have evolved considerably during the twentieth century, producing different phases of emphasis on the introduction of new fashions (Tromp, 2000; Backer et al, 1998; Zijlstra, 1986; Albers, 1998), the commissions of specific professional designers (Zijlstra, 1986, 1987; Moes, 1991, 2002), the use of introduced trees and plants in new styles (Tromp & Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1998), the aesthetic design of particular gardens (Jansen, 1988; Tromp, 1982) and the socio-economic developments that influenced trends in gardening (De Jong, 1989, 1993, 1998).

The conventional chronology of change in styles of garden design is thus well established. An early period from the sixteenth to the early eighteenth centuries, during which the geometric style prevailed gave way to the rise of the landscape style. The latter dominated from the mid eighteenth century until the end of the nineteenth century. In a subsequent phase during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries most fashionable gardens were built in a mixture of modern styles with an emphasis on geometric features (Appendix V offers time lines of the main garden fashions and designers in the Netherlands during the research period). At the start of the period covered by the present thesis, therefore, garden fashion was defined by the landscape style. This contrasted sharply with the geometric regularity of earlier French, Italian and Dutch designs. The landscape style was characterised by an irregularity intended to echo the form of natural terrain and its incorporation of a rich and varied spectrum of natural materials. Landscape style is thus widely regarded as an explicit reaction against earlier geometric gardens. It seems important, therefore, to preface any discussion of the landscape style with a brief overview of the geometric or formal style.

Aesthetic geometry
According to Van Sypestein (1910, p. 69) the layout of Dutch castle gardens changed dramatically during the sixteenth century, as a result of two developments. First, as castles lost their military function and increasingly became recreational in character (as discussed in Section 2.1), the owners extended the gardens and altered their design. Second, and more importantly, at the start of the sixteenth century influences from the Italian Renaissance reached the Netherlands, introducing a notion of garden design as a form of art. This new perspective and the design changes which it ushered in were associated with the work of such Italian architects as Leon Battista Alberti and
Andrea Palladio, who argued that nature was shaped by mathematical laws and therefore art, and especially the art of nature (i.e. gardening) was subject to symmetry and logic (Tromp, 2000, p. 5).

The geometric style evolved in the Netherlands during the stadtholdership of Frederik Hendrik (1584-1647). His gardens near The Hague (including Honselersdijk, 1621; Huis ter Nieuwburg, 1630; and Huis ten Bosch, 1647) were an example of contemporary taste that could be followed by the noblemen and rich merchant-regents who were either changing the character of their established family seats or establishing new country seats. By adapting their gardens to the new style the landowners not only showed loyalty to the stadtholder but also made it clear that they too were aware of the new taste and could afford to give it practical expression (Backer et al, 1998, p. 21). However, a geographical study by Renes (1991, p. 44) shows how the garden layout of new estates in the polder landscape of Diemermeer and the Beemster and along the rivers Amstel and Vecht was not only influenced by the vagaries of fashion. Crucial also was the physical character of the local landscape, which displayed little relief and was frequently intersected with drainage canals. This flat landscape made it difficult to create cascades and terraces, and it was necessary to plant hedges for shelter along the canals to protect the garden from the strong winds. The garden historian De Jong (1993, p. 42) took such arguments further, suggesting that for the Dutch gentry, who greatly valued the combination of beauty and utility, this inclusion of frequent hedges was not only a matter of practical necessity, but also something that came to be seen as an aesthetic asset (Figure 2.3). Most such designs were focused on the main house, from which a symmetric avenue or axis divided the rectangular garden in two (Backer et al, 1998, p. 21; Hopper, 1982, p. 29, 32-34).

Most Dutch gardens, even the royal gardens at Honselersdijk and Huis ten Bosch, were limited in scale, especially when compared with the great formal gardens laid out in France and Italy, and only seldom did the Dutch classical garden extend to encompass forests or deer parks. The English landscape historian Williamson (1995, p. 25) argues that this was because ‘Holland was a young Protestant republic dominated by a wealthy gentry and a merchant bourgeoisie, densely populated and lacking the land necessary for extensive parks and chases’. Turner (1986) also considers that in the polder landscape, that had been won from the North Sea with great difficulty, it would have been perceived as unwise or uneconomical to use the land either for hunting forests or for extensive unproductive gardens. Others, however, attribute the small scale of Dutch gardens to the fact that the large group of newly wealthy merchants generally could only afford a modest sized estate and that around 1700 little land was available to purchase as a means of extending landholdings (Harten, 1998, p. 178; Van Tent, 1972, p. 49). Van Sypestein (1910, p. 130) also emphasised social factors, arguing that the numerous, smaller Dutch gardens were a product of a landed elite which contained
few of the extravagantly wealthy individuals found at the apex of society in some other European countries.

In the 1670s and 1680s a new garden style – dubbed the French, or Louis XIV style – was introduced into the Netherlands. Gardens in this style were rectangular in shape and were divided by a symmetric avenue or axis that ran from the house into the wider environment. Near the house one would find the *parterres de broderie* (complicated patterns defined by box and filled in with colourful plants or coloured earth), whereas further away the *parterres de gazon* (plain turf lawns) were located (Williamson, 1995, p. 25). These lawns were often enclosed by topiary (evergreen shrubs, such as box, cut into obelisks and other geometric shapes). The introduction of this style into the Netherlands is generally attributed to the French architect and ornament artist Daniël Marot, who – as a Huguenot – had fled France in 1685 (Backer et al, 1998, p. 24). Albers (1998, p. 19), however, has pointed out that gardens had been laid out in this style by Jacob Roman, the royal architect, before Marot’s arrival in the Netherlands. In fact, the first garden in this royal style was Slot Zeist in the province of Utrecht, laid out in 1677, by Roman. Other French-styled gardens included those at Clingendaal (1680), Castle Heemstede (ca. 1690) and Twickel (1730) (Albers, 1998, p. 19; Het Oversticht, 1999, p. 12). Nevertheless, the gardens laid out by Roman and Marot at the royal palace of stadtholder prince William III were particularly important. In 1684 William III
purchased the medieval castle of Het Loo and over the following 14 years the estate was transformed into an extensive complex consisting of a hunting lodge with extensive stables and richly ornamented gardens in the French style with cascades, fountains and statues (De Jong, 1993, p. 59). Het Loo was used by the stadtholder prince for his frequent hunting expeditions in the woods of the Veluwe (Gelderland). However, De Jong (1993, p. 59-63) argues that Het Loo was regarded by William as more than a mere hunting lodge. The extravagant gardens became a means to glorify and honour the stadtholder prince. The architecture of the gardens, the fountains, statues and plants conveyed a deeper literary and political meaning, and confirmed garden art as a royal affair. Thus, orange trees were planted as a symbol of the Prince of Orange, sculptures symbolising the rivers Rhine and IJssel indicated the extensive size of the estate situated between these rivers, and a fountain with the statue of Venus portrayed the marriage of William III to the Stuart Queen Mary II of England (De Jong, 1993, p. 80-85; Figure 2.5).

Figure 2.5: Venus fountain at Het Loo estate. Photographed by author, June 2004.

Most of the gardens laid out in the new French taste, however, possessed less grandeur, and in general it seems that despite the enormous impact of French gardening, the new Dutch-French gardens were not dissimilar from the old classical gardens (Backer et al, 1998, p. 24-26; Albers, 1998, p. 19; Figure 2.4). For instance, gardens were still predominantly rectangular, small and divided in the middle by a long symmetric axis. The Louis XIV style, however, extended this axis
beyond the garden itself and into the adjoining lands, creating a spacious view. As many estates were situated in a wetland landscape it was not uncommon that the main axis was formed by a canal. On landed estates created on sandy soils, avenues of trees played an important role, showing the far-reaching power of the landowner as they radiated towards the distant horizon (Williamson, 1991, p. 25). Such features were also intended to portray the domination of man over nature. Avenues had a further, more practical, function in that they made hunting in the forests easier. Parks were, therefore, typically composed of coppice, hunting grounds and ornamental woods, the latter being cut through with star-shaped lane systems thus creating features known as sterrenbossen (Buis, 1985, p. 553-554).

Geometric gardens continued to be popular into the eighteenth century, although the Italian, French and Dutch geometric garden styles were gradually simplified, incorporating more serpentine and naturalistic features, eventually evolving into the so-called Rococo style. This style had its origins in Paris during the 1690s and was marked by an asymmetrical use of s-shaped curves to form flower beds and abstract decoration (Watkin, 1982, p. 31). In the Netherlands the style became apparent from the 1720s onwards and was particularly associated with the creation of patterns through the use of ornamental and more utilitarian trees, interspersed with winding paths, known as slingerbossen (Renes, 1994, p. 43; Albers, 1998, p. 22). Alongside this continuing development of the geometric garden style in the early eighteenth century much more radical ideas were developing. These reflected a shift in philosophical attitudes that placed a new premium on design that echoed natural forms. As Koning argued: ‘The monotonous narrow lanes bounded by hedges, which gave little or no perspective, could, in spite of the statues, ponds, etc., give little satisfaction, and brought about a total reaction in gardening architecture’ (Koning, 1929, p. 137). Koning thus establishes the trend towards a more naturalistic garden style as a reaction against the rigid, geometric forms of the French style. More recent scholars have, however, argued that a further explanation of stylistic change can also be found in the high costs of maintaining formal gardens (Renes, 1994, p. 42; Williamson, 1993, p. 50).

The desire for the ‘natural’

It has often been suggested that new fashions in European garden design were initially prompted by the writings of English intellectuals including Sir William Temple (1628-1699), Joseph Addison (1672-1719); Anthony Ashley Cooper, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713); and Alexander Pope (1688-1744) (Buis, 1985, p. 556; Tromp, 2000, p. 7-10; Williamson, 1995, p. 49). As early as 1692 Sir William Temple noted that ‘there may be other forms wholly irregular that may, for aught I know, have more beauty than any of the others […]’. Something of this I have seen in some places,
but heard more of it from others who have lived much among the Chineses; a people, whose way of thinking seems to lie as wide of ours in Europe, as their country does. Among us, the beauty of building and planting is placed chiefly in some certain proportions, symmetries, or uniformities; our walks and our trees ranged so as to answer one another, and at exact distances. The Chineses scorn this way of planting. [...] their greatest reach of imagination is employed in contriving figures, where the beauty shall be great, and strike the eye, but without any order or disposition of parts that shall be commonly or easily observed’ (Temple, 1692). Watkin (1982, p. 1) argued that to contemporaries this irregularity would have seemed to echo nature. A preference for ‘nature’ was expressed by Lord Shaftesbury in his book *The Moralists, a Philosophical Rhapsody* (first published in 1709): ‘I shall no longer resist the Passion growing in me for Things of a natural kind; where neither Art, nor the Conceit or Caprice of Man has spoil’d their genuine Order… Even the rude Rocks, the mossy Caverns, the irregular unwrought Grottos, and broken Falls of Waters, with all the horrid Graces of the Wilderness itself, as representing NATURE more, will be the more engaging, and appear with a Magnificence beyond the formal Mockery of Princely Gardens’ (Shaftesbury, 1709, p. 101).

The Dutch garden historian Tromp sees the origins of the landscape style in the writings of such intellectuals and in the gardens created by the English designer Stephen Switzer (1682-1745) (Tromp, 2000, p. 6-9). However, as pointed out by Dixon Hunt (2002, p. 20) and Williamson (1995, p. 48-52), these first moves towards the creation of more naturalistic gardens represented a modification of, rather than a radical break from, earlier geometric gardens. This was true of the work of Switzer, who took particular exception to the high hedges (espaliers) found in geometric gardens, which he likened to ‘prison walls’ (Laird, 1999, p. 32, 36). By removing high walls and hedges, and replacing them by *ha-has* or sunken fences Switzer aimed to integrate his gardens more fully into the wider estate landscape. Yet, Switzer’s gardening remained very formal, albeit simplified in pattern and with a greater use made of woodland. But it is this ‘simplified geometric style’ that Williamson believes was the manner of gardening advocated by writers like Shaftesbury, Temple and Pope (Williamson, 1995, p. 51).

Many modern landscape historians thus argue that the Englishman William Kent (1685-1748) was the first designer who worked entirely in the new ‘naturalistic’ style (Williamson, 1995; Backer et al, 1998). Horace Walpole called Kent ‘the father of modern gardening’ and the inventor of ‘an art that realises painting and improves nature’ (Walpole, 1828, p. 263). Kent’s gardens were organised around winding paths and brooks and contained a variety of shrubs, trees and garden structures ‘to diversify the scene, promote associations and interact with the natural features’ (Dixon Hunt, 2002,
Early landscape gardens in Europe are often characterised by follies, including Chinese pavilions, grottoes, Gothic towers, ruins, Turkish tents, stone or wooden bridges, and hermitages. From the 1750s ideas from England reached the Netherlands and slowly the landscape style was enacted on the ground. On the whole the Netherlands seem rather late in adopting this new foreign fashion. Only some 30-40 years after William Kent had laid out gardens with twisting paths, irregular bodies of water, ‘naturalistic’ woodlands and numerous follies, were such designs executed in the Netherlands. The first gardens laid out, at least in part, in the new style were Groenendaal, near Heemstede in Noord-Holland (c. 1750), Over-Holland near Nieuwersluis in Utrecht (1755) and Huis ten Donck in Zuid-Holland (1765). In 1797 Hermanus Numan stated that since 1755 the owner of Over-Holland – Amsterdam merchant Willem Straalman – had removed rigid, geometric features from his garden and transformed it into ‘winding walks and hilly grounds, accompanied and cut by refreshing streamlets and spacious waters’ (quoted by Van den Berg et al, 1980, p. 74). Van den Berg et al did not, however, explore Straalman’s reasons for laying out his garden in this style. Indeed, little research has been undertaken that examines the reasons for the relatively late introduction of the landscape style into the Netherlands. Nor is it clear why it was the ideas of William Kent that were adopted in the second half of the eighteenth century, rather than those of Lancelot Brown, who had then attained remarkable popularity in England (see below). The answer may lie in part in the publication of books such as G. van Laar’s \textit{Magazijn van tuinsieraaden} (Repository of garden ornaments, 1802), which contained many English and German examples of garden pavilions, ornaments and follies including bridges, temples, tents, hermitages and chapels. Van Laar’s publication thus introduced the use of follies (a distinctive feature of Kent’s designs) to a broad Dutch public of landowners. Chapter 7 addresses the impact of such pattern books on the diffusion of garden design in more detail.

Only in the 1820s did the early landscape style in the Netherlands evolve into the Brownian landscape style, named after the English designer Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown (1716-1783). In the Dutch context it is usually referred to as the Romantic or Full landscape style (Albers, 1988, p. 12; Van Groningen, 1999, p. 243). Whereas previously the parks were fashioned in a contrived manner with sharply twisting paths and an abundance of follies, Brownian landscapes placed greater emphasis on creating a harmonious ‘natural’ design, with long curving paths, serpentine ornamental waters, wavy edged woodland, large open lawns with carefully grouped trees (preferably oak, beech or horse chestnut), and an underlying undulating relief (Betsey, 1993, p. 87). The variation created in scenery and views (that is looking both within the estate and further afield) was much appreciated by landowners. Follies were not completely abandoned, but they became more subtly incorporated into the harmony of the park instead of dominating the design. The best-known designers working...
in this style in the Netherlands were J.D. Zocher junior (1791-1870), S.A. van Lunteren (1813-1877), Carl E.A. Petzold (1815-1891) and Jan Copijn (1812-1886). These designers were influenced not only by foreign colleagues, but also by natural European landscapes. At this time, the alpine landscape of Switzerland, a popular holiday destination of the landed elite, was regarded as an ideal, and pine trees, then a rarity in the Netherlands, were particularly favoured in landscaped gardens for their association with the Swiss Alps. As Van Luttervelt (1949, p. 144) noted: ‘The foreign origin of pines and spruces has [had a great impact]. When growing on undulating terrain or alongside meandering brooks, then the decent Dutch would fancy themselves in the mountains of Bavaria or Switzerland. To perfect the illusion wooden “Swiss bridges” and “Swiss chalets” were built’. Such a landscape was, for example, created at Aardenburg estate in the province of Utrecht in 1902-1903 (Figure 2.6). This example also shows that the use of such elements remained popular into the twentieth century. It also serves, therefore, as a reminder that simple accounts of the successive rise and fall of garden style are not a wholly accurate representation of a reality that was often more complicated. Instances of gardens designed in a particular style continued to be created even after it had generally ceased to be fashionable (Albers, 1998; Van Groningen, 1999). Cases such as this also highlight the need to refine existing generalisations about the evolution of garden design through regional investigations and attention to specific estates. Such studies help to clarify the extent to which designs changed in practice and the various ways in which garden fashions were adapted by individual designers and landowners (Chapter 7).
Whereas parks that were a product of the romantic style generally had an open character and could be viewed from their surroundings, those created in the late landscape style (1870-1900) were more often screened off from the outside world by belts of trees, only occasionally cut through to create vistas. Albers (1984, p. 43) notes that towards the end of the nineteenth century a love of exotic trees, shrubs, plants and flowers was evident in parks of the late landscape style. This collecting mania was largely based on German fashions, particularly the work of the designer Hermann Fürst von Pückler-Muskau; 1785-1871 (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 15; Backer et al, 1998, p. 39). The layout of different tree species was carefully planned across the lawn to give an impression of natural planting, either in small groups or as individual specimens. Albers believes, however, that as many designers used standard round, oval or drop-like patterns in shaping lawns and flower beds and creating complex mosaic patterns (‘carpet beddings’), many newly created parks could hardly be taken for a natural landscape (Albers, 1998, p. 26). The use of such standard models can be seen in a design for Stokhorst estate near Enschede by Dirk Wattez (1833-1906) (Figure 2.7). This fashion also derived from Germany (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 53).

Figure 2.7: Design by D. Wattez for Het Stokhorst near Enschede, 1889.
Source: De Bazel Archives, Nederlands Architectuur Instituut.
The late landscape style can be distinguished from previous phases by this German influence, which – according to Zijlstra (1986, p. 41) – can be attributed particularly to the German designer Carl E.A. Petzold (1851-1891) who came to the Netherlands in 1854 to work for Prince Frederik of Orange. Nevertheless, although fashionable, the German landscape style was not always appreciated. It was, for example, criticised as far-fetched by the designer Leonard Springer (Onze Tuinen, 17 August 1923). In the second half of the nineteenth century Springer, and other designers including Henrik Copijn, designed landscape parks that were generally based on ideas derived from much earlier English designers such as Humphrey Repton (1752-1818), Uvedale Price (1747-1829) and Richard Payne Knight (1750-1824), who had advocated the so-called ‘Picturesque’ style. The landscapes created by Price and Knight in particular, were varied in texture and intricacy of natural materials, with a structural organisation of ‘three distances’: the foreground, middle ground and far distance (Dixon Hunt, 2002, p. 76). In these carefully created landscapes nature was rough, wild and unpredictable (Williamson, 1995, p. 148). Although entire gardens in this so-called ‘Picturesque’ style were never realised in the Netherlands, designers such as Springer and Copijn did incorporate picturesque elements into romantic landscape parks. This included creating small waterfalls and artificial rockeries, and the placing of a folly ruin along a meandering brook in a wood (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 38). It is not clear why this particular style had so little influence. Perhaps this ornamental view of landscape improvement was deemed uneconomical – it was certainly criticised in this way in England (Daniels & Watkins, 1991, p. 141) – or perhaps it was a style that was difficult to accommodate within the relatively small country estates and within the flat terrain of much of the Netherlands. It may also simply have been the case that so many different garden fashions were introduced from both England and Germany that no single landscape style ever achieved absolute dominance.

The creation of a landscape garden also demanded new and diverse types of vegetation. This is an aspect of garden design that has received little attention in the existing Dutch literature. Tromp and Oldenburger-Ebbers (1989) were the first to make a detailed study of the dendrological characteristics of several landed estates. Unfortunately, they did not offer a strong conclusion regarding the use of particular plants and trees in the creation of particular garden styles. Their discussion of eighteenth and nineteenth century nursery catalogues does, however, throw some useful light on to this particular aspect of landscape parks. Thus, a Dutch nursery catalogue of 1780 illustrated the wide variety of trees and plants used in the early landscape style (Tromp & Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 12-15). The list included many introduced or exotic species such as maple, horse chestnut, Indian date-plumb, American dwarf laurel, acacia, tulip tree, rhododendron and pomegranate-tree. From financial records of the Weldam estate in the province of Overijssel in
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the 1880s a picture is created of the dendrology of this later period (Tromp & Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 144-146). Park trees such as beech, chestnut, lime, maple tree and oak were still popular, as were rhododendron and acacia. Additions included lilac and palm trees, but overall the species used were similar to those evident on the list of 1780. However, the case of Weldam concerns alterations to an existing landscape park and hence the choice of specific trees and plants in the 1880s was probably influenced by the existing character of the park. Unfortunately, as the research of Tromp and Oldenburger-Ebbers involved only noble estates established prior to 1800 it is impossible to draw any clear conclusions about the species likely to have been used in creating new estates. Although some account is taken of the plant and tree species employed on specific estates (particularly Chapters 7 and 8), it is beyond the scope of the current thesis to investigate further this particular aspects of estate design. For English estates valuable information on the horticulture and dendrology of garden designs can be found in the work of M. Laird (1999, 2002), but in the Netherlands comprehensive research of this kind is largely missing. The investigation of such topics, however, would make a valuable contribution to the study of Dutch landed estates.

In 1923 Geertruida Carelsen (a pseudonym for Amy de Leeuw, granddaughter of J.D. Zocher jr.) wrote that ‘our nation has accepted this art form (i.e. landscape style; author) with much understanding and appreciation’, even coming to the conclusion that ‘after travelling in various countries’, nowhere else has ‘the true core of [the landscape style] been executed so far and so continuously as with us’ (Onze Tuinen, 12 October 1923). Indeed, the landscape style proved extremely popular in the Netherlands, for almost 150 years parks were laid out in this particular fashion. As the landscape style had developed and bloomed in England, landscape parks in the Netherlands are often referred to as ‘English’. Thus, in 1797 the author Hermanus Numan described a Dutch garden that had been laid out in the ‘modern or English manner’ a few decades earlier (quoted by Tromp, 2000, p. 60). Even modern scholars often refer to landscape parks as ‘English’ (e.g. Zeilmaker, 2004, p. 49; Kluckert, 2000, p. 352; Backer et al, 1998, p. 34). Furthermore, when referring to the introduction of new fashions in to the Netherlands, scholars generally emphasise the significance of ideas from England (Tromp, 2000; Dixon Hunt, 2002; Koning, 1929; Backer et al, 1998). Thus, Dixon Hunt noted that from the second half of the eighteenth century a large number of great landowners and gardeners from the Continent visited England to view these modern, natural gardens (Dixon Hunt, 2002, p. 90). He also argued that English ideas were subsequently diffused throughout western Europe, at first to France and Germany, later to other countries such as Sweden and the Netherlands. Tromp (2000, p. 1-2) also highlighted the importance of travel in the diffusion of ideas about garden design to the continent.
Despite the strength of these arguments, it is also important to realise that some aspects of the landscape park in the Netherlands were based on fashions from China (diffused through pattern books; see Chapter 7), the natural landscape of Switzerland and the ideas of German designers, as discussed earlier. The fact that many of the earliest landscape designers in the Netherlands were Germans, for instance G. Michaël (1738-1800) and J. P. Posth (1763-1831), offers further confirmation. By contrast there are no records of English designers working in the Netherlands during this period. It must, of course, be acknowledged that the designer Michaël had been sent to England by his client Jacob Boreel to examine the latest fashions. This suggests that at the end of the eighteenth century, it was England that was regarded as the centre of new trends in gardening. However, by the end of the nineteenth century, comments on Dutch garden fashions by contemporary designers tell us that new ideas were largely coming from Germany, and that landowners also derived independent inspiration from the natural landscapes of popular holiday destinations.

Return of geometry

In an article on Dutch gardens, Koning (1929, p. 317) noted that ‘since the triumphant march of the landscape style over Europe a conflict has been going on between the advocates of the rectilinear garden style and those of the landscape style, which is not yet settled and will not be settled as long as both sides bring forward striking arguments. It was thought … that a solution for a future new garden architecture is to be found in a combination and co-operation of the two modes, and many garden architects now make their plans, with full conviction, on those lines’. Koning was thus signalling a renewed interest in geometry in Dutch gardening towards the end of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, this resulted in the creation of gardens in neo-classical, neo-baroque, and neo-renaissance styles; on the other it led to the so-called mixed garden style that combined the landscape park with geometric flower gardens. According to Zijlstra (1986, p. 41), these developments were based on German, French and English ideas, and typify society in the late nineteenth century, which more generally sought inspiration in revisiting art forms of the past.

In his book *Fragments on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (1816) the English designer Humphrey Repton condemned ‘that bald and insipid custom, introduced by [Lancelot] Brown, of surrounding a house by a naked grass field’, referring to landscape parks in which the mansion stood solitary on an extensive lawn and where the transition from the man-made structure of the house to the supposedly natural sphere of the park was too abrupt. To create a softer transition Repton suggested that terraces and balustrades with flowers should be placed around the house (Dixon Hunt, 2000, p. 77-80). He thus reintroduced an element of symmetry into the park,
albeit only in the areas near the house, particularly in the form of rose gardens. This was taken further by John Claudius Loudon (1783-1843) who advocated surrounding ‘the house with […] certain more or less extended ramifications of arcades, porticoes, terraces, parterres, trellages, avenues and other such still splendid embellishments of art […] at once to offer a striking and varied contrast with, and a dignified and comfortable transition to, the undulating and rural features of the more extended, distant, and exposed boundaries’ (Loudon, 1833). Loudon and other designers such as William Atkinson (1773-1839), Joseph Paxton (1803-1865) and William Nesfield (1773-1881) also reintroduced geometric features from Italian style gardens, illustrating a renewed interest in older garden styles.

From around 1835 this particular interest also emerged in France, often deriving inspiration from French geometric gardens of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as, for instance, seen in the work of designers A. Alphand and E.F. André (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 26). The Dutch designer Hugo Poortman was a student of André, and together they worked at several nobles estates in the Netherlands, for example Weldam and Twickel (Figure 2.8; also see Chapter 7). Their co-operation is generally viewed as partly responsible for introducing the mixed garden style into the Netherlands (Van Groningen, 1999; Moes, 2002; Zijlstra, 1986).

Other influences came from Germany, for example through publications by the German designer Gustav Meyer, particularly his book *Lehrbuch der schönen Gartenkunst* (1860; Study book of the beautiful garden art) (Backer et al, 1998, p. 30) and through the ideas of Petzold who was working in the Netherlands (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 41). These new ideas were, however, more suitable for large noble estates, both in size and style, and foreign designers working in the Netherlands in this style were employed only on such substantial landed properties. By contrast, Dutch designers including Springer and Pieter Wattez (1872-1953) adapted the mixed style in their designs for smaller gardens on the new country estates of the newly wealthy. Such designs combined geometrical and naturalistic elements on a small scale, integrating a formal rose garden close to the main garden, with a relatively small landscape park at a distance from the house. While some of the features of this combination must have reflected a purely practical desire to create variety and a sense of space within a relatively small area, the aesthetic appeal of the mixed style meant that it was widely adopted by owners of new estates. The case of Springer and Wattez illustrates that new ideas from Germany, France and England were not simply copied, as is largely suggested by several of the scholars cited above, but rather they were altered to meet the needs and resources of a particular group of clients. This thesis thus aims to investigate the impact of the rise of a new group of
landowners on garden design, thereby linking changes in landownership to changes in fashion in a way that is largely missing in existing Dutch literature.

Although the mixed style reintroduced the geometric garden around the house, it was thought by some designers that this should be taken further. A desire to bring the house and its surroundings into perfect harmony inspired many architects and landscape designers in the early twentieth century to start working more closely together in a new garden style that was called ‘architectonic’. The stylistic unity of the home and the garden which they sought was expressed through the garden layout and the use made of many constructed elements in the garden, including pergolas, gazebos, steps, walls and ponds. The garden thus became an extension of the house and ‘The garden artist has the task […] of making a work in which the process of life itself is reflected, and that is not only adjusted to the Character of the surrounding Landscape, but also to the Character of the House’ (Van der Swaelmen, 1916, p. 106). Van der Swaelmen, a Belgian garden designer who also worked in the Netherlands, donated his collection of books to the Institute of Architecture at La Cambre in Brussels where he taught. This collection makes clear the extent to which he drew inspiration from the articles in the English magazine *Country Life*, in which Gertrude Jekyll wrote frequently about
the Arts & Crafts style (La Cambre Library, Brussels). Many of Jekyll’s ideas can be seen, for example, at De Boekel estate, designed by Van der Swaelmen in 1916-18, confirming his debt to English designers (see Chapters 7 and 8). However, both Zijlstra and Albers attribute the rise of the architectonic style to renewed German influence, particularly exhibitions and publications (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 72; Albers, 1998, p. 29). It would therefore be safe to say that once more a mixture of foreign ideas influenced Dutch garden design. However, neither Zijlsta nor Albers, nor any other scholar has investigated the working methods of Dirk F. Tersteeg (1876-1942), the leading Dutch garden designer working in the architectonic style. A detailed study of Tersteeg’s influences would be revealing and might throw new light on the degree to which external influences shaped this phase of Dutch garden design. Such a focus on the work of a particular individual is not consistent with the overall aims of the present thesis. It is important to note, however, the extent to which existing studies have concentrated on the work of a handful of leading designers, such as Springer, at the expense of consideration of less famous figures such as Tersteeg.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

This chapter set out to create a context for this thesis by highlighting the three key issues: landownership, estate building and the design of estate landscapes in the Netherlands. Moreover, it has revealed that, although much research has been undertaken on country estates and their gardens, relatively little attention has been paid to the relationship between the emergence of a new group of landowners in the nineteenth century and changes both in the pattern of distribution of estates and the design of estate landscapes. The references to such changes in the work of scholars including Moes (2002), Backer et al (1998), Olde Meierink (1984) and Hammer-Stroeve (2001) leaves many questions unanswered. The specific circumstances and tastes of the landowner, for example, are rarely considered during discussions of changing garden fashions. The impression is therefore given that landowners rapidly and enthusiastically adopted new trends in design. A more questioning attitude to such developments requires greater attention to individual owners’ tastes, motivations, social networks and financial resources. Previous studies also seem to neglect the potential geographical and social consequences of the division of communal wastelands. Yet this raises obvious questions about the scale and location of land entering the market and the extent to which particular types of landowner benefited from wasteland divisions. Such themes will be taken further in the context of the study areas of Utrecht and Twente.

The timing of the establishment of country estates in the Netherlands seems to have reflected particular phases of activity, related to broader changes in social, economic and political circumstances. Within the current research period from 1750 to 1950, two phases have been
identified. The first period of estate building occurred towards the end of the eighteenth century, when the French occupation resulted in a shift in landownership. The old nobility was deprived of their rights and was sometimes compelled to sell their landed properties, which were subsequently bought by patricians or ‘commoners’ who had prospered under French rule. The second phase covered most of the nineteenth century and was marked by the rise of a group of newly wealthy families who used fortunes derived from finance, commerce and industry (see Chapter 5) to invest in land ownership. That they were able to do so was also a result of the division of wastelands throughout the Netherlands, a process that will be discussed in more depth in Chapters 4 and 6.

The new landowners created numerous country estates, often with gardens in the latest fashions. Albers (1998), Backer et al (1998) and Zijlstra (1986) have shown that a sequence of different garden fashions was apparent, progressing through various phases of landscape park design to a later reintroduction of geometric styles. Conventional wisdom suggests that Dutch garden fashions largely depended on ideas from England, but there is evidence to show additional influences from German and French fashions and from the individual ideas and experiences collected by landowners as a result of their own personal travels. It was also the case that specific gardens were periodically redesigned, often leading to a composite landscape that contained elements within it reflecting different phases of garden fashion. For all these reasons, therefore, garden design as found on the ground is often a more complicated and varied creation than accounts of the history of design might lead us to suppose.

Changes in taste were generally a reflection of wider social processes, often reacting against the fashion of the previous period. However, it can be argued that the emergence of a new group of landowners in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries itself influenced the way in which gardens were laid out. This may have reflected a sense of social position and a style of life that was rather different from that of the established class of noble landowners. The scale and location of most estates founded by the *nouveaux riches* may also have influenced their style. Relatively small properties, often established in close proximity to each other and to neighbouring urban centres were perhaps less able to accommodate the landscape style popular on larger estates. Their owners were thus more ready to adopt, and adapt, new fashions. At first this was seen in the use made of the mixed style, but estate design quickly evolved into the architectonic or Arts & Crafts style, which seemed particularly suitable for these estates. A need for a more secluded, private environment also encouraged the planting of tree belts around the estate. Taken together, this suggests that new fashions were both the result of creative thinking by designers, artists and
philosophers and of the various more practical considerations born of change in the pattern of landownership and the character of landowners.

The extent to which links can be drawn between changes in garden fashions and the rise of a new land-owning group will be explored further in the course of this thesis (Chapters 5, 7 and 9). Attention will also be paid to the location of the newly created estates and to ways in which the motives of new estate owners may be reflected in estate design and layout (Chapters 6 and 8). Such thinking perhaps represents a challenge to conventional accounts of the history of garden design which tend to over-emphasise the role played by a handful of professional designers in defining and popularising new trends. It seems appropriate to take this further through attention to the various ways in which ideas about garden fashion were diffused. This allows further note to be taken of the social background of the newly wealthy landowners, exploring the potential influence of their character, status and social circle upon the ways in which they used and experienced their estates, and on their choices of particular designers to create a functionally and aesthetically pleasing landscape. The thesis will therefore, as discussed in Chapter 1, entail a combination of English and Dutch historical geographical approaches, studying both the landscapes of the newly created estates and the people who owned them. The following chapter identifies some of the key elements of this synthetic approach and the sources that have been used to inform the research.
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INTRODUCTION
As a work of synthesis this thesis necessarily draws upon a variety of methodologies, techniques and sources, both geographical and historical. This chapter discusses the strengths and weaknesses of source material available for the study of Dutch country estates in the 1800s and early 1900s, including cartographic material, fieldwork, and archival material. After the detailed discussion of Dutch material, a short review of used English sources is given. The chapter furthermore outlines the methods and techniques used for the retrieval, interpretation and display of data relevant to issues and questions raised in Chapter 1, particularly Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

3.1 CARTOGRAPHIC MATERIAL
Historic and modern atlases and maps often form the first source for geographers, offering a systematic view of spatial processes and patterns (Harten, 1992; Butlin & Dodgshon, 1998; Renes, 1999; Spek, 2004; Beenakker, 1989). The cartographic accuracy of such sources, however, must always be considered, in terms of scale, degrees of detail, area coverage and reproduction of geographic reality. The purpose for which the map had been created (e.g. military, land tax, estate management), generally determines what information is included and how it is depicted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cartographic source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Scale in metres</th>
<th>Principal uses for thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military maps by J.H. Hottinger</td>
<td>1788-1794</td>
<td>1:14400</td>
<td>Estate location, estate name, some detail of estate layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral maps or <em>minuutplans</em> (used only in combination with ledgers)</td>
<td>1832 and after</td>
<td>1:1250, 1:2500 or 1:5000</td>
<td>Identification field types, estate size, estate ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyper’s provincial atlases of municipalities</td>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>1:10000 to 1:150000</td>
<td>Topographical detail, estate name, estate location, aesthetic and functional estate landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Bonne’-maps</td>
<td>1860-1940</td>
<td>1:25000</td>
<td>Identification field types, estate size, landscape, management, ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern topographic maps</td>
<td>1940-present</td>
<td>1:25000 or 1:50000</td>
<td>Topographical detail, estate name, estate location, aesthetic and functional estate landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate maps and surveys</td>
<td>Circa 1800-1950</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Identification field types, topographical detail, estate size, landscape, management, ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Summary of key cartographic sources

In the context of this research, maps help identifying the location, scale and lay-out of country estates and their surrounding landscape. Cartographic material from the late eighteenth century up to the 1950s was thus used to answer questions relating the spatial and temporal distribution
patterns and the use made of country estates (i.e. forestry, agriculture, aesthetic). The main types of cartographic sources employed in this thesis and their uses are summarised in Table 3.1.

Hottinger’s military maps, reprinted by Versfelt (2003), of the northern and eastern parts of the Netherlands (1788-1794) were particularly precise on the course of rivers, roads and borders and in the location of settlements, landed estates and castles. They even showed some detail of the aesthetic layouts of landed estates (Figure 3.1). The surrounding landscape, however, has been drawn with just enough detail to indicate the general nature of an area and whether it could be travelled by the army. The Hottinger maps have only been used for locating estates at the end of the eighteenth century and for identifying the character of the aesthetic landscape at these estates, offering an overview of the existing pattern of landownership in Twente. Unfortunately the Hottinger maps do not include the province of Utrecht and no comparable cartographic source of this time exists (ex. inf. Storms, 2005).

In contrast, nineteenth-century cadastral maps and topographic maps provide complete coverage of both study regions. The cadastral maps (known as minuutplans) form part of the so-called Cadastre, a uniform tax register introduced in 1832. The maps were created for tax registrations and as a record of landownership and land use. Surveyors drew a map of each municipality,
using the triangulation measurement in which the church tower of the main village was the zero point in the co-ordinate system. Each municipality was divided into sections, numbered A, B, C, etc, with Section A being the northernmost section in the municipality. Each section was furthermore divided into plots that were defined by their tax value. The maps lacked topographical detail, as their purpose was only to show the boundaries of the cadastral municipalities and the location of the different plots of land. They were only intended to be used by the surveyors and tax administrators. Numbers in the maps referred to the fiscal data in tabular form, the so-called ‘Oorspronkelijke Aanwijzende Tafels’ (OATs). For example, plot number 188 on the minuutplan of the municipality of Zuilen in the province of Utrecht was registered in the OAT as a castle with court yard, 0.13 hectares in area, that belonged to Baron Willem René Tuyll van Serooskerken (Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2: Detail of a minuutplan showing Castle Zuilen.
Source: Cadastre 1832 of Zuilen, Sectie A2, Utrechts Archief.

The cadastral maps and OATs of both study areas are housed in the provincial archives of Utrecht and Overijssel, but can also been found at the following website: www.dewoonomgeving.nl/. Koeman (1982, p. 114) remarked that the minuutplans are a
difficult cartographic source as they appear in three different scales (1:5000, 1:2500 or 1:1250), have various orientations, and contain hardly any topographic detail. Nevertheless, the maps, together with the ledgers, form a valuable source of information as they give insight into the use, value and ownership of land (Renes, 1999, p. 57). Its assets, accuracy and faults will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.

The minuutplans formed the foundation of topographic maps (Koeman, 1982, p. 114-115; 119; Koeman, 1983, p. 229-230). In the middle of the nineteenth century the first truly accurate topographic map of the Netherlands was produced: Topographische en Militaire Kaart van het Koningrijk der Nederland (TMK; Topographic and Military Map of the Netherlands). For the provinces Utrecht and Overijssel only TMK maps at a scale 1:50000 exist. Beenakker (1989, p. 17) argued that such topographic maps were a ‘cartographic translation of the landscape’ and that they are an important source for reconstructing the landscape in the past. Based on the TMK the cartographer J. Kuyper produced eleven provincial atlases of municipalities in the 1860s, at a scale of 1:10000 to 1:150000. The maps were black and white with only the borders coloured-in. Consequently, details about the character of the estates and the surrounding landscape is hard to identify. Nevertheless, the maps proved to be very valuable for defining the location and name of country estates.

In the time period 1860-1940 a series of topographic maps at a scale of 1:25000 was created. They are generally known as ‘Bonne’-maps, named after the French cartographer Rigobert Bonne (1712-1795) who had developed the projection-method used for these maps (Wieberdink, 1989). With a high degree of topographic detail the coloured Bonne-maps are remarkably accurate reproductions of reality, and as such have been highly valued by Dutch historical geographers (ex. inf. Haartsen, 2005; Renes, 1999, p. 58). From 1940 the ‘modern topographic map series’ (1:50000 and 1:25000) have been published. Every four years a new edition is created. Together the various topographic maps have been used as a means of recording continuity and change in the distribution pattern of country estates, of analysing the design of parks and gardens, and of exploring the character of the regions as a whole (e.g. infrastructure, physical landscape, settlements).

A much used cartographic source in research on landed estates is the estate map (Williamson, 1995; Seymour, 1998; Daniels, 1990; Storms, 2005). Estate maps, commissioned by private landowners interested in increasing the economic profit of their landed property, showed all individual land plots of a single estate with their names and use, as well as buildings, roads and a variety of vegetation. They primarily served to help the owner to manage the property and appraise its value (Harley, 1983, 1990; Buisseret, 1996). Prior to 1800 estate owners in the study areas often desired such a map of their estate with accompanying field books (e.g.
Goudestein estate near Maarssen; HUA, 67, no. 1138), but during the course of the nineteenth century most owners would simply have a copy of a cadastral map with a list of all cadastral land plots in their ownership (e.g. Wulperhorst estate near Zeist; HUA, 67, no. 1291). Hence, due to the availability of cadastral and topographic maps, relatively few estate maps have been created in this time period. The few estate maps that have been found were of large noble estates (e.g. Weldam estate near Delden; Weldam Estate Archive, separate documents). Several maps of nouveaux riches estates have been found that portray the situation prior to new developments (particularly in the gardens and parks), and often these maps were made by the designer employed to redesign the aesthetics of the estate landscape, for example De Paltz near Huis ter Heide, and Hulsbeeke near Oldenzaal (SCL, no. 01.473.02 & 01.419.01). As such they differ from estate maps that were primarily used as a working document in estate management. Nevertheless, the estate maps that were available, including the copies of the Cadastre, have been a most rewarding source for the study of specific estates and the management and design thereof (see also section 3.2: Estate designs and views).

Together, these cartographic sources especially helped developing an overview of the location of estates and the ways in which the pattern changed over time; they have also given an indication of the layout of estates. This information has been combined with data retrieved from secondary literature, archival sources and fieldwork to obtain a more complete picture.

3.2 ARCHIVAL MATERIAL

The reading of archival material – including garden designs, estate accounts, correspondence and other papers – has given insights into contemporary attitudes towards matters of landownership, agricultural improvement, wealth creation and landscape tastes. Archival sources have also been used for detailed study of a sample of individual estates, proving to be a vital source of information on practices in estate management, the workings of the land market and the impact of social relationships upon the functioning of estates.

Estate designs and views

Earlier mention was made of nineteenth-century estate maps that had been made to reveal the layout of the estate prior to alterations in the parks and gardens. Generally these estate maps were made by the designer employed to get a better understanding of the existing landscape on which he could base his ideas for a new estate or garden design. The estate map of De Paltz (1876), for example, was drawn by Leonard Springer who subsequently made a design for a labyrinth and an extension of the park in 1883-1884 (SCL, no. 01.473.01 & 01.473.02). A large number of estate designs are located at the Special Collections Library at the University of Wageningen; the designs for nouveaux riches estates in Utrecht and Twente are listed in the Bibliography of this thesis. Much of this data is also available on the internet:
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http://library.wur.nl/tuin/. The available information at the SCL is, however, not complete as it is largely focused on the works of Springer. Complementary data was sought in estate, family and provincial archives and in historical printed material (see below). Designs have been found for the entire research period. They offered insights into the aesthetics of a specific estate landscape, but also helped to explore the general evolution of garden fashions and the choices made by owners and designers. However, the problem with estate designs is that you cannot be sure that the planned layout was actually executed. Therefore designs always need to be compared to other sources such as photographs, topographic maps or estate records. Establishing whether an estate design was executed can also be confirmed through fieldwork, as is discussed in section 3.4.

The appearance of estates was also portrayed in estate views, drawn by professional painters as M. Mourot (1829-1830) and P.J. Lutgers (1869). Scholars who investigated the architecture of the mansions have eagerly used these sources (e.g. Van Luttervelt, 1943, 1944, 1949; Van Groningen, 1999), but these drawings also give some insights into the layout of the surrounding parks and gardens, and even into the development of new country estates. Thus, the drawings of Lutgers in 1869 included a substantially higher number of *nouveaux riches* estates than the work of Mourot some thirty years earlier, indicating an increase in estate foundation during that time. However, as the focus of these drawings lay on the front of the main house, we get no information about the landscape behind the mansion. Van Groningen (1999, p. 113-114) furthermore noticed that, although Lutgers was generally up-to-date with his drawings, sometimes he would base his estate view on older sketches, therefore giving an inadequate representation of reality (for example at Ma Retraite, Bloemenheuvel and Beeklust). Examples of Mourot’s and Lutgers’ drawings can be found throughout the thesis.

The geographical focus by both Mourot and Lutgers on several parts of the province of Utrecht meant that, unfortunately, no estate views for Twente were included. In fact, on the whole, only a few depictions have been found of estates created between 1800 and 1950 in Twente. Certainly no mass volumes that discuss all landed estates in the area (as seen in Utrecht) have been created. It appears that this lack in estate views is linked to the late establishment of most *nouveaux riches* estates in Twente (namely after 1870). By that time photography was the major tool for depicting landed estates. Two exceptions are Anco Wigboldus’s bird’s eye view of Hooge Boekel estate (1977; see Chapter 8) and a painting of Villa Nuova in Almelo (before 1889) by L. Salm. It is unclear why the owners of these estates employed such artists for depicting their landed property.
Photographs

‘The advent of photography opened new worlds to nineteenth-century viewers, who became able to visualize themselves, their immediate surroundings, their communities, and the world beyond’ (Schwartz & Ryan, 2003, introduction). With their book *Picturing place: photography and the geographical imagination* Schwartz and Ryan presented the first study of the connections between geographical imagination – ‘the ability to know the world and situate oneself in space and time’ – and photographic representation. The focus of the volume, as the editors describe it, is to present photography as a ‘socially constructed, culturally constituted and historically situated practice, and photographs as visual images, historical documents and material objects’ (quoted by Watts, 2003, review).

In the nineteenth century photographs increasingly replaced portraits and paintings as a way of depicting one’s family and landed estate; among the researched newly wealthy of Utrecht and Twente a limited number of paintings have been found, contrasting with the numerous photographs in frames, albums and magazines (early twentieth century). Family photographs celebrate the importance of family life and social links (‘who consorted with who’), and can reveal aspects of landownership, as the new landed elite was often photographed on their landed properties. As such, the photographs also offer a visual record of landscape experience (e.g. hunting, rowing, drinking tea, strolling through the gardens) and the layout of the estate landscapes. Pictures of the gardens, including aerial images, can be measured against future changes, thus revealing the character of the aesthetic landscape through time.

For example, in the 1920s the Van Heek family of Enschede altered part of their garden at Het Stroot estate into a modern garden in architectonic style; its layout is clearly shown on a picture of 1932 (Figure 3.3). This example, however, also shows the greatest weakness of old photographs as evidence: they are often posed and therefore only show a selection of reality. Fortunately, landowners often possessed numerous pictures of their family and friends, and of their landed property, giving a more complete and reliable account of these various aspects of landownership. Some owners, for instance Jan Bernard van Heek, were keen amateur photographers themselves (Stichting Edwina van Heek, 1996).

Among Dutch historical geographers the use of historic photographs as evidence is uncommon. In a special publication of *Historisch Geografisch Tijdschrift* (HGT; Historical-Geographical Magazine), which discussed a wide range of sources for studying the cultural landscape, some mention is made of using postcards as a source of information (Purmer & Van Lochem, 2002, p. 116-119). It showed how postcard images of specific country estates can help to reveal the character of the landscape. The usage of historic photographs in this thesis is much broader in
character as it also serves to explore the communities of the newly wealthy and the way in which the new landowners experienced their estates.

To this must be added the information that can be gleaned from aerial and ground photographs taken in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Taylor, 1998; Phillips & Foy, 1995; Renes, 1995; Blijdenstijn, 2005). In his thesis on the cultural landscape of the Dutch province of Limburg, Renes (1995, p. 58) used aerial photographs primarily ‘as an addition to topographic maps’, while Taylor’s ‘landscape history from the air’ illustrated the greater value of such sources for studying parks and gardens. In the context of this thesis, as in Taylor’s work, aerial photographs have been used to analyse the present-day character of the gardens, revealing – for example – detailed aspects of colour-schemes, tree species, and the connection with the surrounding environment. During my fieldwork (see section 3.4) I have also taken many ground photographs of the country estates and their landscape, thereby creating an extensive archive that has been used to explore the representative features of particular garden designs, periods or regions. The analysis of which appears in chapters 7, 8 and 9.
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**Historical printed material**

A range of historical printed material has been used, including design manuals, journals on gardening, and published descriptions of country estates. They offer valuable information on trends in gardening, on the manner in which new ideas were diffused and on discussions between designers.

Published descriptions of country estates have given insights into the actual character of particular places. Professional writers like J. B. Christemeijer (1837) and J. Craandijk (1888) travelled through various parts of the Netherlands documenting the country estates they visited, including the clusters of country estates near Utrecht. These descriptive documents have often been used by historians for their analysis of house and garden, although sometimes the given descriptions are misunderstood. Thus, archivist and historian Rhoen (2002) criticised scholars like Blijdenstijn (1984) and Moes (1991) who dated the mansion Molenbosch solely on Christemeijer’s descriptions. By consulting family archives and cadastral ledgers Rhoen proved that the mansion was actually built in 1850, and that Christemeijer’s comment in 1837 denoted the building of the gardener’s house. This example indicates the importance of comparing published descriptions of country houses with archival material.

Dutch design manuals or pattern books, such as G. van Laar’s *Magazijn van tuinsieraaden* (Repository of garden ornaments; 1802) or A.J. van Laren’s *Decoratieve tuinbeplanting* (Decorative garden planting; 1913), were often based upon foreign examples. Also foreign books were popular in the Netherlands, for example Krafft’s *Plans of the most beautiful picturesque gardens in France, England and Germany…*(1809) and Loudon’s *An encyclopaedia of gardening* (1822). Such books intended to present examples of gardens and particular features to a broad public of landowners and designers. In this way new trends were diffused through Europe. Analysis of pattern books (the kind of garden designs and features, the number of reprints, etc) can give insights into the popularity of certain styles. Examples are known of features presented in Van Laar’s work that have been copied by landowners (see Chapter 7).

Journals on gardening and design appeared in the Netherlands from the late nineteenth century and have been used by designers as a vehicle to express their personal opinions. Much discussion occurred in journals such as *Onze Tuinen* (Our Gardens), *De Bouwwereld* (The Building World), and *Huis Oud & Nieuw* (The House Old & New), offering researchers of garden history and the diffusion of new trends valuable information. Not only discussions and articles by leading designers have been relevant for this research, also the many advertisements of less known designers, nurserymen and contractors publicising their talents and products have been useful. They can illustrate whether national trends also occurred at a regional level.
Sometimes magazines even included articles on a particular country estate or garden (for example Hooge Vuursche in *Huis Oud & Nieuw*; see section 7.1).

**Personal correspondence (letters)**

Largely ignored by historical geographers (at least in the Netherlands), letters have always been appreciated by historians as valuable sources (Ter Kuile, 1911; Jansen, 1988; De Bruin, 1986, 1996; De Bruin & Pietersma, 2002; Leeuwenberg et al, 2004). Compared to other written documents, letters tell about the past from individual points of view. Schulte & Von Tippelskirch (2004), who edited a volume on letters as historical sources, noted that ‘letters have been written to bridge distances, to build networks and to strengthen relationships’. They permit us ‘to reconstruct social relationships and family structures… [and] possible evolutions of thought, of discourse, circulation and production of knowledge’ (Schulte & Von Tippelskirch, 2004, p. 5, 7-8). Thus, in the context of this thesis, personal records as evidence helped to investigate the social side of landownership, but also gave valuable insights into aspects of estate management, of land purchases, of owners’ involvement in gardening, and of using and experiencing the landscape. Several poems (written by estate owners and their guests) furthermore revealed certain sentiments about nature. Personal records can therefore also hint about people’s motivations for land investment, which is further looked into in chapters 5 and 6.

The personal aspect of letters, however can also be a disadvantage. It means that a letter may be full of ‘private’ matters (for example a mother telling a son to dress warmly) or talks about the weather that are of no interest to the researcher. Reading through the letters of numerous families can therefore be a daunting task, but worthwhile as it often provides the researcher with exclusive information.

**Records of hunting and shooting**

An extraordinary source are hunting diaries, personal records of a landowner’s success in hunting and shooting. These records showed details on the location of hunting grounds, the frequency of hunting, the numbers and species of game killed, and the people who hunted together. Unfortunately, keeping a hunting diary was not common amongst landowners in the study areas. Therefore, these sources needed to be combined with other archival sources such as hunting regulations (often found in family archives), ledgers of hunting permits, and estate accounts (see below). For the province of Utrecht several ledgers have been found that show a list of issued hunting permits with names, age and place of residence of each individual. Together these sources can provide a picture of the social side and of the geography of hunting (see Chapter 8). Within Dutch historical geography at least this is an aspect of landscape use that has not yet been researched.
Estate accounts
Detailed insights into the management of the landed estate and the financial records of the household could be found in estate accounts. Account books, generally in tabular form, show the income and expenses of the estate, including household expenses, taxes, disbursements for maintaining and upgrading the gardens, woods and stables, and wages for game keepers, gardeners and other staff. Many landowners also kept an account book of land purchases and sales. However, engagement with the source material reveals that account books were highly inconsistent in the amount of detail that they included. So, for example, the most informative estate accounts listed individual holdings that were bought with a description of the land plot, the sale date, the name of the previous owner, and how much money was paid. Other accounts only stated the exact extent of the landed estate without any detail on where the land came from. Furthermore, account books generally excluded any detail on the causes of changes in income and expenses. Thus, a sudden rise in garden disbursements indicates an increase in activities here, but more than that it cannot tell us. Fortunately, estate owners often held a personal archive of all sorts of bills paid to, for example, lay out a new garden or plant more trees. Bills of nurserymen and designers provide a wealth of information concerning a particular garden, but also more general trends in garden design (e.g. what kind of trees were used). Nevertheless, the inconsistency of the source material means that the amount of useable data varies according to the issue being investigated.

Tax registers
As the income and ownership defines the height of the tax assessment, nineteenth-century tax registers can be an informative source for examining the financial position of individuals. In the context of this thesis two particular registers have been used, namely the list of highest taxed individuals (lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen; 1813, 1848-1917) and the Cadastre (1832 and onwards; see section 3.3).

The lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen was introduced around 1813 and further enforced through the new constitution in 1848. Each year, until 1917, these tax lists were created for each province, showing all wealthy men older than 30 years of age and with an annual income of over 8500 guilders who lived in that specific province. Whoever was on the list could be elected for the national government. Publications of the lists appeared in provincial newspapers (e.g. Zwolsche Courant) or in provincial magazines (e.g. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht; Figure 5.2), now available at the provincial archives. The lists are helpful in defining the changing status of newly wealthy, in terms of finance and location of property (see Chapter 5). The tax list shows the tax to be paid on landed property (including buildings), business assets and a personal tax (based on the numbers of servants, horses, windows and hearths) (Klep, Lansink & Van Mulken, 1982, p. 7-9). However, because only men living in that specific province are listed, it will not show people who have landed property there but who officially live outside the
province. In other words, a businessman from Amsterdam who owned a country estate near
Utrecht will be listed in the list of the city of Amsterdam, until he permanently moved into his
country house (www.gemeentearchief.amsterdam.nl/).

3.3. THE CADASTRE, 1832

Much of the data on landownership in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been based on
the tax register of the Cadastre. For this reason an overview is given of the history of the
Cadastre and how it can be used in historical-geographical research. Until the end of the
eighteenth century the registration and taxation of landed property in the Netherlands differed
per region. However, the unification of the Dutch provinces in 1798 prompted calls for a
uniform system of land taxation and an accurate record of landownership. In effect, this was a
result of the French occupation (1795-1813), and the ideology of the French Revolution
(WKAU, 1998, p. 7). When the Netherlands were incorporated into the French Empire in 1810,
French laws and customs were introduced, such as “Recueil Méthodique des Lois Décrêtes,
Règlements, Instructions et Décisions sur le Cadastre de la France” (translated into Dutch in
1812). It outlined the instructions for triangulation measurement, cartography, administration
and tax classification in great detail.

The purpose of the cadastre was 1) to create a uniform tax register for the whole country, and 2)
to improve the legal security of landed property (WKAU, 1998, p. 5). Work started in 1812, but
halted after the fall of the entire French Empire in 1813. Furthermore, the surveys proved to be
very time consuming and it was not until 1832 that Het Kadaster was formally introduced. The
result was a detailed record of landownership for each individual cadastral municipality. Every
plot of land - allocated with a specific number - was described in terms of ownership, size,
taxable value and function.

All cadastral surveys in the Netherlands were commissioned by the Ministry of State concerned
with Taxes (later the Ministry of Finance). For each province they were checked and
administered by the provincial governor (for Utrecht it was Baron J.M. van Tuyll van
Serooskerken, and for Twente it was Count J.H. van Rechteren van Appeltern) and the local
bailiff (later the mayor). The actual surveying was directed by the Director of Taxes, and was
undertaken by first and second class surveyors. The first class surveyor, who was assisted by a
second class surveyor, was responsible for the surveying and measuring of the landscape. Their
findings were recorded in the cadastral maps discussed earlier. In Twente each municipality was
generally surveyed by a different surveyor, while in the province of Utrecht two surveyors were
especially active, namely J. Vesters and B. van Zijlman.
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After the OATs or *Oorspronkelijk Aanwijzende Tafels* were compiled, the surveyors, together with the landowners and the local bailiff, would go into the field to check that the given classification was justified (Koeman, 1982, p. 108). When everyone had come to an agreement, the register was given to tax administrators who calculated the tax for each plot. The OATs formed the base for the cadastral ledger that was arranged by person (instead of geographically as in the OATs). In alphabetical order, each individual landowner was listed with their name, occupation and place of residence, together with details of the size, tax value and use of all land plots that person held. The ledgers were used to show how much tax each landowner had to pay. In 1832 the total tax in the Netherlands received through the cadastre was approximately 8 million guilders (Koeman, 1982, p. 105).

When comparing the tax list of different municipalities, it becomes clear that irregularities existed. This is strange, since the government’s aim was to create a uniform tax register. The WKAU (1998, p. 13) argues that there were differences in the classification due to incorrect application of the survey instructions or failings in their interpretation, and perhaps also to a lack of knowledge on the part of the surveyors. Furthermore, alterations of the cadastre frequently occurred after 1832, for instance, because of a change in function or owner, or due to dividing or joining plots of land. By 1870 the many regional changes in the plans that had occurred since 1832 had resulted in a tax register that was far from uniform.

Irregularities also occur in the original maps of the many municipalities, as they were drawn in different years, starting in 1812 and ending in 1831. In those twenty years many changes had taken place, not only in the ownership of land, but also in its functions and value. Furthermore, from 1825 to 1832 maps were drawn more quickly (and therefore with less accuracy) as the government wished for the rapid introduction of the Cadastre.

*The use of the cadastral ledger in this research*

Despite these irregularities, the original cadastre is a valuable source of information on early nineteenth-century property, revealing detail on the location, value, function and ownership of buildings and land in the Netherlands. Updates of the cadastral ledgers allow the creation of a picture of change through time. For the purpose of this research the ledgers of Utrecht and Twente have been used to create a record of estate ownership in these regions from 1832 onwards. Whereas the OATs - the most used cadastral source within contemporary research – are lists of land plots in 1832, the ledgers offer information about the whole landed property of each landowner in 1832 and following years. The ledgers are thus a useful source for analysing change in institutional and individual landownership throughout the nineteenth century and after. It allows the researcher to create a list of the greatest landowners at a given time. Table 3.2 shows the ten greatest individual landowners in Twente as an example.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First names</th>
<th>Total land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rechteren van Limpurg</td>
<td>Count Adolf Frederik Lodewijk van</td>
<td>3092.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassenaar</td>
<td>Countess Maria Cornelia van</td>
<td>2384.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulsken</td>
<td>Jan Hendrik</td>
<td>314.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palthe</td>
<td>Jan (Johannes)</td>
<td>293.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonninghausen</td>
<td>Frans Egon von, esquire</td>
<td>277.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droste</td>
<td>Count Maximiliaan Heideweg Ludeweg van</td>
<td>259.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roesingh Udink</td>
<td>Johannes Theunis</td>
<td>255.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kistemaker</td>
<td>Theodorus Frederikus Anthonius</td>
<td>251.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikkers</td>
<td>Gerhardus Johannes Otto Doris</td>
<td>246.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulert</td>
<td>Adolf August Frederik Baron van</td>
<td>235.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonninghausen</td>
<td>Anna Maria Hillegarde Elisabeth von</td>
<td>187.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: The ten greatest individual landowners in Twente, 1832

NB: 1 hectare is the equivalent of 2.471 acres.
Source: Cadastre 1832, Kadaster Overijssel, Zwolle.

The cadastral ledgers of Twente are housed in the archives of Kadaster Overijssel (in Zwolle), those of Utrecht have recently been transferred from Kadaster Utrecht to the provincial archives Utrecht. However, by the time this thesis was printed the ledgers were still not accessible for the public. Consequently, the ledgers for Utrecht municipalities were consulted in regional archives. Unfortunately, the regional archive of Wijk bij Duurstede was flooded at the end of 2002 and many archival documents were lost or were put in a freezer to prevent further damage. Consequently it was impossible to collect data for the entire province of Utrecht, which meant that – although all data had been assembled for the Twente municipalities – no large-scale regional comparisons (e.g. relative and absolute land prices, and proportional and absolute ownership of land by marken or individual landowners) could be made based on the cadastral evidence. Of course the cadastral data that was found, including all the municipalities with **nouveaux riches** estates, has been used throughout the thesis.

The ledgers enable us to map aspects of landownership (land value, land size and functions) for regions and individuals. Spatial and temporal changes occurring at estate level, whether changes of growth (purchases, increasing coherency, cultivation) or decline (decreasing value, demolition of buildings, sale of land or buildings, decreasing size), have been mapped using Geographical Information Systems (GIS; see section 3.5). Computerised data processing techniques are applied to analyse the date derived from all cadastral ledgers in the study areas. Ledgers were created per municipality. Because landowners frequently held land in more than one municipality, this means that to compile a list of new landowners and their landed properties it is necessary to search for a landowner’s name in every ledger. Furthermore, to analyse changes in landownership through time it is possible to consult ledgers from 1832 up to the present day. Both are certainly daunting tasks, but manageable due to computerised data processing (see Section 3.5).
3.4 FIELDWORK
In his thesis on the cultural landscape of the Dutch province of Drenthe, Spek argues that although historic sources, such as maps and archival material, are valuable in historical-geographical research, they need to be supplemented by studying the landscape itself through fieldwork (Spek, 2004, p. 33, 40-45). In other words, a researcher cannot understand the character of the place (its location, layout and physical nature) unless he has actually seen it and walked through it. Chapter 1 already pointed out that Dutch historical geography has a tradition in which the actual landscape was one of the most important sources of knowledge (Harten, 1973; Beenakker, 1989; Renes, 1999; Spek, 2004). This tradition has been integrated into this research. Over a period of four years I have frequently visited the regions, for a better perspective of the distribution of estates, the absolute and relative location of specific cases, and the aesthetics of estate landscapes. Fieldwork helped to update and extend knowledge derived from archival and cartographic sources.

Particularly in the case of gardens and parks, fieldwork is a necessity. Physical evidence in existing gardens helps to identify the overall style of the garden and particular features within it, for instance (exotic) plants and trees, water features, statues and structural elements like artificial ruins. By investigating these individual features and the way in which they have been arranged to create a landscape, the researcher can define how the layout was related to the nature of the place, the surrounding landscape, issues of taste, and the use of the estate landscape. It furthermore illustrates the way in which the surrounding landscape has been changed by this landscaping, particularly in areas with many estates. Not only at estate level is fieldwork important; it is also crucial in understanding the pattern of distribution and the impact of country estates as a group on the surrounding landscape.

Fieldwork, although valuable, is limited by the landscape changes that have occurred during the last two centuries. Thus, as a result of urbanisation many country estates that were originally located outside the towns and cities, are now part of the urban sphere. In some cases the estate was divided into smaller land plots that were sold off to accommodate villas and office buildings. Even when new developments were not as dramatic, alterations have almost always taken place. Hence, fieldwork always needs to be linked to other sources like archives and maps.

3.5 ENGLISH SOURCES
In order to contextualise my specific studies of Dutch estates this thesis also encompasses a more selective attention to contemporary developments in England, comparing *nouveaux riches* in Twente with a similar social group in West Yorkshire (in the historic West Riding). As far as possible similar sources have been used, including photographs, hunting diaries, estate designs,
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correspondence, historical published material, maps, and registers of landownership. Documentary evidence like photographs, diaries and letters compare to the Dutch sources and therefore need no further explanation. Other sources, however, do. Of the large number of estate maps and designs found in the various regional archives in West Yorkshire, the majority were similar to Dutch examples in terms of techniques and manner of depiction, although they depicted different garden fashions (see Chapter 9). Exceptional is the work of leading designer Humphrey Repton who laid out the gardens at two *nouveaux riches* estates in West Yorkshire, namely Oulton Hall and Armley Hall, both in 1809. For his commissions Repton produced his famous Red Books, in which he used flaps and overlays to show how the existing gardens, parks and woodlands could be aesthetically improved (Daniels, 1981, 1999). The Red Book of Oulton Hall is deposited at the West Yorkshire Archive Service in Leeds; that of Armley Hall lies in an American archive. The designs by Repton, as well as the other plans for gardens in the region, proved to be valuable for identifying the scale and nature of gardening. It helped to compare this particular aspect of landownership with contemporary developments in Twente.

Important cartographic evidence was found in the one-inch Ordnance Survey maps, drawn from the 1830s onwards. They possess a high degree of accuracy and provide complete coverage for West Yorkshire (Harley & O'Donoghue, 1975). The OS maps have been used in this research as a topographic reference point for locating estates. Information about the distribution of landed estates and landownership has furthermore been gathered from such sources as the nineteenth-century Tithe maps, John Bateman’s survey of *The great landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (1873), Parliamentary Papers detailing landownership, and the 1911 New Domesday survey of landownership. In effect, these sources can be seen as the equivalent of *Het Kadaster*.

The tithe maps and apportionments, dated between 1836 and 1848, record the tithe (tax) paid on each piece of land, levied according to the productivity of the land. It was part of the implementation of the 1836 Act of Parliament to commute tithes from payment in kind to a money payment. However, in 1836 only 54 per cent of the West Riding remained subject to the payment of tithes and hence this detailed source of information on landownership and the location of estates is not available for the entire study area (Beech & Mitchell, 2004).

In 1872, Lord Derby initiated the creation of a register in the Parliamentary Papers with an official return of the landowners of the United Kingdom (Thompson, 1963, p. 27). This was followed up by the Return of Owners of Land in 1873, commonly known as the New Domesday Survey. Prior to this only the 1086 Domesday Book, made in the reign of William the Conqueror, provides a comprehensive survey of English landownership. The 1873 Parliamentary Papers were used by John Bateman for his survey of great landowners. In his opinion a great landowner owned over 3,000 acres of land, which was worth more than £3,000 a
year. For identifying estates of such proportions the survey proved very valuable, but the newly wealthy in West Yorkshire only rarely created such large properties, as mentioned previously in Chapter 1. In the period after Bateman’s survey knowledge about landownership can be drawn from Lloyd George's 'Domesday' of landownership of 1910-11 (Cahill, 2002). On the whole, however, it proved more useful to explore the account books and sale advertisements of particular estates. Unfortunately, this did not provide an overview of how much land had been bought up by newly wealthy in general, yet it has given some insight into this process through the use of case studies. The data from land tax records has been complemented by the New Dictionary of National Biography and commercial directories to obtain information about the character of the new landowners. Such directories included White’s *Directory and Gazetteer of Leeds, Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Wakefield and the whole of the Clothing District of Yorkshire* (1853), which detailed the various businesses in West Yorkshire, including those of many new landowners. It helped to create a database of these individuals and their landed properties.

On the whole, the sources used differed only slightly from the Dutch sources. The largest problem was the absence of a source that really was the equivalent of the Cadastre, a uniform tax register with complete coverage for the study areas. Nevertheless, the data found in general sources like the tithe maps and in specific evidence from estate records offered sufficient ground to compare the *nouveaux riches* of West Yorkshire with those in Twente (see Chapter 9).

### 3.6 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

The discussion of sources used already illustrated that this thesis is largely based on a combination of geographical and historical approaches, and a method of cross-referencing. This meant that documentary evidence seen as typical sources for historians have been used to answer questions of a geographical nature. Hunting diaries, for example, have been used for gaining insight into the nature of this sport, but also the social network of estate owners and the location of hunting grounds. Furthermore, garden designs, family correspondence and bills from designers provided valuable information on aspects of gardening and the employment of certain designers. By mapping this data a geographical image was created, revealing the impact of a specific garden architect in an area. Through the exploration of spatial patterns this thesis therefore embodies a geographical interrogation of the documentary evidence. The extraction of material used in defining the distribution and the character of landed estates is in fact largely based on traditional historical geographical methodologies: field work and reading of the three-dimensional landscape, the analysis of historic maps and archival material.

Similar sources and methods have also been used in understanding the social background of the *nouveaux riches* landowners, the broader processes of economics, politics and society that have
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influenced landownership, and the various aspects of garden design. However, for these contextual issues existing literature has also been an important source of information, as already discussed in Chapter 2. Data on specific country estates and particular landowners have been thus compiled from a large number of books, both historic and modern, from archival and cartographic sources, and from fieldwork. This method of cross-reference ensured that detailed information about, for example, the date of establishment of an estate, the garden designers employed, and the genealogy of families (which at times could be very complicated indeed), was accurate, complete and up-to-date. The same methodology has also proven useful for analysing this data, linking – for example – details about a particular garden in a personal letter to broader information on Dutch garden fashions in historical publications.

This thesis also relies on the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) for mapping, displaying and analysing data, for instance the distribution of estates, the employment of a specific designer, the character of the physical landscape, and the layout of a particular estate.

The use of GIS in historical geography

Throughout the thesis, recording and display of the data utilises computer mapping and database management. The thesis thus has a wider aim of extending and refining links between traditional historical research and recent advances in the techniques of computer-aided analysis related to the development of GIS. The use of GIS by professional historical geographers in the Netherlands is not as extensive as one would imagine or hope. In fact, it is more common that they use historic maps or call in the help of a cartographer to illustrate a spatial image (ex. inf. Renes, 2004; ex. inf. Haartsen, 2005). This is unfortunate as GIS can be much more than a tool for spatial visualisation.

In this research the GIS programme ArcView has been used, which combines a database management system with a computer mapping functionality, meaning it offers a combination of attribute data (characteristics of the features in rows of data; Figure 3.4) and spatial data (the visualisation of the geographical features in points, lines or polygons; Figure 3.5). Gregory (2003, p. 4) argues that because the user can alter the visual aspects of the map, the context of the data shown, and the cartographic scale, a map ‘rather than being a finished product […] now becomes an integral part of the research process’. Within this research ArcView has been used in various ways. For both regions, all landed estates created have been listed in a database with specifics including XY-coordinates, address, owner, designer and time of establishment. The user can then create a large variety of maps, including one that simply shows all estates in that particular region and one that indicates the presence of estates created before and after 1800 (to analyse the impact of existing landownership on new estate building).
Figure 3.4: ArcView database showing specifics of all landed estates created in the province of Utrecht

Figure 3.5: ArcView map of all landed estates created in the province of Utrecht.
As the database gives the exact date of establishment for each *nouveaux riches* estate it was possible to analyse the spatial sequence of estate building through time. Furthermore, it enables selection of a specific family, revealing the distribution of their family estates. Chapter 6 will show that this has brought up some surprising results.

Hence, ArcView has been used not only at a regional level but also at estate and family levels. For specific owners details from the cadastral ledgers have been transformed onto maps, enabling the researcher to analyse change and continuity in size, function and value of the owner’s landed property, and to study the process of land accumulation.

Overlaying the estate locations and other specifics (e.g. lay-out, functions) onto a map of the physical landscape, of the diffused *marken* grounds (in Twente) or of the transport network allowed a better perspective of why these estates were located where they were and how they were designed. Furthermore, by using buffer zones around the estates the distance to cities was analysed. The map of the *marken* grounds has been made by drawing each plot of land (indicated in the cadastre as belonging to a *marke*) as polygons on a modern topographic map. For locating the plots of land correctly much use has been made of the *minuutplans* and the Bonne maps, a time-consuming task, but worthwhile as it gives an accurate image of the *marken* in Twente.

These are several ways in which ArcView has been used in this thesis, showing that GIS can be used to illustrate and present data but also to analyse it, often leading to new conclusions. Embedded in the traditional methods of historical geographical analyses (exploring continuity and change of landscape and society in spatial and temporal terms) GIS can therefore become a valuable tool.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Due to the scale of the research, analysing several hundred country estates, it meant that the nature and availability of such archival sources as estate views, photographs and account books were inconsistent; and even if they were available for every estate, it would not have been possible to analyse everything. A selection had to be made, which – in effect – could influence conclusive comments made about the development of estates. Therefore it was crucial to combine the detailed records of particular estates with more general sources such as tax registers, maps and historical printed material. It is this combination of historical and geographical sources that forms the base of this thesis’ methodology. By using typical historical sources in a geographical manner, this thesis furthermore aims - on the one hand - to increase the information gleaned from particular documentary evidence and - on the other - to broaden the methodology and contextual focus within Dutch historical geography. Within the Dutch
tradition little attention has been paid to the landscape of estates or the people who owned these landscapes. Hoping to stimulate further geographical research on these topics, this thesis will illustrate the value of historical sources like letters, diaries and estate accounts for landscape study.

The following chapter is a first engagement with the sources outlined above. A range of contextual themes are examined that may have influenced the rise of a new class of wealthy and the development of estate building in Utrecht and Twente.
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Twente and Utrecht:
An Historical-Geographical Overview

INTRODUCTION

Before proceeding to the more detailed discussion of estate development that forms the main focus of the thesis it is important to provide some account of the regions within which these changes in the character of the land market and in the pattern of land ownership took place. The account presented here of the region of Twente and the province of Utrecht is necessarily selective, focusing on those aspects of the physical environment and the evolution of socio-economic systems which are most relevant to the subsequent exploration of the potential for estate development. It follows that we need to know more about the underlying physical environment; the ways in which this natural endowment has historically been altered and exploited through human use, primarily for agriculture; the evolution of land holding, with particular emphasis on the establishment of major estates prior to the study period of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; the existence and causes of major changes in land holding patterns; and the processes of urban and industrial development, viewed primarily as the source of the new wealth which created the nouveaux riches estate owners who are at the heart of this thesis. Although discussion of the two case study regions of Twente and Utrecht is elsewhere treated as an integrated whole, in setting out this initial context greater clarity will be obtained by offering separate accounts of the two areas.

4.1 TWENTE

Physical setting

The region of Twente, an area of some 1,200 square kilometres within the province of Overijssel, lies on the eastern margins of the Netherlands. Accounts of its physical character refer to the predominance of a ‘sand landscape’, reflecting the prevalence of sand dunes and ice-pushed ridges, largely formed during the last two ice ages (Vervloet, 1995, p. 9; Zonneveld, 1993, p. 162).

During the Saalien ice age (200,000-130,000 years BP) glaciers, originating from Scandinavia, moved south through pre-existing north-south orientated river valleys. The weight of the glaciers pushed the river floor downwards and the flanks upwards, thus creating low hills, as found, for example at Tubbergen, Oldenzaal and Markelo. These glacial uplands – known as stuwwallen in the Netherlands – are composed of sand, clay and gravel. Individual uplands can be up to 20 kilometres long, reaching heights of around...
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80 metres (Figure 4.1). Originally they were wooded, typically with beech and oak (Zonneveld, 1993, p. 163).

A further legacy of the Saalien glaciation is the deposit of boulder clay – a mixture of clay, crushed boulders and mineral dust – deposited in the low lying valleys during glacial retreat. Boulder clay is highly impermeable leading to the creation of a very high ground water level. Isolated larger boulders, transported by the glaciers, were also left behind (Jansma, Jansma & Schroor, 1990, p. 14-16).

Figure 4.1: The physical geography of Twente
Source: Based on SC-DLO Staring Centrum/ Alterra, Wageningen; Het Oversticht/ Smeets, Zwolle.

In the latest ice age (Weichselien, 90,000-10,000 years BP) southward moving ice sheets did not reach the Netherlands. The landscape was, nevertheless, greatly influenced by climatic change. Over an extended period the Netherlands experienced alternating episodes of warmth and cold. During the colder phases in particular, the development of vegetation was severely restricted and wind erosion created a barren landscape. One important result of the wind experienced during this period was the dispersal of sand across the entire landscape (Figure 4.1). In particular, sand blown against the east of the stuwwallen reinforced the upland character of these areas through the formation of a range of sand hills. The stuwwallen and the sand areas are dominated by podsol soils and the artificially created plaggen soils (see
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the following section) (Zonneveld, 1993, p. 162-163). Lower-lying sand areas are cut by a large number of streams and rivers that form the natural drainage of Twente, the most important being the Dinkel and the Regge.

In areas where the natural drainage was poor, especially where boulder clay emerged close to the surface, peat and bog fens were formed during the Holocene (10,000 years BP to present), a period marked by a warmer climate and abundance in vegetation. Such marshy terrain is still evident today in western Twente, around Vrienzenveen, Markelo and Haaksbergen. The peat fens of Vriezenveen (veen = peat), to the north of Almelo are especially extensive.

These particular physical elements of infertile hills, sandy plains dissected by streams, and marshland define the various physical landscapes of Twente. For all their variety these different environments have in common relatively low levels of fertility, which have important implications for their human exploitation.

Agricultural systems

Until well into the nineteenth century, Twente was a predominantly agricultural area. The infertile sandy soils gave rise to a system of mixed arable and pastoral farming. Village communities survived by exploiting to the full the particular characteristics and capacities of different types of environment. When heavily fertilised the sand hills were capable of sustaining arable cultivation, land near the rivers was used for hay meadows, while the low-lying marshlands and high stuwwallen remained largely as wastelands. One of the important uses of the latter, however, was a source of heather, grass and wood humus, which was mixed with sheep dung and used to fertilise the sandy soil (Vervloet, 1995, p. 10). The continuous application of this technique, resulting in the creation of homogenous soils rich in humus, allowed the progressive extension of the area suitable for arable cultivation. The term plaggen soil is applied to such fertilised areas when the humus layer established attains a depth of more than 50cm. An indication of the extent of such plaggen soils and the associated extension of arable cultivation is provided by Figure 4.2.

Small, individually owned arable fields called kampen were established in the stream and river valleys, particularly in the region between Goor and Haaksbergen. Larger arable fields (generally known as essen) were created on the flanks, and sometimes on the ridges, of the stuwwallen. These were communally owned and farmed, so that on any particular es many farmers would own plots of land. The outer perimeters of both kampen and essen were defined by hedges, intended to exclude cattle. The boundaries of individual plots on an es were not, however, marked in an immediately visible
fashion, creating a landscape akin the English open fields. Settlements grew alongside these open arable fields, their structure and distribution being influenced by the form, location and size of the *es*.

![Figure 4.2: Plaggen soils.](image)

*Source: Based on SC-DLO Staring Centrum/ Alterra, Wageningen; Het Oversticht/ Smeets, Zwolle.*

The wastelands also played an important part in pre-modern agricultural systems. Woodlands provided timber and also grazing for pigs. Sheep grazed on the dry heathlands. In wetter areas and especially in areas of peatland, the principal resource was fuel, both turf and peat. The use of these extensive areas of wasteland was regulated by communal organisations known as *marken* (a title deriving from the word *marke*, meaning border). The nature of these communal organisations, and also the manner of their abolition merits particular attention here, as the latter was the trigger to the release of substantial areas of communal land on to the private market. Without this important episode of land privatisation in the nineteenth century it would have been very much more difficult for would-be estate owners during this period to have realised their ambitions. As will be subsequently detailed the location of the *marke* lands had a significant impact on the geography of later estate development.
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The Marken of Twente and their abolition

The *marken* were originally the product of a sharp rise in Twente’s population during the Middle Ages, which necessitated a new level of organisation in the use made of communal land. The term *marke* denoted both the political unit of the local community and the area over which it had jurisdiction. The political organisation of the *marke* was formed by the *gerechtigden* or *gewaarde boeren*, the yeomen and large landowners, who had the largest share in the landed properties of the *marke* (Demoed 1987, p. 7). Together the members of the *marke* regulated the use of the communal lands as grazing and as a source of fuel, fertiliser and other products, such as honey. The extent of the use-shares – for instance the number of cartloads of peat sods that anyone was allowed to cut, or the number of sheep that anyone was allowed to graze – was related to the size of the individual’s holding of arable land (Hendrikx, 1999, p. 19). Before 1800 cottagers, who were not members of the *marke*, were allowed access to the communal lands but had no other rights (Hoppenbrouwers, 2002, p. 104).

The *marken* were led by a so-called *markerichter* (or judge), usually the largest landowner in the marke. Thus in the first half of the nineteenth century Ludwig Ernst von Bönninghausen and his son Franz Egon von Bönninghausen of the noble estate at Herinckhave were the *markerichters* of Albergen, Tubbergen, Fleringen, Mander, Geesteren and Vasse (Mensema & Gevers, 1995, p. 459-460).

At the start of the nineteenth century around 60,000 hectares of communal wasteland – some 50 per cent of the total land area of Twente – remained under the administration of the *marken* (Cadastral ledgers, Kadaster Overijssel). Locally the proportion was sometimes higher; in the municipalities of Lonneker and Enschede (the present-day municipality of Enschede), for instance, seven *marken* together owned over 10,000 hectares of wastelands, approximately 70 per cent of the entire area (Figure 4.3).

The traditional system of the *marken* was, however, placed under increasing strain as a result of population growth; between 1675 and 1800 the population of Twente increased from 17,000 to 51,000 (De Vries, 1974, p. 117). The Dutch government also came to see the division and privatisation of communal land as a primary means of encouraging the cultivation of the wastelands, which, it was hoped, would accelerate the growth of the wider economy. Such thinking was also supported at the local level by the great landowners who were the likely beneficiaries of any scheme of land reallocation.

As discussed in Chapter 2, legislation passed in 1809/10 was intended to promote the division and transfer into private ownership of communal lands throughout the Netherlands (Van Zanden, 1985, p. 153; Pleyte, 1879, p. 139). This, together with the establishment of individual municipalities in 1811, downgraded the *marken* from their previous status as the primary units of local government to more limited civil law
organisations. Yet in Twente only two attempts to divide communal lands were made as an immediate result of the 1809/10 law, at the marke of Notter and Zuna (in the municipality of Wierden) and the Eschmarke near Enschede (Buis, 1985a, p. 404). Even in these cases the plans remained unexecuted. This resistance to change reflected the value placed on the wastelands by farmers as a source of peat sods, fuel and honey, and as grazing for sheep. While the legal framework for marke division stated that the majority of members had to agree to any such change there was, therefore, little prospect of decisive action.

Chapter 2 furthermore detailed about voluntary marke divisions enacted before 1837 and subsequent activity which reflected much greater pressure and supervision from the provincial government. In Twente only three marken were divided before 1837, namely Gammelke, De Lutte and Goor. More rapid subsequent progress reflected not only pressure from the provincial government of Overijssel, but also the establishment of the Cadastre in 1832, which allowed all marke owned land plots to be clearly identified and located (Demoed, 1987, p. 68-75; Van der Zanden, 1985, p. 155-157). Moreover, with the introduction of the Cadastre, the French tax law of 1811 was re-instated, meaning that wastelands were taxed as they had been during the French occupation of the early nineteenth century. Depending on its quality, one hectare of heath land could be taxed at between 40 and 100 cents. For instance the marke ‘De
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Groote Boeren van Ambt Delden’ (The Great Farmers of Ambt Delden) owned circa 2200 hectares of land, in total taxed at approximately 1900 guilders (Cadastre of Ambt Delden, Kadaster Overijssel). Payment of taxation thus provided a stimulus to maximise the income that could be derived from an area by bringing wasteland under cultivation.

As a result of these various factors many commons in Twente were divided between 1840 and 1860, following the general trend for the whole of Overijssel (Table 4.1). Nevertheless, it was not until the Marke law of 1886 that all the communal lands in Twente were finally divided and sold off. Indeed, this latter law was specifically drafted to bring about the end of the marke organisations in the eastern regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Province of Overijssel</th>
<th>Twente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1819-1829</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1839</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1859</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1879</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: The number of marke divisions in the Province of Overijssel and Twente, 1819-1879

When a marke was divided the land entered the market in several ways. Occasionally, the newly-defined individual plots were sold off directly, usually at auction. For instance, in 1895 Dr. Gerrit Jan van Heek, a textile industrialist from Enschede, bought some 450 hectares of heathland (known as Lankheet and Assinkbos) in the municipality of Haaksbergen through an auction of former communal lands (Cadastral ledger Haaksbergen, Kadaster Overijssel). It was more common, however, for land to be distributed initially amongst the members of the marke. The resultant plots were frequently too small, too scattered and located too far away from the home farm to constitute a viable agricultural unit. Moreover, as the land was generally of poor quality, making profitable cultivation impossible without considerable investments of effort, time and money, most smaller owners quickly sold off their newly acquired property.

Although the abolition of the marken was initially a slow process, the ultimate effect was to release substantial areas of land on to local markets, particularly in eastern Twente, where much was purchased by the industrial nouveaux riches (Cadastral ledgers, Kadaster Overijssel). In the west of the region, however, the dissolution of the marken tended to reinforce existing landownership patterns. The main beneficiaries were the established nobility who received major extensions to their existing holdings. This redistribution of land and its implications will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 5 and 6. It seems appropriate here, however, to turn now to a brief discussion of this established pattern of landownership, for the potential for the establishment of new estates was obviously determined, at least in part, by the extent to which land was already accounted for by the long-established estates of the region’s nobility.
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Castles and country estates
In early nineteenth-century Twente surviving estates associated with medieval castles and manors were not particularly numerous, and were chiefly clustered in the region around Delden and between Almelo and Oldenzaal (Figure 4.4). The original military functions of such settlements and the logic of their location had long since lost their relevance (Van der Wyck, 1982, p. 7). There had, however, been some post-medieval survival of status and privileges associated with possession of a moated manor. The latter conferred upon its owner the highly sought-after status of a ‘havezathe’, as explained earlier in Chapter 2. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, this combination of property and title was significant in granting an individual hunting and fishing rights, it enabled him to enter provincial government and it ensured freedom from the house tax (Mensema & Gevers, 1995, p. 12-13, Ten Hove, 1996, p. 85; Smeets, 2000, p. 25). In Twente around 40 havezathes were acknowledged by the States of Overijssel in the early seventeenth century, including amongst others Twickel (Figure 4.5), Weldam, Singraven, Huize Almelo, Saasveld, and Hachmeule (Mensema & Gevers, 1995).

Figure 4.4: The medieval castles and manors of Twente.
During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Barfde, Cattelaer and Hulscher were amongst the few new estates created in Twente. Some existing estates did, however, change hands as some newly wealthy individuals chose to purchase existing noble manors, with their associated benefits and privileges. In 1719, for instance, the widow of Jan Jansen van der Sluys, a wealthy wood merchant, bought the manor of Westerflier on which she built a new country house (Mensema & Gevers, 1995, p. 382-383). Mensema & Gevers (1995) recorded similar changes of ownership for the manors of Stoevelaer, Boekelo and Pekkedam. During this period, however, it was primarily the most powerful noble families who continued to extend their property, wealth and power. This was true of families such as Van Rechteren Limpurg (Huis Almelo) and Wassenaer (Twickel estate; Figure 4.5), who were already truly great landowners, each owning over 3,000 hectares (Cadastral ledgers of Stad Almelo, Ambt Almelo, Stad Delden and Ambt Delden, Kadaster Overijssel).

Figure 4.5: The castle of Twickel estate near Delden. Photographed by Het Oversticht. With kind permission.

Thus there were few newcomers before 1800 and most changes evident on existing estates reflected the activities of noble families in converting their military residences into comfortable country retreats, sometimes entailing the complete demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a more modern residence.

Acknowledgement of the existence and influence of this established class of great landowners will be shown to be important to our understanding of later phases of estate building. As an established landed and social elite the nobility exerted a major influence upon the rural economy and often defined models of style in architecture and garden design. Furthermore, the extent of their landed property and their impact
on the land market established important constraints upon the potential for the establishment of new estates. Chapter 6 will analyse this enduring influence of pre-existing landownership patterns upon the distribution of new estates in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this later analysis we will be juxtaposing the position of ‘old’ and ‘new’ money in an evolving land market. It is important here, therefore, to consider the source of the new industrial wealth which enabled its owners to contemplate the purchase or establishment of a country estate.

The industrialisation of Twente

In an overpopulated area with limited natural potential for agricultural development and where the continuing presence of the marken initially prevented the transfer of additional land to private farms, many were forced to look beyond farming for their livelihoods. As a result domestic textile industry became an important facet of both the rural and urban economy from the early seventeenth century onwards, in turn speeding the growth of towns such as Almelo, Enschede and Hengelo (Trompetter, 1997, p. 9, 143-144). An initial proto-industrial phase of development was focused on the production of linen, made from locally grown flax. The domestic weavers of Twente also specialised in the production of bombazine cloth, a mixture of woollen and linen or cotton thread. Twente had a substantial advantage over other linen industries in the country due to the low wage levels and the large pool of labour available for weaving (Trompetter, 1997, p. 143). The production and distribution of the goods was organised by traders from the region’s main urban centres, as named above. This created a new commercial elite including families, such as the Van Heeks, Ten Cates, Janninks, Blijdensteins and Ter Kuiles, who would preside over the region’s business development during the following centuries (Lambert, 1985, p. 262-263).

Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century Twente’s textile industry was still domestic (Boot, 1935, p. 260; Hendrickx, 2003, p. 46). Its scale and mode of operation were, however, transformed over the ensuing decades, reflecting technological innovation, in particular the introduction of steam power in 1830, a growing input of professional knowledge, and the Dutch government’s decision to concentrate cotton production for East Indian colonial markets in Twente (Lambert, 1985, p. 263; Schmal, 1995, p. 115). This official decision was partly the result of the separation of the Northern and Southern Netherlands in 1830, after which many Belgian textile businesses moved to the north (the new Dutch state) in order to continue to benefit from its overseas trade connections. This ensured that the Nederlandsche Handel Maatschappij (Dutch Trade Company or NHM) shifted its main focus of operations from the Gent region to Twente. By concentrating cotton production for the Dutch Indies in Twente, the government took advantage of existing local knowledge and skills, the availability of cheap
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labour, and the region’s strategic location (Lambert, 1985, p. 263; Schmal, 1995, p. 115). The industrial class of Twente benefited in turn from a significant upturn in regional economic activity.

Subsequent industrial development was rapid, particularly during the boom years of the 1860s. Throughout this period increasing use was made of steam power as factory-based production replaced small workshops. Between 1861 and 1865 alone the number of steam-powered spinning mills rose from 10 to 18, with a still more dramatic increase in the number of spindles from 41,000 to 168,000 (Lambert, 1985, p. 263). A further important dimension of modernisation was the improvement of the existing transport network and the establishment of new roads, canals and railways in the mid-nineteenth century, which was actively supported by leading textile producers (Mensema, www.historischcentrumoverijssel.nl/). Subsequently, the industrialists built large factories close to the new railroads, for example the factory of the Van Heek family along the railroad from Enschede to the German settlement of Gronau (Figure 4.6).

![Figure 4.6: The factory of the Van Heek family along the railroad Enschede-Gronau, circa 1960. Source: Stichting Historische Sociëteit Enschede-Lonneker](image)

The commercial expansion of the nineteenth century thus provided former linen traders, such as the Blijdensteins, Van Heeks and Geldermans, with the means to invest in land. The social background of these families and their motivations for land investment will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. Initially, the extension of their landed property was achieved through the piecemeal purchase of individual small farms. Increasingly, however, they were able to acquire much larger tracts of waste as a result of the divisions of communal land executed chiefly between 1840 and 1900. The effect this had on the land market and the spatial distribution of new country estates will be dealt with in Chapter 6.  
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4.2 UTRECHT

Physical setting

The province of Utrecht lies right in the middle of the Netherlands, and for that reason is often called the heart of the country. Its physical environment is unusual in incorporating many different types of Dutch landscapes. Traditionally the region has been divided into three broad areas: the sandy hills of the east (the Utrechtse Heuvelrug), the peat lowlands of the west, and the river landscape along the rivers Vecht and Rhine (Vernooy, 1990, p. 13; Figure 4.7).

![Map of Utrecht](image)

**Figure 4.7: The physical geography of the province of Utrecht**

Source: Based on SC-DLO Staring Centrum/Alterra, Wageningen

The sandy hills in the east of the province, known as the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, were created by similar processes to those that formed the *stuwwallen* of Twente. Glaciers from Scandinavia entered the region in the Saalien ice age (200,000 - 130,000 BP), eroding and widening the river valley of the Maas and pushing up old river sediments including coarse sand and gravel. The broad valley that was thus created,
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the Gelderse Vallei, was bordered by two long *stuwwallen* (Stades-Vischer, 1999, p. 13). However, the eastern *stuwwal*, called The Veluwe, lies in the province of Gelderland.

The Utrechtse Heuvelrug forms the western *stuwwal* which stretches between the villages of Soest and Rhenen, and reaches heights of 50 to 55 metres (Kooiman, 1999, p. 13; Figure 4.8). The Amerongse Berg (*berg* = hill or mountain) in the woods to the north of Amerongen is almost 69 metres high, which is a significant elevation by Dutch standards. Names referring to the relief of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug – including Soesterberg, Grebbeberg, Maarnsche Berg, Moersbergen and Keienberg – are abundant in the region. As in Twente sand was blown into this area during the last ice age (Weichselien, circa 90,000-10,000 years BP), covering the entire landscape. Sand blown against the *stuwwallen* formed a range of low sand hills.

Whereas the landscape of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug was largely formed in the Pleistocene ice ages, the other two landscapes of the province were the product of changes in the climate during the Holocene. Due to an increase in temperature the glaciers melted, the sea-level rose, as did the ground water level. Around 5,000 years BP the rising sea deposited sand on the site of the present-day Dutch coast, creating a zone of dunes and sand banks (Vervloet, 1998, p. 150; Smeets, 2000, p. 11). The area between these dunes and the

![Figure 4.8: The Utrechtse Heuvelrug near Rhenen.](image)
Photographed by author, December 2003.
high hills of the east of the country formed a low-lying plain in which clay from the North Sea and rivers was deposited. In these wet, oxygen-poor soils it was impossible for dead plants to disintegrate completely, resulting in the creation of peat. Plants here included peat moss, sedge and reed. To the west of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug peat up to three metres deep was thus formed. In later times much of this peat was eroded away by rivers, and currently the peat and fenlands are confined to the northwest and westernmost part of the province of Utrecht (Figure 4.7).

The rivers that flow through the peat and fenlands of western Utrecht are the Rijn, Kromme Rijn, Lek, Vecht and Hollandsche IJssel. During the Holocene the rivers repeatedly changed course, thus meandering and eroding through the young peat landscape. When a river flooded its environment, heavy sediments – typically gravel and sand – were deposited close to the river, while further from the river lighter materials (fine sand and clay) were deposited on the peat. On both sides of the river high riverbanks were formed from the gravel and sand, whereas the low-lying plains behind the banks were characterised by clay soils (Boekhorst-Van Maren, 1981, p. 18). Sometimes an old meander was filled with sandy clays. Together with the riverbank on each side of such a silted-up channel is known as *stroomrug*.

**Agricultural systems**

The diversity of the physical landscape noted above has produced great variety in land use and settlement patterns. Traditionally, settlement was confined to the higher areas of the *stroomruggen*, the riverbanks and the small sand hills along the western flanks of the Heuvelrug. The fertile soils of these areas enabled prosperous farming and their height ensured safety from flooding. Before 1100 the peat lands were barely populated.

The settlements along the rivers – such as Harmelen, Wijk bij Duurstede and Maarssen – were characterised by mixed farming, with arable lands immediately around the settlements on the riverbanks and *stroomruggen*, and with meadows for grazing and hay in the low-lying plains. At the start of the twelfth century, however, most plains were still uncultivated. As wastelands they automatically belonged to the Bishop of Utrecht who sold plots of land to entrepreneurs to stimulate the cultivation of the area, as he had done earlier in the west of Utrecht (Vernooy, 1990, p. 25; also see below, p. 84-86). Large-scale cultivation started after 1122, when a dam was constructed in the Kromme Rijn river near Wijk bij Duurstede (Berendsen, 1992, p. 21). Several canals were dug for draining the plains, the most important being the Langbroekerwetering. The continuous importance of the Langbroekerwetering was later illustrated by the construction of castles from the thirteenth century (see below, p. 84-86). From the nineteenth century the farms on the riverbanks and plains increasingly specialised in fruit production. To this day the region remains predominantly agricultural.
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As noted above the peat lands in the west of Utrecht were only sparsely populated before 1100. However, the subsequent continuous rise in the area’s population necessitated the extension of agricultural production, resulting in the cultivation of the peat lands. Such developments in the province of Utrecht were chiefly initiated by successive Bishops of Utrecht and executed by local entrepreneurs including clergymen (Smeets, 2000, p. 14). By encouraging settlement on reclaimed land the bishops hoped to extend their political power and territory thus securing pre-eminence over the local representatives of temporal power in the shape of the counts of Gelre and Holland. The extensive peat lands were cultivated in long narrow strips, starting at a main road, river or canal, where the farm buildings would be located (Vervloet, 1998, p. 154). This resulted in the creation of ribbon settlements, which are common in this part of Utrecht. Cultivation of the peat lands subsequently gave way to use as meadows for cattle and horses. From the nineteenth century onwards, many fields were used for fruit production.

The physical landscape of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, characterised by sandy soils of poor quality, limited the possibilities for creating arable lands (Vernooy, 1990, p. 17). Only the flanks of the ice-pushed ridges could be used intensively, and it is here that hamlets and villages were created from the eighth century, stretching along the relief. A system of mixed farming characterised these settlements. Cattle grazed on meadows in the valley and sheep on heath lands on the Heuvelrug (Kooiman, 1999, p. 20-22). As in Twente a system of plaggen fertilisation was used in order to establish arable fields on the sandy soils. Here, however, the newly raised arable areas – called essen in Twente – were known as engen. A distinctive development in this part of Utrecht was the use from the 1640s onwards of some arable fields between Amerongen and Rhenen as tobacco plantations (Vernooy, 1990, p. 17). Initiated by the Lord of Amerongen, the production of tobacco continued until the 1950s (Demoed, 1997, p.164). Intense fertilisation was a necessity for all forms of arable cultivation, reinforcing the importance of sheep pasture on the high grounds of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug. This in turn had a transforming effect upon the landscape of the Heuvelrug. Overgrazing resulted in the replacement of the original cover of deciduous trees by extensive heath lands. With the exception of the woods belonging to the major estates on the south side of the Heuvelrug most of the region was stripped of its woodland by the beginning of the seventeenth century (Buis, 1985, p. 124). In the nineteenth century, however, landowners, particularly the nouveaux riches, restored areas of woodland, planting pine trees for timber production and exotics, such as American oak, for their aesthetic value.

Under the leadership of successive Bishops of Utrecht the wastelands in the peat and river landscapes were thus cultivated at an early stage. In contrast, the heath lands on the Heuvelrug remained largely uncultivated into the nineteenth century. The regulation of these wastelands was, as in Twente, in the
hands of communal organisations. The next section will investigate the nature of these organisations, and how the division of wastelands might have been a potential factor in the establishment of new country estates.

**Communal lands and the division of the meenten**

In Utrecht organisations for the regulation of communal landholdings were a product of the late medieval period. As in Twente some were known as marken, but in Utrecht the alternative title of meenten (literally ‘communities’) was used in some contexts. This difference of terminology was a reflection of an important difference in the detail of the origins and operation of the two forms of communal organisation. Whereas the marken were created and initially worked independently from the wider structures of local government, the meenten were closely linked to local government or the authority of the landlord from the start (Buis, 1985, p. 124; Hoppenbrouwers, 2002, p. 92). Thus during the Middle Ages the meenten of Utrecht were bound to the Prince Bishop of Utrecht. Moreover, the bishops also regarded extensive areas of woodland as part of their demesne lands (Hoppenbrouwers, 2002, p. 99). In 1528 this position of ownership and leadership was transferred to the Habsburg Emperor Charles V. After the establishment of the Dutch Republic (1588) such crown lands became state property. Thus, for instance, the meenten of Elst, Maarn and Amerongen became governed directly by the Provincial States of Utrecht (Buis, 1985, p. 126, 131-132, 144).

Hoppenbrouwers (2002, p. 95) believes that in most instances differences between marken and meenten were small, as in both cases the local large landowners, that is a cadre of aristocrats and urban patricians, played an important role in the decision making concerning the management of common land. The office of markerichter also had a direct counterpart in Utrecht, where a richter, usually a substantial landowner was appointed to lead the management of the communal lands. For instance at the beginning of the nineteenth century C. J. van Nellesteyn (Lord of Broekhuizen) was the richter of Darthuizen. Buis (1985, p. 139) thinks that the small afforestations in Darthuizen around 1810 were Nellesteyn’s initiative.

Hoppenbrouwer’s statement is most relevant for the period when both communal organisations were active. It is argued here, however, that the distinct nature of the different organisations did have a significant influence on the process of dividing the commons. Within Twente the communal wastelands could not be partitioned unless all the marke members agreed to the proposal, which meant that it could take years, even decades, before any such plan was executed. In many Utrecht meenten, however, ownership of the wastelands rested with the state or the newly created municipalities. These bodies showed themselves willing to divide and sell off wasteland as early as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Demoed, 1997, p. 32, 147).
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It followed that the process of partition was frequently earlier and faster in Utrecht than in Twente. The law of 1809/10 to encourage the division and sale of communal land was correspondingly more successful in Utrecht. The law also provided that individuals who cultivated former communal lands would be exempt from taxation upon them for the next 50 years (Dekker, 1997, p. 14; WKAU, 1996, p. 32). This reinforced the incentive for individuals such as Van Nellesteyn, Lord of Broekhuizen, and Baron d’Ablaing van Giessenburg to invest in the afforestation of heath lands on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 50-51). Indeed, Van Oosthuyse started buying up land and cultivating it before the law was officially enacted. This confirms the early enthusiasm for sale and division of such communal lands. The implications of this initiative will be explored in more detail in subsequent chapters. It should be readily apparent, however, that there is not likely to have been an immediate equivalence in the way that the division of communal lands affected the land markets of nineteenth-century Twente and Utrecht. In the former, communal lands came to the market late at a time when they could, in some parts of the region at least, come to form the basis of new estates. In Utrecht, however, the release of much communal land was not delayed in this way.

However, as already noted in the section on Twente, the availability of land also depended on the existing pattern of individual landownership, particularly that of the established landed elite. It is therefore necessary to draw attention to the presence of castles and landed estates created prior to 1800, as has been done earlier for Twente.

Castles and country estates

As in Twente, or elsewhere in the Netherlands, fortified medieval castles in Utrecht were located on strategic sites near water, particularly in the western half of the province (Figure 4.9). In part it reflected the territorial expansion of the Bishop of Utrecht in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as previously mentioned in Chapter 2 and above. From 1250 an abundance of castles were constructed throughout the province, particularly between the city of Utrecht and Wijk bij Duurstede. Blijdenstein pointed out that this development was due to the increasing wealth, political instability, and the extending power of the knighthood (Blijdenstijn, 2005, p. 136-137). De Bruin, however, argued that it was largely the result of the Bishop’s decision to allow noblemen to build their own castles, a privilege that previously belonged to the Emperor and the Bishop (De Bruin, 2003, p. 19).

In sixteenth-century Utrecht a castle or nobleman’s home conferred a higher status on its owner if certain criteria were met (Van Drie, 1995, p. 41). The owner himself needed to be of noble, knightly origin (equivalent to the middle and upper orders of the English nobility), whilst his house had to be fortified and
moated, and equipped with a drawbridge. A third provision was that the complex must also include a farm or other adjacent buildings. Religious Reformation at the end of the sixteenth century introduced an additional requirement that the owner be of the Protestant religion. Those who remained Catholic were not allowed to sit in Parliament, and their estates were not recognised as a *ridderhofstad*. The combination of all these criteria meant that it was far from easy to obtain such a title. In Utrecht only 40 per cent of the medieval manors were admitted by the States of Utrecht as *ridderhofstad*. In 1536 the States of Utrecht acknowledged 38 *ridderhofsteden*, including Schonauwen, Levendaal, Drakestein, Harmelen, Doorn, Ter Aa, Den Ham and Wolven. More were added (e.g. Bottestein, Sandenburg, Lunenburg and Kersbergen) in the latter part of the sixteenth century. In total there were over 50 *ridderhofsteden* in Utrecht (Wittert van Hoogland, 1912, volumes I and II).

Figure 4.9: The medieval castles and manors of Utrecht.

In contrast to Twente, estate building in Utrecht during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not only practised by the existing nobility. The turn of the seventeenth century saw the rise of a new community of influential and wealthy people in Dutch society, known as the merchant-regents. The
majority of these individuals, who became part of the Dutch upper classes, were from Amsterdam – the Republic’s capital and centre of international trade – or from other leading cities, including Leiden, The Hague and Haarlem. Trade and business in the Netherlands of the seventeenth century were so successful and the national economy so prosperous that in later times this period was dubbed the ‘Golden Age’. During these years, many merchants-regents invested their fortunes in the reclamation of land from marshland and the sea (a process known as inpoldering), and – on a more personal level – the purchase of land to establish estates as both country retreats and business investments. During the early stages of this process luxurious farmsteads that served as country houses were built near the sites of several major reclamation projects (Van de Ven, 2004, p. 136).

To enable quick access back to their main businesses most new landowners invested in land located within a day’s travel of their urban base. The preferred method of transport in the seventeenth century was by water. It was faster, safer and more comfortable than the available means of land transportation (De Jong, 1987, p. 165). Consequently country estates were chiefly established along the major waterways within a 30 kilometre radius (approximately the maximum distance that could be travelled in one day) around the major urban centres. For the province of Utrecht, this helps to explain the abundance of estates along the rivers Vecht and Amstel between Amsterdam and Utrecht, including, among others: Gansenhoef, Rupelmonde, Vreedenhoff, Goudenstein, Donkervliet and Over Holland (Figure 4.10). In general the houses and gardens were situated on the higher river banks, with the orchards and meadows in the lower fields (Albers, 1997, p. 82).

The Vecht was without doubt the main focus of estate development in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Utrecht, but some estates were also created along the southwestern side of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug and near the village of Baarn where stadtholder Willem III had his hunting lodge at Soestdijk (Gaasbeek, Van ‘t Hof & Koenders, 1994, p. 32-34). On the Heuvelrug a large number of estates were also created on former church land, which had been confiscated after the Reformation at the end of the sixteenth century. From the middle of the seventeenth century the States of Utrecht sold blocks of land on the western flanks of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug to wealthy individuals belonging to the local nobility and to members of the local and provincial governments. In 1674, for example, over 51 hectares of land previously belonging to the Saint Laurens abbey of Oostbroek, consisting of ‘the old and dilapidated house of Oostbroek with orchard, farmhouse and barn’, was sold to Pieter Ruysch esquire who then created the Oostbroek estate (HUA, 29-31, no. 32 & 377; Figure 4.11). Other estates built on former church land include Jagtlust, Heiligenberg, Vollenhoven, Houdringe, Sandwijck and Maarsbergen (Broekhoven & Barends, 1995).
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The pattern of great landownership in Utrecht prior to 1800 obviously differed from that in Twente. The more detailed aspects hereof and how it affected new developments in estate building in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will be dealt with in Chapter 6. Another important difference between the two study areas is that Utrecht had not gone through similar developments as the industrialisation of Twente during the 1800s. Between 1780 and 1860 the population of the entire province almost doubled from 90,000 to over 160,000 (Dekker, 1997, p. 21). The municipality of Utrecht, including the provincial capital, counted approximately 55,000 citizens in 1865 (Kuyper’s atlas of Utrecht, 1868). However, this increase in population did not include the emergence of a large class of newly wealthy, although some individuals who purchased land in the province, lived in Utrecht or had their business there, for example De Heus, Bosch (van Drakestein) and Kol (see next chapter). This was partly because, in terms of economic progress, the city of Utrecht did not compare to Amsterdam, which had developed into a modern financial centre during the course of the nineteenth century. In fact, Utrecht only started profiting from its central location in the twentieth century (Musterd & De Pater, 1992, p. 20-21). The following chapter will discuss the origins of the new landowners in Utrecht, most of whom came from Amsterdam.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS
The account offered here of Twente and Utrecht has necessarily been partial and selective. Particular themes – the nature of the physical environment, pre-modern agricultural activity, established patterns of land ownership, the changing status of communal lands and aspects of the non-agricultural economy – have been highlighted as providing key components of the context required for understanding the processes and patterns of new estate building from 1800 to 1950.
The study regions have been shown to be characterised by an interesting degree of internal environmental variation. This has implications for the value of land and for the extent of its incorporation into established pre-modern estates. The extent of relief is also unusual – at least in the Dutch context – something which has both practical and aesthetic implications in relation to the establishment of attractive park and garden landscapes within an estate. The potential for the development of different styles and appearances of designed landscape rests fundamentally on the raw material provided by the underlying shape of the landscape and quality of the land. For example, estates created in the low-lying areas along the river Vecht would have a different appearance than estates on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug or on the ice-pushed ridges of Twente. We will return to many of these issues in considering the location of estates (Chapter 6), attempts to develop aesthetically appealing landscapes (Chapter 7) and the recreational use of estates (Chapter 8).

The nineteenth-century estates that are the main concern of the present thesis were not in most instances intended as viable economic units. Agriculture is thus more of a concern in relation to the earlier history of the communal management of waste lands, and the ways in which these communal systems were disbanded. Historically both Twente and Utrecht were characterised by the presence of important communal organisations – known as *marken* and *meenten*. The brief discussion here has served to highlight important differences of detail between these two forms (a more general discussion of the wasteland divisions had been given in Chapter 2), which have important implications for the timing of the release of former communal land on to the commercial market. This in turn already seems to be a potentially important influence upon the availability of land for purchase by would-be estate owners. Clearly, however, we need to know more about the relative extent of existing estates and communal land and the differing opportunities for land purchase within and between the two study regions. This distribution of opportunities and the implications it had for the geographical distribution of new estates will be explored further in Chapter 6.

Some brief account has also been given here of the sources of new wealth which enabled land purchase and estate creation during the nineteenth century. Again this initial overview has been useful in highlighting the differences between Utrecht and Twente. The industrial development of the latter, which accelerated sharply in the mid-nineteenth century, has no real counterpart in Utrecht. Here commercial wealth, much of it generated outside the region, gave rise to a much longer tradition of newly wealthy families establishing themselves alongside the established nobility. This raises questions about the identity and attitudes of these two different groups, especially as they relate to landownership and estate development. It is to the more detailed investigation of the character of the *nouveaux riches* and their place in landed society that we therefore turn in the following chapter.
INTRODUCTION

During the course of the nineteenth century Twente and Utrecht witnessed the rise of a newly wealthy group within society, individuals often referred to as *nouveaux riches*. This chapter investigates who these people were, by studying them as a group and as individuals. The social, religious, economic and political backgrounds of the *nouveaux riches* will be taken into account, considering the extent to which they formed a coherent group with internally consistent characteristics, or whether they are best understood as a series of individuals whose actions reflected different means, motives and aspirations.

5.1 THE EMERGENCE OF NEW MONEY

*Nouveaux riches* can be observed in many western European countries, including the Netherlands, Great Britain, Belgium, Germany and France. In general, the newly wealthy originated from commercial, financial and industrial enterprises. The time of emergence of a newly wealthy class in the various parts of Europe depended, according to Mosse (1993, p. 71), on the country’s ‘economic development, political setting and the peculiarities of the [people] involved’; the first of these being of special importance.

Processes of urbanisation and industrialisation are two key indicators of economic development. Demographically, continental Europe remained predominantly rural into the latter half of the nineteenth century. At mid-century only Britain, generally seen as the first urbanised European society, had reached the point where its urban population outnumbered those remaining in the countryside (Hobsbawm, 1975, p. 173). Extensive, large-scale industrialisation was first witnessed in Great Britain in the eighteenth century, and appeared on the Continent from the mid nineteenth century (Ferguson, 2000, p. 90; Atzema & Wever, 1994). In this the Netherlands was relatively late. Though proto-industrialisation was witnessed in many parts of the country in the eighteenth century, it was not until the 1860s that mechanisation became widespread, reflecting the increasing use of steam power and the replacement of small workshops with factories (Lambert, 1985, p. 263).

Britain’s early industrialisation involved types of people and regions that previously were regarded as poor and marginal, and thus its success generated a social shift, potentially giving rise to a new class of wealthy individuals. The British *nouveaux riches* included both those who had made their money through manufacturing, for instance the textile industries of Lancashire and Yorkshire, but new money was also generated by the broader development of the country’s
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financial and service sector, including banking, trade and stock market dealing (Mordaunt Crook, 1999, p. 2-3, 7-18). Whereas manufacturing wealth was largely provincial, the financial sector was particularly concentrated in London. There were thus significant social and geographical differences within the **nouveaux riches**, some of which found expression in differences in their financial means and investment decisions.

In the British context, Rubinstein (1987, p. 22) has argued that the pinnacle of individual wealth continued to be occupied by an established landed elite. The most substantial new fortunes were more commonly created through commerce and finance. By comparison the newly rich from provincial industrial Britain were in general smaller players. Few of the latter invested in land on a grand scale. Rubinstein defines a ‘great landowner’ as any individual with land holdings of over 3,000 acres; by this criterion few of the newly wealthy merit inclusion in the category. The limitations of investment in land seems to reflect a range of factors, including individual means, the availability of land, and the potential for making alternative investments. It should be remembered that for most nineteenth-century **nouveaux riches** a landed estate fulfilled no direct economic functions. In a wider European context we also have to acknowledge that the general scale of landownership varied widely – in the Netherlands, even amongst the pre-industrial landed elite there would be many whose land holdings were less than 3,000 acres.

It is important to realise that the nineteenth-century **nouveaux riches**, as discussed above, were not unique. All ‘old money’ had once been new and it is possible to point to earlier phases of commercial development, in particular, which created newly wealthy individuals. In the Dutch context one can point to the success of Amsterdam merchants of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their new money allowed them to establish country retreats for themselves along the river Vecht in the province of Utrecht (see Chapters 2 and 4). At the time they remained socially distant from Utrecht’s established landed elite. Yet by the nineteenth century, families like the Huydecopers whose wealth was of seventeenth and eighteenth century origin, had become fully integrated members of the provincial and national elite. Mordaunt Crook (1999, p. 4) observes of a transition from new to old money that ‘the traditional time-span of assimilation may […] have been three generations’.

In the Netherlands key dimensions of modern industrialisation and urbanisation appeared relatively late. The rise of the associated commercial and industrial elite was thus delayed by comparison with neighbouring countries. Before 1850 only a few individuals can be identified as possessing new money originating from modern forms of industry, commerce and financial services. From the mid-nineteenth century, however, a substantial group of **nouveaux riches** were to be found. Particular concentrations of new money were evident in areas with new economic opportunities (Figure 5.1). These included the country’s capital, Amsterdam, which
was the centre for financial and commercial enterprises. Recreational investments in land made by Amsterdam’s newly wealthy were focused on areas of natural beauty within a day’s travel; the Utrechtse Heuvelrug and the Gooi were especially popular. By contrast, new industrial wealth was chiefly found in the towns of Enschede and Oldenzaal, in the east of the country, and Eindhoven and ‘s Hertogenbosch, in the south. By focusing upon the province of Utrecht and the region of Twente, this thesis thus incorporates the study of two different kinds of newly wealthy. The following sections deals with identifying the individuals who were part of this new landed elite.

Figure 5.1: The areas of geographical origin and recreational investment of Dutch *nouveaux riches* in the nineteenth century

5.2 IDENTIFYING THE NEW LANDED ELITE

The focus of the present thesis on landownership requires that particular attention is paid to identifying and describing the character of those individuals within the wider *nouveaux riches* of the nineteenth-century Netherlands who became the most significant landowners.

A range of sources have been used to identify the new landed elite of Twente and Utrecht. As a starting point, a review of the existing literature (e.g. Van Groningen, 1999; Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912; Munnig Schmidt & Lisman, 1997; Mensema & Gevers, 1995; Olde Meierink, 1984) enabled the compilation of a record both of members of the *nouveaux riches* who purchased existing estates, and of those individuals who established new country estates.
after 1800; inclusion in the research is based on the possession of a country estate of at least 10 hectares or 25 acres in Utrecht or Twente. As will become clear, the latter group was not exclusively composed of individuals who had made money through industry and commerce. Younger members of established landowning families were also involved in estate building, especially in Utrecht. For instance the Boom estate near Leusden was created in 1878 for the old gentry De Beaufort family (Renes et al, 1998, p. 74).

Contemporary sources also provide an important record of the entrance of new money into the land market; particular use has been made here of the tax registers of the Cadastre and the lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen, an official listing of substantial individual taxpayers. More detailed discussion of these sources can be found in Chapter 3.

Although the lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen (1813, 1848-1917) gives no insight into the actual income of a person, analysis of this source does present a good overview of the scale and chronology of the creation of new money and of the financial status of the individuals involved. Furthermore, as previously discussed in Chapter 3, to be included in the list an individual needed to have a personal income of at least 8,500 guilders yearly. The list can thus be used to get an indication of wealth, which was then supplemented by data from personal documents (see below, p. 98-101).

From the Overijssel tax list published in the newspaper Zwolsche Courant several conclusions can be drawn. Initially it was the case that only a few individuals from Twente appear in this listing for the province as a whole. Thus of the 69 individuals included in the 1850 list, only nine resided in the region of Twente. These included the two wealthiest individuals in the province: Baron J.D.C. Heeckeren van Wassenaer and Count A.F.L. Van Rechteren Limpurg (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 9 August 1850). The other individuals listed were: G.W. Bosch van Drakestein esquire, J.Th. Roessingh Udink (Figure 5.4), G.J.O.D. Dikkers, Count G. Schimmelpenninck, Th.F.A. Kistemaker, W. Nieuwenhuis and G.C. Arntenius. With the exception of the last two named, all were large and established landowners (Cadastral ledgers, Kadaster Overijssel). In 1855 three industrialists entered the list, namely B.W. Blijdenstein and L. ten Cate from Enschede and G. Salomonson from Almelo. From the 1870s the number of industrialists included rises more rapidly, including members of newly important families such as Van Heek, Gelderman, Palthe, Scholten, Spanjaard and Stork. Over time, therefore, the list reveals the expected rise in the number of residents of Twente and newcomers, particularly industrialists, amongst the province’s richest individuals. For example, of the 84 listed individuals in 1875 more than 15 were industrialists, including Gerrit Jan van Heek who was taxed over 1100 guilders in total (placing him as number 17 on the list). This was still modest, however, when compared to the wealthiest individual in the province, namely Jacob van Heeckeren van Wassenaer of Twickel who had to pay almost 16,000 guilders in tax, largely
based on his extensive landed properties in the provinces of Overijssel and Gelderland in the east of the country (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 6 May 1875). Ten years later, in 1885, Gerrit Jan was listed as the 12th wealthiest individual, and was taxed at nearly 1500 guilders, of which approximately half was tax paid on his business assets (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 1 May 1885). The tax list thus also indicates a difference in source of money. Whereas the nobility’s wealth was rooted in their extensive landed estates, the newly wealthy derived their income from their businesses, although some of them sought to increase their landed property (see Chapter 6).

In Utrecht on average 50 individuals were included in the lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen published in the provincial magazine Provinciaalblad van Utrecht (HUA, 79, no. 3567-3610). Study of the lists published between 1850 and 1890 reveals that initially only a few members of a new landed elite are included, for example E.H. Kol, P.A.M. van Oosthuyse van Rijckevorsel van Rijssenburg, H.W. Bosch van Drakestein and H. van den Bosch (Figure 5.2).

One possible implication is that industrial and commercial activity in Utrecht was not generating new personal fortunes of a scale sufficient to warrant inclusion in this list of substantial taxpayers. In practice, however, we need to recognise that many of those who became the owners of new estates in Utrecht had their principal residence outside the province.
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at this stage and were registered for taxation purposes elsewhere. For example, the Amsterdam real estate agent Dirk Jan Voombergh (1768-1824) who owned Slotzicht estate near Vreeland and his only son Albert, who had created the Hoog Beek en Royen estate near Zeist in 1825 appeared not on the *lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen* for the province of Utrecht, but on that for the city of Amsterdam (Van Nierop, 1925, p. 1-76). From the 1880s onwards, however, more Amsterdam *nouveaux riches* were included on the Utrecht lists, for example M. Crommelin, M. van Marwik Kooij, H.D. Willink van Collen and C. van Notten. This suggests that by this date such families increasingly chose to reside permanently on their country house estates. In 1890 some sixteen families identified as *nouveaux riches* (see Table 5.1) appeared on the tax list (HUA, 79, no. 3610).

However, not all newly wealthy decided to invest in land. The *lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen* of 1875 indicates that the industrialist Maurits (Wertheim) Salomonson became one of the wealthiest individuals in Overijssel (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 6 May 1875). Salomonson’s company was in 1851 the first to establish a steam-powered mill in Twente and with over 450 powerlooms it long remained one of the largest such mills in the region (Boot, 1935, p. 108-109). The *lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen* shows that Salomonson’s tax assessment was largely based on his business properties and included only a relatively small tax assessment for landed property in Twente (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 6 May 1875). Similarly, other wealthy industrialists, such as the Scholten family from Enschede and the Spanjaard family from Borne, owned relatively little land outside the urban sphere. To filter out such wealthy newcomers who chose not to invest in the creation of country estates, or whose major landholdings lie outside the study areas, the initial list of potentially relevant individuals obtained from the *lijst* was set against information derived from the cadastral ledgers from 1832 onwards. These ledgers contain information that can be used to build up a record of the accumulation and extension of landed properties, revealing the identity of new entrants amongst the great landowners. At this stage, it will suffice to identify these new entrants. More detailed analyses of the extent of their land purchases and other issues of landownership will be dealt with in Chapter 6, largely focusing upon the creation of new estates in period researched.

Based on their size of capital (as discussed above) and estate ownership (see Chapter 6) the following families certainly belonged to the new landed elite: Van Heek, Blijdenstein, Stork, Ter Kuile, Roessingh Udink, Dikkers and Gelderman in Twente; and Bosch (van Drakestein/ van Oud-Amelisweerd), Oosthuyse (van Rijsenburg), Kol, Pauw van Wieldrecht, Nellesteyn, Kneppelhout, Voombergh and Hooft in Utrecht. A fuller listing of these families and other *nouveaux riches* who either bought or established country retreats in the two regions during the course of the nineteenth century is set out in Tables 5.1 and 5.2.
For each family brief information is provided regarding geographical origins and their main source of income. The compilation of such information offers some initial insights into the characteristics of individual families, but, equally important, a sense of their differences and similarities as a group. Knowledge of the landowners’ background may also throw light on the nature of their interaction with the local society and environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Source of money/profession</th>
<th>Geographical origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Bauningen - Van Heek</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blijdenstein</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam/ Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blokhuis</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boer</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boissevain</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Germany/ Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch (van Drakestein/ van Amelisweerd)</td>
<td>Industry/ Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Bosch</td>
<td>Navy officer</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clopperbooke Patijn van Kloetinge</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordes</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crommelin</td>
<td>Banking/ Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Eeghen</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erdmann</td>
<td>Dutch East-Indies sugar plantations</td>
<td>Germany/ Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Heus</td>
<td>Industry (cleaning coins)</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooff</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneppelhout</td>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kol</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintelo de Geer</td>
<td>Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Loon</td>
<td>Banking/ Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luden</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Marwijk Kooij</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metelerkamp</td>
<td>Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munzerbroek</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Notten</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Amsterdam/ Zeist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Oosthuyse (van Rijsenbur)</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Belgium/ The Hague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauw van Wieldrecht</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The Hague/ Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Poorten Schwartz</td>
<td>Writer &amp; poet</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Pré</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoop</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voombergh</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendelaar</td>
<td>Stock market</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Wetstein Pfister</td>
<td>Dutch-Indies army officer</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willink</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The new landed elite of Utrecht with source of money and geographical origin.
Source: Cadastral Ledgers (1832 onwards); Lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen (1850-1890); Van Groningen, 1999; Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912; Munnig Schmidt & Lisman, 1997.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Source of money/ profession</th>
<th>Geographical origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baurichter-Essink</td>
<td>Stock market</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blijdenstein</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch van Drakenstein</td>
<td>Legal Profession (lawyer, judge)</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civati</td>
<td>Trade/commerce</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coster</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromhoff</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikkers</td>
<td>Tax authorities/major</td>
<td>Rijssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelderman</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulshoff</td>
<td>Landownership</td>
<td>Vriezenveen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannink</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laan</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledeboer</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Maere</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molkenboer</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palthe</td>
<td>Religious/political leadership</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roessingh Udink</td>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholten</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stork</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Cate</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter Horst</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Rijssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter Kuile</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Wyck</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Heek</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wulften Palthe</td>
<td>Textile industry</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The new landed elite of Twente with source of money and geographical origin.

Sources: Cadastral Ledgers (1832 onwards); lijst van hoogstaanlagenen (1850-1890); Mensema & Gevers (1995); Olde Meierink (1984, 1985, 1988).

5.3 ORIGINS AND CHARACTERISTICS

Geographical origins and local links

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 reveal that, with only a few exceptions, the new landed elite in Twente originated from within the region (particularly Almelo, Oldenzaal and Enschede), whilst those in Utrecht mostly originated from outside the province, particularly from Amsterdam.

This acknowledgement of geographical origins is important as they were a potential influence on individuals’ interest in and emotional attachment to the region in which they purchased land. The involvement in the local society, evident for example in participation in local government and support for local charities, was generally much greater amongst the Twente nouveaux riches than with their Amsterdam-based counterparts in Utrecht. In eastern Twente, in particular, industrialists played an important role in local government and society from the late eighteenth century until well into the twentieth century (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 172-176). A specific instance of their support for local causes was the charity launched in Twente in 1911, which commemorated the fire of 1862 that had destroyed Enschede. Amongst its most generous supporters were the city’s leading industrial families: Van Heek, Ter Kuile and Jannink (Archives Van Deinse Instituut, Inteekenlijst no. 1).
In Utrecht those amongst the newly wealthy who originated from within the region itself seem also to have displayed a greater interest in the area’s social and political life. Utrecht-born Paulus Wilhelms Bosch van Drakestein, for example, was very active in both the provincial and city politics of Utrecht throughout his adult life. During the French occupation, around 1800, he was major of Utrecht (De Bruin, 1996, p. 24). Other individuals acted as public benefactors. In 1903, for example, Jan Kol III, owner of the Vlaer and Kol provincial bank, employed the designer firm H. Copijn & Son to create a public park on a former country estate near the city of Utrecht. This move was, however, coloured by self-interest as Kol hoped that the surrounding land which he also owned would become a favoured location for residential development, leading to profitable land deals (Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 170).

In contrast, only after establishing permanently in their Utrecht retreats did wealthy urbanites from Amsterdam invest in local projects. Interest was, for instance, expressed in participation in governmental bodies and charities, and also in attempts to improve local communications. This growing level of local involvement was clearly seen in the case of the Blijdenstein family of Amsterdam bankers (ex. inf. J. van Notten, 2003). Willem Benjamin Blijdenstein (Figure 5.3) was the director of the Amsterdam headquarters of the Twentsche Bank and had also worked in London for several years (ex. inf. J. van Notten, 2003). On returning to the Netherlands he and his family purchased large tracts of heath land near the village of Maarn on which they built a country house, initially used only at weekends and holidays (see Chapter 6 and 7 for more detail). Before retiring at Huis te Maarn in the 1920s they were still very much part of Amsterdam society, but after settling permanently on the estate they displayed considerable interest in the local society of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug. This included involvement in regional government and donations to the ‘Groene Kruis’ medical institution and to the Scouts of Maarn (ex. inf. J. van Notten, 2003).

Sources and scales of wealth
Chapter 4 revealed that at the beginning of the nineteenth century Twente’s textile industry was still domestic, yet after 1850 it expanded to a much larger factory-based enterprise. This commercial expansion – which coincided with the availability of extensive areas of cheap land released as a result of the division of communal lands (discussed in more detail in Chapter 6) – was central to the subsequent ability of the Blijdensteins, Van Heeks, Geldermans and other former linen traders to establish themselves as substantial landowners.

The Blijdenstein family can serve as an example of this growth in the scale of family wealth. In 1815 the firm of Blijdenstein & Co, directed by Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein (1780-1857), had a financial value of 107,000 guilders. By 1864 the firm was worth over 300,000 guilders, and in 1896 it was valued at 1.8 million guilders (Jansen, 1996, p. 10-11). The share of director
Albert Jan Blijdenstein, Benjamin’s son, was alone worth almost 400,000 guilders in the 1890s. At his death in 1896 Albert Jan left over 700,000 guilders to his descendants (HCO, Family Archive Blijdenstein, document 127). Other families amongst the Twente industrialists listed in Table 5.2 experienced a similar growth in their wealth. Booth (1935, appendix 3) calculated that on average the capital of a Twente industrial firm grew from 170,000 guilders in 1820 to 469,000 in 1850, further increasing to over 1.3 million guilders in the 1870s.

Figure 5.3: Willem Benjamin Blijdenstein, painted by Jan Veth in 1909.
Source: Historisch Archief ABN Amro bank.
Figure 5.4: Johannes Theunis Roessingh Udink, painted by Jan Adam Kruseman in 1844.
Source: Stichting Edwina van Heek, Enschede.

Textiles were the largest single source of wealth for the nouveaux riches of Twente. Indeed, the importance of industrial wealth is rather under-stated on Table 5.2 as many of the leading industrial families were large, with several different branches all involved in this sector of the economy. Other income sources were, however, important in individual cases. Banking, for example, was the chosen field of Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein junior. He founded the Twentsche Bank in the 1860s after being refused admittance into the family’s textile business. (Wevers, 1993, p. 9). Similarly, finance was the source of capital for Gerhardus J.O. Dikkers (1782-1852) who was a tax collector for the state tax office and who became the owner of several manorial properties in Twente including Diepenheim and Weleveld (Den Otter, 1990, p. 49-50). In 1832 Dikkers owned 546 hectares of land, taxed at 2885 guilders annually (Cadastral ledgers Wierden, Borne and Diepenheim). Others amongst the Twente nouveaux riches derived their incomes from commerce, or had seen military service (Table 5.2).
It was also the case that some individuals within industrial or commercial families benefitted from inherited wealth. This was true, for example, of Johannes Theunis Roessingh Udink (Figure 5.4) who devoted his new wealth to purchasing medieval estates at Singraven (1829), Harseveld (1838) and Noorddeurningen (1856). This landholding was further extended with the addition of large tracts of wasteland from marke divisions. At his death in 1858 Roessingh Udink’s property totalled 1165 hectares, valued at 323,000 guilders (Dingeldein, 1969, p. 37-43; Mensema & Gevers, 1995, p. 481). He thus ranked as the second wealthiest person in Twente, outstripped only by Baron Heeckeren van Wassenaer, lord of Twickel (HCO, Zwolsche Courant, 17 April 1855). The latter’s landed property in Twente was, however, much the larger of the two, amounting to approximately 4000 hectares (Cadastral ledgers Ambt & Stad Delden).

If the nouveaux riches of Twente were chiefly industrialists, their counterparts in Utrecht more commonly owed their wealth to the financial sector (Table 5.1). Individuals made fortunes in stock market dealing and in real estate. It was banking, however, that was the most significant single sector. The Voombergh family fortunes, for example, owed much to the activities of Dirk Jan Voombergh who was a leading figure in the establishment of the Associatie-Cassa banking business in the early 1800s. With an income of 60,000 guilders in 1813 Voombergh was amongst Amsterdam’s wealthiest individuals, reflected also in his ownership of two houses in the city and a country estate in the province of Utrecht (Van Nierop, 1925, p. 1-76). Voombergh’s son Albert took over the business in the 1820s. The cadastral ledger of 1832 showed that he possessed over 220 hectares of land in the municipality of Zeist, taxed at 2362 guilders annually (Cadastral ledger Zeist, Archief Zeist). He thus ranked as the sixth greatest individual landowner in the municipality.

The leading banking house in the city of Utrecht itself was the firm of Vlaer & Kol established in 1748 by Jan Kol I (1726-1805). During the nineteenth century the bank administered the financial affairs of much of Utrecht’s nobility, including the families of Van der Capellen, Feith, Hardenbroeck, Heeckeren, Van Lijnden, Ram, Renesse, Tuijl van Serooskerken, Taets van Amerongen and Utenhove. This success ensured that the Kol family numbered amongst the wealthiest people in nineteenth-century Utrecht. By 1832 Jan Kol II (1789-1848) owned over 300 hectares of land in the municipalities of Zuilen, Lauwerext and Zeist, taxed annually at 6462 guilders (Cadastral ledgers Zuilen, Lauwerext and Zeist; HUA & Archief Zeist). In 1885 his descendant Everard Henry Kol was listed as the tenth largest taxpayer in the lijst van hoogstaangeslagenen for the province of Utrecht, with a total tax bill of 2417.65 guilders (HUA, 79, nr. 3605).

Beyond the financial sector sources of income for other members of Utrecht’s nouveaux riches were quite diverse. Van Oosthuizen, for example, owed his wealth to supplying the French
army. Bosch van Drakestein’s family fortune derived from brandy production (Van Groningen, 2003, p. 11-12; De Bruin, 1996, p. 24-25; Sleeuwenshoek & Van Dam, 1998, p. 48). Paulus Wilhelmus Bosch (1771-1834) was the youngest son of Theodorus Gerardus Bosch and Cornelia Maria van Bijleveld (De Bruin, 1996, p. 24). His father owned a brandy distillery in Utrecht, and his mother came from a wealthy brewing family. The success of both businesses ensured access to a higher education for Paulus Wilhelmus and his older brother. In 1793 Paulus Wilhelmus secured qualifications in law and started working as a lawyer. At the same time he was still involved in the booming family business. In 1796 the business capital was approximately 400,000 guilders. At his death in 1834 he left his children 1.5 million guilders (De Bruin, 1996, p. 28). This scale of wealth meant that he ranked amongst the richest individuals in the province (HUA, 79, no. 3567-3610; 703-10, no. 767-x). In subsequent generations several individuals practised law and some enjoyed a successful political career. This was true of Paulus Wilhelmus’ son Frederik Lodewijk H.J. Bosch van Drakestein, who followed his father as lord of Drakestein. In 1860 Frederik Lodewijk bought the nearby manor of Drakenburg (Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912, Volume II, p. 1-19).

Urban and rural connections

Another way to identify the nature of these new landowners is by analysing the relative strength of their connections with town and country. Landownership often carried with it connotations of involvement in both a rural economy and a wider rural society. Major landowners have often assumed positions of political and social leadership within their own localities, in turn reinforcing the assumption that land ownership confers a degree of status (Spring 1977, p. 13-14). Yet Mosse (1993, p.72) has asserted that even when members of the *nouveaux riches* invested in land they often remained ‘essentially urban in outlook’. Evidence from the two case study regions suggests, however, that such generalisations are not always valid.

In Twente it appears that many *nouveaux riches* families had previously owned proto-industrial enterprises, establishing a long-standing record of contact with countryside as well as town. The former might subsequently have been reinforced through investments in estate development. Van Heek (1945), a member of the family of leading industrialists who wrote a thesis on his own social circle, suggests that many Twente industrialists retained a mentality that was shaped by a previous phase of economic development in which livelihoods had been derived from both farming and linen trading. This was particularly true in cases where individuals had themselves been born in the small villages that clustered around the cities of eastern Twente and where enterprises continued to recruit rural labour (Van Heek, 1945, p. 239-241). These enduring links with the countryside perhaps help to explain the attention paid by many to the acquisition and management of estates, and their specific interest in farming, forestry and the visual appearance of the landscape.
In contrast, the Utrecht *nouveaux riches* formed a largely urban elite, originating in the cities of Amsterdam and Utrecht. Their social and business life was frequently still rooted in those cities. It was perhaps for this reason – amongst others – that they were more prone than their counterparts in Twente to use their country estates chiefly as weekend or summer residences. A similar tendency was evident amongst other new estate owners whose fortunes were more established, but who had previously chosen to invest in urban property. A case in point was Hendrik Maurits van Loon, a director of the banking company which bore the family name. Van Loon came from a wealthy bourgeois family from Amsterdam that had been ennobled by King Willem I. Hendrik Maurits, in fact, was not only banker, but also chamberlain and head gamekeeper of King Willem III (Dek, 1992, p.10). In the 1880s he purchased an estate near Doorn and replaced the existing villa built in 1815 with a grandiose mansion in neo-renaissance style (Figure 5.5). Yet, despite its size, Hydepark ‘was a residence for the weekends and holidays’ (Vi van Loon, granddaughter, cited by Dek, 1992, p. 10).

These general observations raise further questions about the depth of individual and family connections with town and countryside and the extent to which long-standing participation in rural economic systems impacted on the aesthetic sensibilities of the new estate owners and their understanding of the natural world. Exploration of their interest in specific dimensions of rural life may help to clarify this and it is partly with this in mind that Chapters 7 and 8 include
more detailed discussion of the use made of estate land, including hunting, and estate owners’ interest in landscape design.

**Motivations for land investment**

Indications that some *nouveaux riches* at least felt a familial and emotional attachment to rural landscapes and society suggest one aspect of the motivation for the purchase of estates. It is important to recognise, however, that decisions about land acquisition generally reflected a series of interlocking considerations. In some instances, land was clearly seen as a safe and durable investment, or was initially considered as a direct adjunct to established industrial interests. As will be detailed in Chapter 6, some Twente estates had their origins in the purchase of land on which to locate bleach or dye works associated with the textile trade. In Utrecht, by contrast, it was more common for an estate to be viewed as a source of rental income, newly acquired estates and country houses being sometimes rented in whole, or in part, to other middle-class families from Amsterdam.

Other sources of potential returns from land investment included agriculture and forestry. In particular, large-scale pine plantations were established to meet the demand for timber from the coal mining industry in the south of the Netherlands and Belgium. In Twente, both individual landowners and companies, such as the *Nederlandse Heidemaatschappij* (Dutch Heath Company, established in 1886) and the *Grontmij* (Land Company, established in 1915), cultivated large tracts of former heath land for this purpose (Vervloet, 1995, p. 21). Similar ventures in Utrecht more frequently reflected extensive investments in forestry on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug by individuals including Albert Voombergh, Petrus Jacobus van Oosthuyse, and Frans Nicolaas van Bern (Van Luttervelt, 1949, p. 145; Blijdenstein, 2005, p. 109-111; see next chapter). In some instances, therefore, land purchase was a reflection of the wider business instincts that characterised the emergent industrial, commercial and financial elite (Keiser, 1967, p. 123).

Despite the importance of this entrepreneurial rationale, most investors also had more personal reasons to purchase or create an estate. As elsewhere in urbanising western Europe, families increasingly aspired to own rural property, allowing them to escape the increasing industrial pollution and urban congestion which, ironically, they had themselves helped to create (Daniels, 1981, p. 384). As a member of the Blijdenstein family reflected in a short poem: ‘Is it not sweet pleasure, to step into the green? Where there is no smoke, no fumes from the cities’ (Translated by the author from HCO, 233.1, no. 58). A place in the countryside offered peace and tranquillity. The undulating landscape with its woods and clean air was also regarded as healthy. The creation of extensive parks and tasteful gardens in such a context also offered an opportunity for the new estate owners to demonstrate their aesthetic understanding. Moreover,
land purchase and ownership of a country estate with fashionable gardens had become something of a trend among the newly wealthy by the second half of the nineteenth century. This evident interest in landownership may thus have become self-reinforcing, as individuals and families sought to enhance their social and economic status, both within the immediate ranks of the *nouveaux riches* and, in some instances, through closer links with the established nobility.

**Relation to nobility**

The perception that landownership was valued as a means of acquiring social status, and potentially an aristocratic title, by newly monied families keen to become part of the establishment has previously been cited as a significant motivation for land purchase in nineteenth-century Britain (Thompson 1963, p.20 & 23; Wiener 1981, p. 127). It is less clear, however, whether similar motives were widely evident in the Netherlands.

It does seem to have been the case that the emergent Dutch *nouveaux riches* of the seventeenth century not only invested in manorial land, but also attached the related manorial title to their name. This process was repeated in Utrecht in the first half of the nineteenth century. Individuals such as Petrus Jacobus van Oosthuyse, Paulus Wilhelms Bosch, and Hendrik Daniel Hooft purchased existing country estates from impoverished noble families (see Chapter 2). Immediately after the purchase they also added the manorial titles to their name, respectively Rijsenburg, Drakenstein and Woudenberg (Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912, volume I, p. 83-97, 512-555). Paulus Wilhelms Bosch, for example, purchased several estates from impoverished patricians and noblemen, including the manors of Drakenstein (in 1806) and Oud-Amelisweerd (in 1811). He added the title of the first estate to his surname, becoming Bosch van Drakenstein. It appears, however, that neither the name, nor his evident wealth gave him the status he wanted. The traditional elite did not accept him into their midst (De Bruin, 1996, p. 25-26). In part this reflected the source of his wealth and his spending seems also to have been regarded as both extravagant and improper. His Catholicism and support for the French occupation of the Netherlands during the early nineteenth century further distanced Bosch from a predominantly Protestant Dutch nobility – as was also the case for Van Oosthuyse van Rijsenburg (ex. inf. De Bruin, 2003). These individuals form part of an earlier phase of estate building, 1780-1820, which has been identified in Chapter 2 as an elaboration on the work of Buis (1993).

In 1829 Bosch van Drakenstein was ennobled by King William I, but it would take several generations before the family was truly accepted and respected as members of the elite. Towards the middle of the nineteenth century one of his sons, Gerard Willem Bosch van Drakenstein, moved to Goor in Twente, where he had bought the medieval estate of Heeckeren, circa 75 hectares in extent, for approximately 134,000 guilders (Cadastral ledgers of Goor,
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Kadaster Overijssel). It is some measure of the social distance that the family had travelled during the intervening decades that Gerard Willem identified himself socially and through marriage with the local gentry, and became involved in provincial politics. In contrast there are few signs that he established close contacts with the new industrial elite from Oldenzaal, Hengelo and Enschede.

The experience of the Bosch van Drakesteins may not, however, have been typical as several Amsterdam businessmen did successfully establish links with noble families and even the Dutch royal family. Instances of the latter included Van Loon, noted above as royal chamberlain. The Van Loons and other families, such as the Van Eeghens, whose fortunes derived from the commercial world of Amsterdam were also linked by marriage both with each other and with various noble families, including the Van Zuijlen van Nijvelts, Bentincks, Van Limburg Stirums and De Beauforts (www.genlias.nl/). More anecdotal evidence also survives of social links between the family of the banker Willem Blijdenstein and members of the local nobility. According to one of their descendants the Blijdensteins frequently played tennis with the Van Aldenburgh Bentinck family of Castle Amerongen (ex. inf. J. van Notten, 2003).

In Twente it appears to have been less common than in Utrecht for manorial lands and titles to pass into new hands, although some nouveaux riches did buy havezathes. Mensema and Gevers (1995, p. 221) argue that Helmich van Heek’s purchase of Hof te Boekelo in 1822 showed his aspirations to consolidate and enhance his social status by linking himself to a noble house. Evidence of such aspirations is, however, lacking, and it is more likely that the purchase was chiefly intended to create a large, recreational family estate. Inheritance and purchase of more land resulted in further substantial extensions to the estate, for instance in 1866 the nearby Het Stroot estate was bought and added to Boekelo (Van Schelven, 1984, 19). It is difficult to find instances where newly wealthy families expressed any overt desire to enhance their social status by obtaining either landed property or associated titles. Indeed, it appears that such ostentatious behaviour in seeking social enhancement was frowned upon within the industrial elite of Twente. After purchasing the Baasdam estate, for example, Nico ter Kuile was dissuaded by his children from any attempt to enhance his status by adding the title ‘Van Baasdam’ to his surname (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 56). This contrasts, for example, with Belgian industrialists of whom many became part of the nobility (ex. inf. Olde Meierink, 2002).

This lack of appetite for noble titles is consistent with other indications of a lack of social connections between the industrial nouveaux riches and the nobility. Family and estate archives which have been consulted for this study contained no personal correspondence between the two social groups (e.g. HCO, 233.1 & 166; Twickel Estate Archive; Weldam Estate Archive). One possible point of contact was found in the leasing of hunting rights to land owned by Baron...
Heeckeren van Wassenaer to several industrialists (Twickel Estate Archive, no. 3177). In practice, however, this was probably a purely business arrangement. The hunting diary of Helmich Blijdenstein (HCO, 233.1, no. 149) details his hunting companions, none of whom came from local noble families.

According to Van Heek (1945, p. 241) this absence of social contact between old and new money reflected the nobility’s relative lack of social and political influence in the nineteenth-century Netherlands. This was, in part, true, but we also have to consider the scale of the likely gap between the wealth and status of the two groups in particular contexts. In Twente social links between the *nouveaux riches* and existing noble landowners may have been discouraged by the very substantial wealth enjoyed by many of the latter and their membership of an elite that was national rather than local. The gap between old and new may often have been smaller in Utrecht. Social and marriage links may also have been encouraged by the fact that new money in Utrecht more often defined from commerce or professional activity, rather than industry. Money itself – or rather its source – carried distinct social connotations.

We should also acknowledge that a desire for social advancement within the social world formed by the *nouveaux riches* themselves provided a motive for some land purchases. Social status within the new elite was undoubtedly gained through the development of increasingly grand estates, created by professional architects and designers, and maintained by land agents, gamekeepers and lesser servants. The recreational use of land, particularly the establishment of gardens, parks and hunting grounds, provided an important opportunity for the display of both wealth and taste.

**Intermarriages and social coherence**

The extent of social coherence within the *nouveaux riches* can be explored through consideration of the extent to which individual families shared a common background – judged in social, economic and geographical terms – and evidence of active contacts between them through marriage, business dealings and membership of social and charitable organisations.

With few exceptions, the *nouveaux riches* of Twente seem to have been a coherent group. In particular, the families from Enschede formed a strong social entity characterised by a similarity in backgrounds. Their wealth derived largely from the success of the local textile industry, meaning, as noted above, their sympathies were rural as well as urban (Van Heek, 1945; Hammer-Stroeve, 2001; Trompetter, 1997). They were generally of the Mennonite religion, and this, together with their broad social and professional equivalence, encouraged inter-marriage. Thus the children of Gerrit Jan van Heek (1837-1915) with his first wife Julia Blijdenstein (1836-1867) and his second wife Christine Meier (1842-1920) had married members of other
industrialist families, including the Janninks, Blijdensteins, Van Wulfften Palthes, and Ter Kuiles (Figure 5.6). Sometimes the lines of inter-marriage could be rather complicated. For example, two of Gerrit Jan’s older brothers, Hendrik Jan and Herman, were also married to women of the Blijdenstein family. One of Herman’s sons, Helmich (1845-1902), married Willemina Jannink in 1870, the daughter of Gerhard Jannink and Aleida van Heek (www.genlias.nl/). This complicated record of marriage links was first established when these families were simply linen traders in the seventeenth century, and continued well into the twentieth century. Commercial and social links were thus mutually reinforcing, reflecting the importance attached to the maintenance of family businesses in the local textile industry. It is also clear that recreational interests were often held in common. Helmich Blijdenstein’s hunting diary, for example, reveals that Enschede’s industrial elite often hunted together on each other’s land. Blijdenstein’s hunting companions included fellow industrialists and family members G. J. van Heek, E. ter Kuile, G. J. Jannink and A. Ledeboer jr (HCO, 233.1, no. 149).

Families from other parts of Twente seem, however, to have had less social contact with those from Enschede. To some extent this was true for the Gelderman family from Oldenzaal, but it was especially the case for families perceived to be newcomers or ‘outsiders’; their Jewish religion counted particularly against the Menko and Spanjaard families who were not readily accepted into the new regional elite (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 66). It does not seem to have been the case that social links were maintained exclusively between families whose fortunes were industrial. In practice, others whose money derived from commerce, such as the Roessingh...
Udink, Dikkers, Laan and Baurichter families, established business links with industrialists. The Twentsche Bank, founded by Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein junior played an important role in this, as many other financial interests were integrated into this large bank. Most industrial firms in Twente were clients of the Twentsche Bank (HCO, 59, introduction).

The situation in Utrecht seems to have been more complex because the majority of the nouveaux riches originated from outside the province and maintained geographically more extensive social networks, including important links to Amsterdam. Little appears to have been previously written about the extent of social links within this group. Genealogical records, such as biographies (e.g. Aalbers, 1996; www.genlias.nl/), and books on the Dutch nobility (Nederland’s Adelsboek, since 1903) and patricians (Nederland’s Patriciën, since 1910), provide evidence of inter-marriage, albeit less frequent than was generally the case in Twente. For example, Albert Voombergh’s first daughter married Jan Willem van Loon (lawyer and politician) in 1848, his second daughter married Matthieu C.H. Pauw van Wieldrecht esquire in 1855, and his third daughter married Charles Bernard Labouchere (banker and financial advisor). Albert’s grandson Ernest Labouchere took over the firm of Van Ketwich & Voombergh in 1880 with Adriaan Oyens (his nephew through marriage). Cross-referencing mentioned sources illustrated a number of other intermarriages including Van Notten-Blijdenstein, Kol-Van den Bosch, Van Beuningen-Van Heek, Van Eeghen-Labouchere, and Van Eeghen-Van Loon.

However, alongside this group of closely linked families, the Utrecht nouveaux riches also included many individuals and families who seem to have established no such marriage ties. Given the function of their country houses as weekend and holiday retreats, rather than primary residence, this is not perhaps surprising. Urban business interests were more varied than was the case for the industrialists of Twente and even though some families established business partnerships – including the Voombergh, Kol and Van Eeghen families in the financial sector – many others were business rivals.

**SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS**

Even from this brief account of the nouveaux riches in Twente and Utrecht it has become apparent that we are dealing with two very different social groups. Most new money in nineteenth-century Twente derived from the textile industry. This created a class of businessmen with strong rural links which were maintained and reinforced through the subsequent purchase of estates. The textile industrialists were furthermore marked by a strong social coherence, illustrated by the numerous inter-marriages. Their motives for landownership seem often to have been mixed, embracing economic, emotional and aesthetic considerations.
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By contrast Utrecht’s newly wealthy owed their fortunes chiefly to financial businesses centred in Amsterdam. Initially, the country estates which they acquired served only as temporary homes for weekends and holidays. This was perhaps a reflection of the general absence of previous rural ties, and of investment in land with recreational ends in mind, rather than a search for new business interests. New landowners whose origins were from within the province of Utrecht itself, and those who chose to reside there permanently appear to have shown more interest in the wider social, economic and political life of the area. Only a minority, however, seem to have been linked together through business dealings or inter-marriage. The sense of social cohesion and attachment to the countryside evident in Twente’s *nouveaux riches* seems to have been lacking among their counterparts in Utrecht.

Such differences in the character of the new landowners might be expected to have been reflected in different attitudes towards the estates they purchased or created. For example, the interlocking range of motivations for investment, that differed amongst the discussed groups and amongst individuals, will have had an impact on the use made of the estate, the land value and the size of the estate. An estate on which forestry and agriculture played an important role was probably more extensive in size than a country estate that was rented out to wealthy citizens for recreational purposes. It can furthermore be expected that the strong social network of a handful of families in Twente was also reflected in their way of experiencing the landscape, as already briefly demonstrated by the example of hunting. In the following chapters, aspects of landownership and estate building (Chapter 6), designing the estate (Chapter 7) and leisure in the landscape (Chapter 8) will be explored with reference to the characteristics of the new landowners, as discussed here.
Chapter 6.
Continuity and Change
in the Distribution of Country Estates

INTRODUCTION
The newly monied families identified in the previous chapter increasingly chose to invest part of their wealth in the accumulation of land and the creation of country estates. They thus made a significant contribution to the total of over 80 new estates in Twente and almost 100 in Utrecht established between 1800 and 1950. This chapter deals with the spatial patterning of these newly created country estates, mapping and exploring aspects of continuity and change in their character and distribution. This involves consideration of features such as relief, land value and availability, distance to urban centres and population density. Together these factors help to build up an explanatory account of the absolute and relative location of estate development. This general overview will be supplemented with more detailed attention to individual estates, and to variation within the study areas in the extent to which land was held in estates.

6.1 NEW COUNTRY ESTATES FROM 1800 ONWARDS
The new activities in estate building were largely undertaken by *nouveaux riches*, although the established elite was also still involved in estate development. The latter chiefly involved the modification and extension of existing estates, in part as a reflection of their owner’s changing means, but also in response to the dictates of agricultural markets and changing tastes in landscape design, as already indicated in Chapters 2 and 4. Yet several established noble families also invested in the creation of entirely new landholdings during the period under consideration. This section thus investigates the pattern of distribution of new estates by both old and new money and discusses the various opportunities and constraints that shaped the choice of their location. Lists of all new country estates built in the two study areas between 1800 and 1950 can be found in appendices I and II.

By mapping the location of all newly created estates in Twente (Figures 6.1 A and B) and Utrecht (Figures 6.2 A and B) between 1800 and 1950 a particular pattern becomes apparent in both regions. For both Twente and Utrecht the majority of new estates were clustered in the east, near or on the sandy ice-pushed ridges. The extent of relief discussed earlier in Chapter 4 thus appears to have considerable effect on the distribution pattern. Distance to city seems to have been equally important.
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Figure 6.1 A: The nouveaux riches estates of Twente
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Figure 6.2 A: The nouveaux riches estates of Utrecht.
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Figure 6.2 B: Inlay map of the *nouveaux riches* estates near Driebergen, Zeist and Doorn.
Approximately 80 per cent of Twente’s *nouveaux riches* estates were established within a 10 kilometre radius around the eastern cities of Enschede, Hengelo and Oldenzaal in which many of the industrialists made their fortunes. A further small cluster of estates, around 10 per cent of the total, appeared in the vicinity of the city of Almelo. In Utrecht more than half of the new estates were established on the southwest flank of the ice-pushed ridges of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, particularly along the main road through the villages of De Bilt, Zeist and Driebergen. Smaller concentrations were found on top of these uplands (16 per cent), along the river Vecht (6 per cent) and within a five kilometre radius around the city of Utrecht (8 per cent).

Having mapped modern estate development in the two study regions we must now begin to develop an explanation of the observed distribution pattern. From the outset it seems clear that a wide variety of factors may have influenced the location of specific estate developments.

**Existing pattern of landownership**

The particular geographical distribution of estate development seen in Utrecht and Twente was in part the result of the dominant presence of older estates in certain areas (Figures 6.3 A and B). Chapter 4 already discussed the regional differences of two previous phases of estate development in the Netherlands, the first occurring during the late Middle Ages and the second during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The influence of these earlier estates on developments during the nineteenth century was two-fold. In some instances the newly wealthy of this latter era bought an established medieval or seventeenth-century estate from owners who had fallen upon hard times (see Section 6.3). More often, however, the existing pattern of ownership was significant as a constraint upon the establishment of new estates. In Twente, especially, the continuing presence of the nobility as major landowners in the western half of the region allowed little opportunity for land purchase. Few new estates were established around Almelo, for example, where Count Van Rechteren Limpurg held over 3,000 hectares (Cadastral Ledgers of Ambt Almelo, Stad Almelo, Borne, Goor, Vriezenveen and Wierden at Kadaster Overijssel). A few of Almelo’s newly wealthy were initially able to establish small country seats, particularly tea houses, along the major roads away from the city. But those who sought to create a larger country landholding were frequently forced to look further afield, particularly in the vicinity of Oldenzaal (e.g. Egheria estate of the Ten Cate family), but also in the neighbouring municipality of Wierden (e.g. Vossenbosch estate of the Scholten family). By contrast, the limited presence of an established landed elite in local land markets in eastern Twente made it easier for new money to acquire substantial properties.
Figures 6.3 A and B: The distribution pattern of Twente and Utrecht estates before and after 1800.
Compiled from various sources. See Figures 6.1 and 6.2.
Figures 6.4 A and B: The chronological distribution pattern of *nouveaux riches* estates in Twente and Utrecht, 1800-1950

Compiled from various sources. See Figures 6.1 and 6.2.
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Travel, transport and communication

As was the case for earlier periods, the newly wealthy of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries wanted to escape from the city, but at the same time stay within a day’s travel of their urban business interests. This was particularly the case as country estates were initially used chiefly as weekend and summer houses, with the accompanying expectation that any visit would be short and easily accomplished. This combination of circumstances had a constraining effect on the distribution pattern of estates. The need for access dictated that many were located close to the major roads linking the major urban centres. But journey times also exercised a continuing constraint upon estate location that was only slowly relaxed with the improvement of transport and communication networks. The finite supply of land in close proximity to towns and cities also ensured, perforce, that later estates were often located further away from major urban centres.

This is reflected, for example, in the creation of a cluster of country houses less than 5 kilometres to the north-east of Oldenzaal created between 1890 and 1950 (Figures 6.1B and 6.4 A). A large number of estates were established along the regional road from Oldenzaal to Denekamp, including Mierennest (no. 77; 1925), Paaschberg (no. 78; 1910) and Hakenberg (no. 80; 1927), or between the road from Oldenzaal to Germany and the railroad, for example Koppelboer (no. 65; 1895), Boschkamp (no. 68; 1913) and Kruisselt (no. 69; 1921). This pattern was, however, complicated by the late establishment of estates close to Oldenzaal, particularly evident at the properties of the Gelderman family. They had purchased the seventeenth-century estate De Hulst from the Kistemaker family in 1898 and divided the property in 1916 into two smaller estates, of which one kept the old name, and the other was named Scholtenhaer (Cadastral ledgers of Oldenzaal and Losser).

The influence of transport was particularly evident along the south-western side of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug where a cluster of retreats lined the main road between Utrecht and Doorn (Figures 6.2 A and B). From the early nineteenth century wealthy individuals purchased blocks of land along this route on which to build retreats, either for themselves or to rent to others. The earliest examples include Ma Retraite (no. 50), Bloemenheuvel (no. 57) and Schaerweijde (no. 55), some 5 kilometres from the city of Utrecht. Road improvements after 1816, railway connections to the east of Utrecht (1840s) and the construction of a tramline from Utrecht to Doorn (1883) ensured that this route continued to be a popular location for the establishment of new estates which gradually spread further away from Utrecht over the ensuing decades (Blijdenstijn, 2005, p. 106-108). The presence of a cluster of estates (no. 67 to 76) around the railway station at Driebergen-Zeist, where the railway crosses the Utrechtseweg, also provides a reminder of the particular importance of points of access to the railway system, as well as its wider ability to conquer distance.
The overall pattern of the increasing spread of estates away from Utrecht over time is also complicated by evidence when land became available some later estates were created close to the city, effectively filling the gaps between their established neighbours. At Zeist, for example, the Molenbosch estate, built for the Amsterdam banker J.B. Stoop in 1835, and Hoog Beek en Royen, created for Albert Voomberg in 1825 (Figure 6.6), were later joined by Nieuw Beerschoten (1889) and Arendsburg (1872). Overall, however, only a few late-nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century estates were established along the Utrecht-Doorn axis, in the villages of De Bilt, Zeist and Driebergen. As Figure 6.4B suggests it was more common for such later landholdings to be created further away from the main interurban routes, on previously isolated parts of the Heuvelrug. From the 1890s, for instance, the sandy hills between the road from Utrecht to Rhenen and the road from Amersfoort to Doorn became popular for estate building, for example ‘t Stort (no. 32), Stameren (no. 34), Schutterhoef (no. 27) and Huis te Maarn (no. 36).

Figure 6.5: Hoog Beek en Royen estate in Zeist, 1896.
Source: Rutgers, 1869.

The growing separation of houses and estates from the economic centres thus in part reflected improvements in transport, ensuring quick and easy access along the major routes into the urban centres. In effect, improvements in road and rail transport decreased the relative distance between residence and place of business. Further potential factors influencing estate location included improvements in communications, particularly the telegraph and the telephone, and changing management practices which left more of the day to day running of
businesses in the hands of paid managers. In practice, the latter may not have been of particular significance in the present context. In Twente, in particular, many of the industrial concerns remained family-run businesses until well into the twentieth century, with management responsibilities passing from father to eldest son. As late as 1921 this attitude towards business management was expressed by J. Bernard van Heek (1863-1923): ‘the best manager is he, whose father and grandfather had been managers’ (quoted by Heerma van Voss, 1993, p. 146). A similar attitude seems to have prevailed in other prominent families, including the Blijdensteins and the Ter Kuiles. Moreover, even when formal management responsibilities had been taken over by a new generation, older family members remained interested in the business and were often present at the factory.

Any specific role played by changes in communications is harder to identify. The introduction of the telegraph and telephone in the 1880s certainly enabled contact over long distances. However, initially telephones were only installed in the largest cities, including Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. Not until the turn of the century did it become common to use these new technologies to communicate between town and country (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 189). By then most estates in both the case study regions had already been established. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the telephone or the telegraph played a significant role in decision-making about the location and establishment of estates. They may, however, have enabled some families to make greater use of existing estates and accelerated their conversion from period to permanent use as a place of residence.

In the region of Utrecht a few estates stand out by virtue of their age and distance from the city. Berghuisje (no. 30; Figure 6.6), Het Zwitserse Huis or Dartheuizerberg (no. 39), De Hoogstraat (no. 40) and Dartheide or Nieuw Broekhuizen (no. 43) were all relatively early foundations, yet none is within a 25 kilometer radius of Utrecht. They thus reflect the need to take account of other, more specific factors, in individual instances. Berghuisje was built as a hunting lodge in 1837-1840 for J. B. Stoop, who probably valued its location amidst extensive heath lands for grouse shooting. Stoop had bought the land in 1831, but his initial aim of transforming the lodge into a full-blown country estate had to be abandoned. His plans fell foul of a lack of water, required for the economic development of the land and as a design element in a landscaped garden, and the isolation of the location. Instead, in 1835 Stoop invested in land near the Driebergseweg in Zeist (Molenbosch estate) much closer to the main focus of estate development in Utrecht. The other three estates named above were all created by Cornelis Jan van Nellesteyn, lord of Broekhuizen, and are all in the vicinity of his main estate. When he sold Broekhuizen to his son Wouter Hendrik in 1824 he already had built a new (‘Nieuw’) Broekhuizen (later Dartheide) for himself and his wife (Van Groningen, 2003, p. 45; Blijdenstijn & Olde Meierink, 1990, p. 96).
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Figure 6.6: Berghuisje on the heath lands near Maarn in 1840. The owner, J.B. Stoop, stands on the left.
Source: RDMZ, Zeist.

The physical landscape

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 suggest that the locational distribution of the estates developed by the *nouveaux riches* was related not only to distance from the city and transport infrastructure, but also to the physical landscape. The ice-pushed ridges and sandy hills in the eastern part of the two case-study regions were particularly popular for new estate building. Between 60 and 80 per cent of the newly built estates were situated on or adjacent to these uplands. In Utrecht the estates were chiefly located along the upland flanks, whereas in Twente the whole area of the equivalent upland was popular. This geographical concentration of estates seen on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug and eastern Twente has often been explained as reflecting the undulating character of the landscape, which offered particular potential for the creation of aesthetically-pleasing landscape gardens (Olde Meierink, 1985, p. 62; Van Groningen, 1999, p. 39; Sleeuwenhoek & Van Dam, 1998, p. 38; Blijdenstijn, 2005, p. 106). Some support for this argument is, indeed, evident in the way that the existing landscape was often exploited to create fashionable naturalistic gardens.

As will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 7 the lie of the land was exploited in various aspects of garden design. Not only was the landscape used to display an individual owner’s knowledge of the latest fashionable designs, but also to give what were usually rather small gardens a greater appeal. Vistas through the park offered views over the surrounding countryside, giving shape and a sense of scale to grounds that were relatively modest in extent. This was clearly seen on Twente estates on the hills to the east of Enschede and Oldenzaal, for instance De Hooge Boekel (no. 51), Paaschberg (no. 78) and Hakenberg (no. 80; Figure 6.7). Relief was used in these cases to give a natural feel to the gardens, but also to
create a connection with their surroundings, blurring boundaries and so giving the illusion of a large estate. Nevertheless, previous studies may have accorded too great an importance to this motivation for upland locations. Any exploration of the development of new estates in Utrecht and Twente must also take account of issues of land availability and changes in the land market. As will become clear in the following section the release of former marke land – much of it poor quality heath- and moorland – on to the market had a major influence on the availability of land for estate development.

Figure 6.7: The Hakenberg estate near Oldenzaal.

So far, the distribution pattern has been explained through essentially traditional morphological methods which are particularly characteristic of Dutch historical geography. Attention has been paid to the physical characteristics of estate site, such as relief, and to their location in relation to major urban centres. The potential for change in locational considerations over time as a result of improvements in transportation has also been acknowledged. The approach thus parallels the work of several other Dutch scholars working on the geography of estates, for instance Van Groningen (1999) and Blijdenstijn (2005). The present case study broadly confirms their conclusions that the distribution pattern of estates reflected owners’ needs to stay close to the cities in which their main business activities were located, prevailing systems of transport and communications, and the nature of the physical landscape. It is apparent, however, that such factors do not offer a full and adequate explanation of the pattern observed here. It is therefore necessary to take account of other
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factors, these include the nature of the land market, land laws and in some instances the family and social networks which influenced the choice of estate location.

**Land availability and privatisation of common land**

As already noted the growing scarcity of land in the vicinity of major cities had a progressive influence upon the location of estates developed in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But other aspects of the land market also influenced people’s choices of location for estate development. Chapters 2 and 4 already acknowledged the major changes in the Dutch land market during the nineteenth century that were caused by new land laws and the partition and privatisation of communal land, formerly held by communal organisations variously entitled *marken* or *meenten*. In respect to land availability the noted differences between the two regions are of great significance.

In Twente, land coming out of the dissolution of a *marke* was initially distributed amongst the members of the *marke* in proportion to their other land holdings within the local area. Thus it was often chiefly the established nobility who were the major beneficiaries of the transfer of land from communal to private ownership. This was particularly evident in western Twente where the existing landed nobility dominated the land market; in Delden, for example, the owners of the Twickel estate received approximately 1900 hectares through various *marken* divisions between 1842 and 1854 (Archive Twickel, document 2458). The effect was to reinforce the already substantial hold of established great landowners upon the local land market, diminishing still further the scope for new estate development. By comparison, in the east of the region, wastelands were divided amongst a much larger number of *marken* members. However, here most smaller owners sold off their newly acquired land quickly and cheaply because they were unable to make considerable investments of effort, time and money to cultivate the poor soils. Around the towns of Enschede, Hengelo and Oldenzaal, in particular, the buyers were predominantly drawn from the industrial *nouveaux riches*. The Enschede industrialist Gerrit Jan van Heek, who bought some 450 hectares of heath land in the municipality of Haaksbergen through an auction of communal lands in 1895, was typical of this new class of landowner (Cadastral ledgers of Haaksbergen). The case study of the Blijdenstein family at the end of this chapter gives more detailed insight into the process of land accumulation resulting from the division of *marke* lands.

The situation in Utrecht was more complicated as ownership of wastelands was divided between the *meenten*, municipalities, individual great landowners, and the States of Utrecht. Here, in contrast to Twente, the 1809/10 law for division of communal lands ensured that several individuals invested in the purchase of heath lands on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug to establish new areas of forestry, including Albert Voomergh, Petrus Jacobus van Oosthuysen,
Johannes Bernardus Stoop, Willem Hendrik de Beaufort and Frans Nicolaas van Bern. In 1832 all these individuals owned over 200 hectares of land on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, incorporating large tracks of pine forest (Cadastral ledgers Zeist, De Bilt, Soest, Woudenberg, Driebergen and Leusden). According to Dekker (1997, p. 14) such activities ensured that the forest area in the province of Utrecht extended from 80 square kilometres in 1810 to 130 square kilometres twenty years later. Also in later years heath lands were purchased from the States of Utrecht. For example, in 1836 H.J. van Bennekom, major of Doorn, purchased 36 hectares of heath land in the westernmost part of his municipality to create himself an estate: Zonneheuvel (Demoed, 1997, p. 12). However, in some parts of Utrecht the heath lands were the property of a meente, for instance in Leusden, and in these cases the division of land was delayed until the end of the nineteenth century. Here the outcome was the creation of new estates, for example Schutterhoef and Leusderend (Renes, 1998, p. 44, 56, 77).

The overall availability of land for new estates was thus greatly influenced by the distribution of this former common land. Much was located on the dry, sandy soils of the ice-pushed ridges and, in comparison with the existing estate land, it was often very cheap to buy. This seems to have been a critical factor in accounting for the concentration of new estate development in such areas, over and above the influence alluded to above of the potential landscape value of the land. Without this fundamental change in the basis of landownership caused by the release of common land on to the market, most aspiring estate owners would have had to content themselves with piece-meal land accumulation.

One further issue relating to land availability should also be noted, namely the release of land on to the market caused by the sale of smaller blocks of land resulting from the division of large established landed estates. From 1818 onwards, for example, the public sale of Slot Zeist and Beek en Royen caused the steady release of land on to the market at Zeist (Blijdenstijn & Olde Meierink, 1990, p. 94-95). Coinciding with improvements to the road from Utrecht to Zeist, this process resulted in the building of many new, but individually smaller estates. These included Hoog Beek en Royen (1825), Sparrenheuvel (1818), Molenbosch (1835) and De Breul (1824). In 1850-1855 Hoog Beek en Royen was further divided by its owner Albert Voombergh to create an estate as a wedding present for his daughter and her husband M.C.H. Pauw van Wieldrecht esquire. The newly weds named it Pavia (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 202-203). Such a division of large estates into smaller ones was not, however, typical for the region.

Social network
The choice of a particular location for a new estate sometimes also reflected personal reasons in cases where individuals wanted to be close to family and friends. Given their strong social
ties it is unsurprising that such motives were clearly apparent amongst the industrial families of Twente. The great importance of the extended family showed in both the business and social aspects of daily life. Visits between family members were regular, often taking place on a set day every week (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 125-128). Hence, where possible, family members preferred to live close to each other. Personal preferences for a particular location thus become embedded in a wider social concept of family ties.

A good example of this is Willem Benjamin Blijdenstein, who managed the headquarters of the Twentsche Bank in Amsterdam. Initially he and his wife Alida van Heek sought to buy an existing estate near Hilversum, which would have been close to their city house and business in Amsterdam. Furthermore, Willem’s parents owned an estate in Hilversum. However, their attempts were unsuccessful and thus they bought approximately 50 hectares of waste lands on the Heuvelrug (Figure 6.8). This consisted of woods, heath land and a forester’s cottage. The choice of the location near Maarn was influenced by the fact that Willem’s grandfather owned land close by (ex. inf. Van Notten, 2003; Estate Archive Huis te Maarn). Thus the Blijdenstein’s choice for the location of their country retreat certainly reflected the wish to be close to their family.

**Figures 6.8: Huis te Maarn estate in the 1920s, with the newly built country house.**
Source: Estate Archive Huis te Maarn. With kind permission of Jim van Notten.

Whether this was also the case for other families is less clear as little direct evidence can be located amongst the surviving archival material. However, mapping of the location of estates held by particular extended families is suggestive (Figure 6.9). The estates of the Geldermans in particular seem to have been clustered together, all to the east of Oldenzaal. The estates of
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the Van Heeks and Ter Kuiles were also generally situated in close proximity to each other. The properties of Blijdensteins are more dispersed, reflecting the late date of establishment of the estates near Oldenzaal: Hakenberg in 1912, Nijehuss in 1913, Snippert in 1932, and Bekspring in 1937. Issues of land availability probably forced the family members to look further away from Enschede where their main estate and business were.

![Figure 6.9: The estates of the Van Heek, Blijdenstein, Ter Kuile and Gelderman families in Twente](image)

Figure 6.9: The estates of the Van Heek, Blijdenstein, Ter Kuile and Gelderman families in Twente


The Van Heeks in particular form an interesting case study. In the 1820s the Van Heek family started investing in land. Specifically, Helmich van Heek (1785-1847) bought the medieval manor of Hof te Boekelo, and his sister Johanna Berendina van Heek (1782-1863) purchased the farmstead of Het Stroot near Enschede. At Het Stroot a small country house was built, which forms the core of the current house (Overijssels Particulier Grondbezit, 1999, p. 9). After Johanna’s death in 1863 her heirs auctioned off the estate, which was then bought by Johanna’s cousin Gerrit Jan van Heek (1837-1915) and his wife Julia Blijdenstein (1836-1867).

Together with his brothers Hendrik Jan (1815-1872) and Herman (1816-1882), Gerrit Jan had founded the textile firm of Van Heek & Co in 1859. All three became great landowners around Enschede and created estates that remained in each brother’s branch of the family. For
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Gerrit Jan’s branch Het Stroot remained the main estate, from which later landholdings were established by some of his children (five from Julia and eight from his second wife Christine Meier; Based on genealogy data from Van Heek, 1996, and interview with A. van Heek, 2003):

1. Marie (1862-1923) x Ysaac van Delden
2. Jan Bernard (1863-1923) x Edwina Burr Ewing
3. Henny (1864-1930) x Jet ter Kuile
4. Julia (1865-1929) x Jan van Delden
5. Helmig (1865-1929) x Margaretha Jannink
6. Ludwig (1871-1930) x Catharina van Heek
7. Alida (1872-1937) x Willem Blijdenstein
8. Jan Herman (1872-1937) x Annetje van Wulften Palthé
9. Tini (1875-1968) x Gerhard Jannink
10. Bertha (1876-1960) x Jan Jordaan
11. Gus (1878-1944) x Hermann Jungé
12. Gerrit Jan (1880-1958) x Jacoba ter Horst
13. Arnold (1882-1972) x Welmoet van Hoorn

The estates established by this branch of the Van Heek family in Twente are shown in Figure 6.10. It is striking that the children either resided on existing family holdings (Roessingsbleek and Kotten) or created new estates (e.g. Zonnebeek, De Weele and Strootman) within a 6
kilometre radius of the parental house. The only exception is the son Gerrit Jan who purchased large tracts of land in the municipality of Haaksbergen to the south. Here he created the estates of Stepelerveld and Lankheet. The patterns as presented here are complicated by the transfer of established estates between the generations – Gerrit Jan’s youngest son Arnold, for example, inherited the parental estate of Het Stroot and the Hof te Boekelo estate – and by intermarriage within the industrial families (see previous chapter). Thus Tini (Catharina) married Gerhard Jannink and together created Het Stokhorst estate (1912-16) north of Enschede. Most daughters, however, moved outside the region, for instance to Germany (Marie, Julia and Gus) or other parts of the Netherlands (Alida to Huis te Maarn in Utrecht). However, as seen above in connection with Huis te Maarn, contact with their relatives remained vital.

In part the clustering of estates referred to here might also have reflected a common need to remain close to the main urban centres in which family members maintained their shared business interests. But it seems likely that the business and social dimensions of interaction within families were mutually reinforcing and are thus both relevant in the study of estate locations.

It seems clear, therefore, that factors relating to major changes in the nineteenth-century land market and to the social networks of industrialists must be added to previous accounts of the influences upon estate location. The location of an estate therefore reflected the means and personal requirements of individual owners, within the wider context of opportunities and constraints created by the physical landscape and society. We have looked at these as constraints and choices. A major stimulus for new estate building was provided by the availability of cheap land that had previously been in communal ownership.

The incorporation of large areas of land into existing estates was commonly a constraint upon the scope for new estate developments. In some cases, however, such estates were purchased in their entirety from impoverished noble owners by members of the *nouveaux riches*. This points to the need to consider the various different ways in which land for the establishment of new estates was acquired.

**6.2 THE PROCESS OF CREATING AN ESTATE**

The manner in which an estate was created reflected the owners’ motivations, their financial means and the character of the land market. Chapter 5 noted that some *nouveaux riches* still believed that the acquisition of an established noble estate would gain them respect and acceptance from the landed nobility. Other families seem not to have sought such social advancement, although status within their own group often remained important. Many
nouveaux riches did not, however, simply acquire an entire estate in a single purchase, but built up their landholdings piece by piece. They thus moved through a series of stages in creating their own new estate, often starting with the purchase of wasteland on which they established some form of temporary structure, before investing in more substantial buildings and the creation of a landscaped park and garden.

In his study of the estates of Twente industrialists Olde Meierink (1984) set out a typology of use which reflected the length of time spent at the landed properties. He thus distinguished between non-permanent use (chiefly day recreation); semi-permanent use (typically involving an annual residency of less than three months, frequently during the summer); and permanent residence. This distinction in terms of use type should be related to a parallel typology which aims to distinguish between the various different routes followed in the acquisition of land to create a new estate. It is proposed here that five main routes can be distinguished from the evidence for Twente and Utrecht:

1. The purchase of an existing estate followed by its renovation or restyling;
2. The purchase of land and the construction of a temporary building (tea house, hunting lodge), subsequently leading to its replacement with a larger and more permanent country house;
3. The purchase of land and the immediate construction of a substantial and permanent country house;
4. The transformation of a landed property initially acquired for industrial use into a recreational retreat.
5. The subdivision of an existing estate into smaller units, often to accommodate the next generation of the family – each new unit being established as an estate with its own country house.

1. Purchasing an existing estate

It seems to have been a popular option for the nouveaux riches to acquire an existing estate. In addition to the status that might be gained in this way, such purchases were also a means to obtain land in a prime location and to avoid what could be a long drawn out process of piecemeal land accumulation. In Utrecht approximately 35 noble estates were purchased by newly wealthy, for example Drakestein (Figure 6.11), Drakenburg and Amelisweerd by the Bosch van Drakestein family in respectively 1806, 1860 and 1811; the purchase of Ewijkshoeve by the Gildemeester family in 1827, and the purchase of Den Treek in 1807 and Molenstein in 1821 by the De Beaufort family (Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912, Volume II, pp. 20-87). Thus, in 1807 Willem Hendrik de Beaufort (1775-1829) purchased the eighteenth-century Treek estate. He subsequently built a new house and greatly extended the
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Estate grounds. In this way he became the greatest landowner in the municipality of Leusden (Renes, 1998, p. 52).

Figure 6.11: The Drakestein estate near Baarn.
Source: RDMZ, Zeist. No. 2247

Estates created prior to 1800 were not the only properties to be traded, some early nineteenth-century retreats also changed hands and underwent great changes in architectural styles. The Ma Retraite estate of 1805, for example, was purchased by J.H. van Marwijk Kooij in 1896, after the small country house previously on the site had been demolished to make room for a road extension. He immediately had a new Italianate house built, surrounded by a landscape park (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 146). Overall, of the 97 nouveaux riches estates in Utrecht at least 24 properties are known to have been sold off at least once during the research period.

By comparison, it appears that the purchase of an existing estate was less common in nineteenth-century Twente than was the case in Utrecht: approximately 18 of such transactions have been recorded for Twente. Nevertheless, the process was evident at the noble estates Singraven, Harseveld and Noorddeurningen (bought by Roessingh Udink in respectively 1829, 1838 and 1856), Heeckeren (Bosch van Drakestein in 1841), Bellinkhof (Ten Cate in 1925), Hof te Boekelo (Van Heek in 1820s) and De Hulst (Geldermaen in 1898). Close to Oldenzaal, the Gelderman family bought an eighteenth-century estate from the Kistemaker family in 1898, and created the recreational estates of De Hulst and Scholtenhaer for the brothers Joan and Philippus Johannes (Cadastral ledger Oldenzaal, Kadaster
Overijssel). The site of De Hulst was redeveloped in 1916 with the construction of a country house designed by the Amsterdam architect Karel Muller (Figure 6.12), while his friend Leonard Springer added a garden in the fashionable mixed style, incorporating elements of the older formal garden (Moes, 2002, p. 87). This process of estate purchasing thus helps to account for the previous observation that not all estate development in the later-nineteenth or early-twentieth centuries was on the outer margins of the urban hinterland.

Figure 6.12: De Hulst estate near Oldenzaal
Photographed by author, October 2003.

2. The purchase of land and the construction of a temporary building
The second process of estate building was most evident in Twente. Initially more than half of the retreats consisted of modest houses for weekend visits, farms with a gentleman’s chamber or teahouses and garden pavilions for daytime recreational use only (Figures 6.13 A-C). Previously it was mentioned that due to the availability of land, the Blijdenstein family of Enschede were forced to look further afield, to the ice-pushed ridges to the east of Oldenzaal. At the end of the nineteenth century they purchased several acres of land (at a height of 55 metres) on which they built a small tea house in 1903: Hakenberg (Goïnga, 1999, p. 134). Nine years later the family employed Pieter Wattez to design the gardens, yet a country house was not built until 1927. By that time the family had extended their property to 66 hectares (Jansen, forthcoming, p. 43). Other examples of this process of estate building are Beernink (1893), Boerskotten (1860; mansion in 1927), Bonenkamp (1919; later absorbed by Hooge Boekel estate), Tankenberg (1840; in 1909 absorbed by Egheria estate) and Oldenzaalsche Veen (1897; mansion in 1957) (Keiser, 1967; cd-roms Het Oversticht; Cadastral ledgers Losser, Lonneker and Enschede). The existing garden pavilions were thus replaced at a later stage by new country houses.
In other cases, the families had built or converted farms into a modest country house for the weekends. The families seem often to have looked forward to their retreat to the countryside. In his memoirs Jan Herman van Heek (1945, quoted by Loonstra & Enklaar, 1999, p.11) recalls that in his youth he and his family spend three months during the summer at Het Stroot estate near Enschede: ‘Then the whole family moved there at the beginning of June. For all of us it was a joyous occasion’. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, it became increasingly common for families to invest in the creation of more substantial country houses, often surrounded by gardens and parkland laid out to a fashionable design, on which they would spend their summers away from the hectic world of the cities. Eventually, many adopted their country seat as a principal residence, retaining their town houses for business purposes.

![Figures 6.13 A, B and C: Examples of garden pavilions and tea houses in Twente: hunting society Enschede, Oldenzaalse Veen and Bonenkamp/ Hooge Boekel. Source: Het Oversticht. With kind permission.](image)

Simple structures such as teahouses, garden pavilions and hunting lodges resembled the small temples and folly-like buildings on many older country estates. The difference was that initially the teahouses of the industrialists were the main building on the estate, rather than being an ancillary element within a more developed scheme of landownership, as was the case on many older estates. This modest beginning perhaps reflected the limitations of some industrialists’ means, which did not allow the establishment of a great estate with a large country house in the earlier years of their business careers. Another possible explanation is that this process was more a product of the limited availability of land so that individuals had to buy up what small plots they could as it became available. Unfortunately, the cadastral ledgers proved to be rather complicated to follow this process through time for specific estates, as the ledgers offered overviews of the entire holdings of landowners. It is clear, however, that in Twente many new landowners progressed by phases, but that even when their estates were not particularly large at the outset, this initial investment still reflected their desire to have a place in the countryside where they could take their leisure. When a permanent country house was built on the site of the pavilion, the latter was usually removed to another part of the estate, as has become clear from studying the cadastral ledgers.
Examples of estate building by stages are rarer in Utrecht, only five instances can be found: Huis te Maarn (1906), Lindenhorst (1863), Molenbosch (1835), Berghuisje (1837) and Beerschoten-Willinkshof (1850). The first in this list was initiated in 1906 when the Blijdenstein-Van Heek family bought 46 hectares of land on which they built a tea-house (Figure 6.14) in a landscape park created by Pieter Wattez – the design of the latter will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7. Eight years later, in 1914, the tea-house was moved to another part of the estate, and a large country house was built in its former location (Figure 6.8). In 1921 the family made this new house their permanent residence, by which time the estate had been extended to approximately 155 hectares (Estate Archive Huis te Maarn, estate history by Van Notten-Blijdenstein, 1983). Given the association of this staged model of estate building with Twente it may be significant that Huis te Maarn’s first owner was descended from the Blijdenstein family from Twente.

However, in this instance at least, the fact that the family could afford to employ a professional to design the landscape of their parkland suggests that money was not a major constraint upon estate development. It may have been the case, therefore, that the creation of the estate in phases was more a reflection of the different stages of Willem’s career and his attitude to landownership. Initially, whilst he remained closely involved in the urban business world, the estate was used only for short visits (Estate Archive Huis te Maarn, estate history by Van Notten-Blijdenstein, 1983). A large house was therefore unnecessary. The subsequent creation of the country house followed when Willem reached a stage in his career when the number and length of his country visits could increase. A further example of this type of estate building in Utrecht is the Molenbosch estate near Zeist. The owner, the Amsterdam banker J.B. Stoop, already owned another country house along the Utrechtseweg and consequently did not feel the need to build a mansion immediately after purchasing the land.
in 1837 (Rhoen, 2002, p. 184). Initially, he contented himself with the construction of an orangery and gardener’s cottage; a major house following only in 1850.

3. The purchase of land and the construction of a country house

If the phased development of property on an estate described above was important in Twente then in Utrecht it was more common for *nouveaux riches* to proceed with the immediate construction of a substantial country house on their newly established estates. Instances of this type of estate accounted for circa 64 of the 97 *nouveaux riches* estates, including Schoonoord, De Boom, ‘t Stort, Ter Wege, De Hooft, De Brink, Beeklust, Aardenburg, and Ruiterberg.

![Figure 6.15: The Ruiterberg estate near Doorn](image)

Source: Special Collections Wageningen, no. 01.2142.01

In some cases the gardens and parkland were laid out prior to the construction of the house, for example at Aardenburg, Molenbosch and Ruiterberg (Figure 6.15). At the Ruiterberg, the owner, the Amsterdam businessman J. Wilmink, first employed the garden designer Wattez in 1916-17 to create a park and garden and only subsequently hired the Utrecht architect J.C. Wentink in 1918-1919 to construct a mansion, coach house, hunting lodge with a hothouse, orangery and a farm (Van Lochem-Van der Wel, 2000, p. 163). The aesthetic layout of Molenbosch estate and how it was established will be discussed in Chapter 7.

In Twente this type of estate building was apparent at approximately eight estates: Hölterhof, Stroot, Walmink, IJzerhaar, Welna, Zonnebeek, Hooge Bockel and Egtheria.
4. **Transforming a landed property associated with industry into a recreational retreat.**

A further type of estate building was based on the redevelopment of property associated with an owner’s commercial or industrial enterprises. Land was initially acquired for industrial purposes, with a proprietor’s house on the site, adjacent to the industrial buildings. Subsequently, however, the functions of the estate changed with the removal of the industrial aspects and the establishment of a purely recreational retreat for the family. This was seen at the Zijdebalen estate near the city of Utrecht as early as the end of the seventeenth century, where the silk producer Van Mollem created one of the most extravagant geometric gardens in the country (De Jong, 1981, p. 2). In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries similar processes were seen in Twente where many industrialists initially purchased land to accommodate their industrial enterprises, particularly wool bleach- and dye-works (Olde Meierink, 1986, p. 64-65).

This process was evident at circa 15 country estates, including Schuttersveld, Amelink, Van Lochemsbleek, De Kolk, and Wageler. Initial construction thus focused on the creation of small premises for the supervision of these industrial operations, generally accompanied by a room for the owner. Business growth and, in some instances, technical innovations, led to the transfer of industrial operations to new factory sites closer to the city. Hence, waterways initially used for bleaching and dyeing often became ponds within an ornamental garden, whilst the early buildings formed the nucleus of a more stylish and substantial country retreat. Charles de Maere, for instance, extended the Schuttersveld estate to the west of his dye factory ‘Rigersbleek’ in Enschede in 1834-1835 to circa 10 hectares (Figure 6.16; Cadastral ledgers of Enschede and Lonneker).

![Figure 6.16: Schuttersveld estate near Enschede](Source: Het Oversticht)
Although this transition from industrial to residential and recreational use was most common in Twente, only two instances were evident in Utrecht. At the Sluishoef estate in the village of De Bilt, the Amsterdam industrialist Hendrik de Heus established a small factory (for cleaning coins) in 1824 and a modest country house where he lived (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 121). By 1832 De Heus moved his business to the city of Utrecht. Sixteen years later, his heirs sold Sluifhoef estate to the owners of the neighbouring Sandwijk estate, who incorporated the small landholding into their own property. Another example is the Jaffa estate along the Vleutensevaart to the east of the city of Utrecht. Here, Louis Smulders and his two sons started a machine factory in 1891 and built a large villa on the site (Wilmer, 1982, p. 9).

5. Estate subdivision and the construction of new properties

A final way of establishing newly independent units was the result of the subdivision of landed property already in family ownership. This was motivated by the desire to create smaller country retreats for secondary family members or for rental to others. This process was evident at five estates in Utrecht, for example amongst families who had entered the landowning elite around 1800. Thus after the death of Petrus J. van Oosthuyse van Rijsenburg (see Chapter 5) in 1819, his widow Margaretha de Jongh developed several estates in Driebergen, which she let to others. From 1818 to 1828 she created the Pietersberg estate (named after her deceased husband, later renamed Beukenstein when it passed into new ownership), which was rented out to D. Hooft, esquire (www.digipub.nl/monumenten/). The later creation of Bloemenoord (1833) was similarly rented out, as was Kraaijbeek (1845), which was subsequently purchased by its tenant, P.A. Diederichs (Van Groningen, 2003, p. 20). The implication of these examples is that maybe the widow needed a source of income after her husband died, but it is more likely that she thought this subdivision to be a good investment for making her landed property of over 1200 hectares (in 1832) even more profitable, thereby responding to the apparent need amongst the newly wealthy to own an estate (Cadastral ledgers of Driebergen and Zeist).

In other instances, however, it was the need to accommodate family members that prompted estate division and the construction of new houses. An example of this is provided by the Van Nellesteyn family in Leersum. Cornelis Jan van Nellesteyn had purchased the noble manor of Broekhuizen at the end of the eighteenth century and greatly extended the grounds. In 1815 he built a banqueting house, het Zwitserse Huis (Figure 8.2), on a hill on the north side of the estate (Christemeijer, 1837, p. 168). In 1824 Cornelis Jan built a country house on his lands for himself and his wife, as he was selling Broekhuizen to his oldest son. The new house was called Nieuw Broekhuizen. A year later he constructed a smaller summer house, named De Hoogstraat, which he rented out to wealthy citizens. Similarly at Hoog Beek en Royen the
Voombergh family separated part of the estate to establish the Pavia estate as a wedding present for his daughter, and on the 18th-century Sparrendaal estate in Driebergen another country house was built in the 1850s: Seminarie (Van Groningen, pp. 134-136, 202-203, 239-240). There are no recorded instances of any direct parallels to this process of estate division in Twente.

**Combining typologies in practice**

In practice the creation of an estate was a complicated process, and landowners often created new estates by various means. This is, for example, shown in the case of the De Beaufort family who – at the end of the nineteenth century – were among the greatest landowners in Utrecht, with properties on and around the Utrechtse Heuvelrug and along the river Rhine. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the family purchased the old manors of Oud-Broekhuisen, Maarsbergen and Doorn, and the eighteenth century estates Den Treek and Molenstein (Wittert van Hoogland, 1900-1912, Vol I p.474-489, Vol II p. 275-291, p. 315-328). Around Leusden a cluster of new country retreats were built for various family members: Schutterhoef (no. 27), Leusder End (no. 26) and De Boom (no. 28). As mentioned earlier, the first two were created on former common land owned by the municipality of Amersfoort and bought by the De Beauforts. By contrast De Boom was established by Arnoud Jan de Beaufort (1855-1929) in the 1880s (Renes, 1998, p. 56). The estate consisted of farms and blocks of land in the municipality of Leusden that Arnoud Jan had bought up piecemeal. The family’s estate building was thus varied; it included the purchase of an entire estate, the establishment of an estate on former wasteland and the creation of an estate from piecemeal purchases of farms and farmland. The establishment of a country estate was indeed more complicated than might seem initially.

Issues concerning the location, evolution and design of estates, and the complexities of transforming an estate will now be explored in more detail through a case study of the industrialist Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein (1780-1857).

**Case study: The Blijdenstein family**

The Blijdenstein family of Twente was one of the first industrial families to emerge in the region as substantial landowners. The family’s main estate was Het Amelink in the municipality of Lonneker, to the northeast of Enschede and near to the main road to Oldenzaal. During the lifetime of Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein (1780-1857) the estate was at its largest (approximately 75 hectares of a total ownership of circa 220 hectares), incorporating De Welle (purchased in 1830), Het Bouwhuis (purchased in 1844) and part of Het Welna (Van der Wyck & Enklaar-Lagendijk 1983, p. 91; Cadastral ledgers of Lonneker). The estate remained in family hands until 1971.
Figure 6.17: The landed property of B.W. Blijdenstein in Lonneker, 1832.
Source: Cadastral ledgers of Lonneker, 1832. Kadaster Overijssel, Zwolle.

Figure 6.18: The landed property of Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein in 1854 with its value per hectare.
Source: Cadastral ledgers of Lonneker, 1832 and onwards. Kadaster Overijssel, Zwolle.
In addition to Het Amelink the family owned land elsewhere in Twente, particularly in the adjacent municipality of Losser, but the present study will focus on their holdings in the nineteenth-century municipality of Lonneker. Figures 6.17 to 6.18 show the growth of Benjamin Willem’s landholding in Lonneker between 1832 and 1854. Cadastral ledgers of the municipality of Lonneker have been used to reconstruct the exact location, scale, use and land tax value of Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein’s landed property in 1832 (Figure 6.17). The map reflects the economic and social position of the family in the early-nineteenth century. At this date they were small industrialists with additional interests in farming. About half of the land area was devoted to arable cultivation, with small portions remaining as woods, coppice and heath land. The property also included a bleach works: a network of small rectangular canals were used for bleaching the cloth, which was then dried on the bankside. The main house was situated to the east of the bleach-works. In its immediate environs Blijdenstein created a naturalistic garden with ornamental ponds and a pavilion in the early-nineteenth century. Chapter 7 discusses the designed landscape of the estate in more detail.

In 1832 Blijdenstein’s Lonneker property extended over 27.5 hectares and was taxed at 610.57 guilders per year. In the years up to 1850 Benjamin Willem added to his holding by purchasing a series of farms (e.g. Bouwhuis and IJzerhaar), each including a house, with yard, arable and pasture land, orchards and hay meadows. These piecemeal extensions (i.e. 3.44 ha in 1835; 0.96 ha in 1842; 5.36 ha in 1845; 1.78 in 1847; 2 ha in 1848), all within a five-mile radius of the family’s seat, added gradually to the estate’s agricultural activity, but they were completely eclipsed by the major addition to Blijdenstein’s landholding between 1850 and 1852, which created an estate of around 206 hectares. This sudden expansion reflected the opportunities opened up by the privatisation of the communal marke lands in Lonneker. Some of the new land came to Blijdenstein directly as his share of the marke division; the remainder was purchased from other recipients. In total Benjamin Willem acquired around 160 hectares from the Lonneker Marke. In general this was relatively poor quality heath land, with an average value of 50 cents per hectare (Figure 6.18).

As Blijdenstein extended his property, he also changed its function. The industrial elements were erased or reused as aesthetic elements within a designed landscape, and the agricultural activities were moved to other parts of the estate. This example shows the complexities of estate building, which was not as simple a process as portrayed in the typology discussed above.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS
Attention to the geographical distribution of the landed estates created during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Twente and Utrecht reveals a concentration in the eastern parts of
these two regions. Areas of elevated relief associated with ice-pushed ridges proved especially popular locations. The explanation here offered for this popularity goes beyond the emphasis in previous studies on the physical characteristics of the land and landscape, and its location relative to urban centres. It is also clear that changes in the land market – particularly the division and sale of former common land – and the social networks of estate owners also had an influence upon estate location.

As said, in both areas the ice-pushed ridges proved to be most popular for estate building in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, some differences have been observed. An important factor was the availability of land. In Twente this was largely linked to the division of wastelands during the course of the nineteenth century. In Utrecht, however, the ownership of wastelands on the Heuvelrug were regulated slightly differently. Since the early Middle Ages all wastelands in Utrecht were regarded as demesne lands of successive bishops of Utrecht. In the sixteenth century these lands first became crown lands, the property of the Habsburg Emperor Charles V, and later – after the Reformation of religion in 1588 – became state property. This meant that some wastelands on the Heuvelrug were already sold in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Subsequently the law of 1809/10 to encourage the division and sale of communal land had a greater impact in Utrecht than in Twente, and on average the communal wastelands in Utrecht were partitioned at an early stage. An exception was the meente of Leusden. Its division in the 1880s resulted in the creation of new estates, for example Schutterhoef and Leusderend.

It has furthermore been revealed that aspects of family and social links played a role in determining the location for an estate. This was particularly true for the industrialist families in Twente, but was also evident in Utrecht, although the family in question (the Blijdensteins of Huis te Maarn) actually originated from Twente. It shows, once more, the importance of investigating the social backgrounds of the new landowners for potential explanatory factors in estate building.

Diversity in factors influencing estate location was matched by differences in the way in which estates had been created. A five-fold typology of estate building is advanced here which incorporates both instances where estates were developed from land acquired piecemeal and where only a single substantial purchase was made. Other forms of transitional development, including the transformation of an essentially industrial property into one designed for residential and recreational use, are also acknowledged. The Blijdenstein family case study provides some insights into the complexity and diversity of estate development, involving both estate extension through a series of land purchases and the conversion of land from industrial to recreational use.
This diversity in locational characteristics and the manner in which land was acquired also has implications for the study of the use made of estate land and its implications for the appearance and design of the landscape. Chapters 7 and 8 thus shift the focus more explicitly to the aesthetics of estate landscapes. Attention will be paid to landscape taste and designs, exploring the ways in which developments on particular estates reflect the character of individual sites and that of their owners, as well as national and international trends in garden and estate design.
Chapter 7.

The Aesthetics of Estate Landscapes

INTRODUCTION

Why did so many newly enriched families choose to invest part of their fortunes in the acquisition of land and what did they do with their property? Previous chapters have shown that land was seen as a safe investment. Forestry, agriculture, industry, and substantial rental income from a country house were an asset to the financial position of many individuals. Parallel to these economic motivations for land investment, a variety of personal reasons existed. The noisy and dirty towns were left behind for the quiet, beautiful countryside; sometimes as a reflection of a strong social attachment to the region. The possession of a country estate had furthermore become a trend, a necessity even for those who wished to increase their social status. To truly be part of the landed elite required that the new owners invested substantially in the aesthetics of the estate where they would entertain guests and relax and enjoy in their free time. Hence, parks and gardens, arboretums and hunting grounds were created.

Garden fashions largely influenced the landscape of new and existing estates. The impact of new trends on gardens at newly created estates is explored in detail in section 7.1, revealing the character of the created aesthetic landscape. New ideas in garden architecture were diffused through various channels, inspiring owners, garden designers and nurserymen. Leading designers obviously had a great effect on this, as has been stressed by many scholars. However, parallel to this new ideas were also based on local circumstances, i.e. the character of the estate (physical landscape, size, etc) and the status and financial abilities of the owner. The latter part of the chapter explores the diffusion of new ideas in garden design, and investigates how the diffusion of new ideas in garden design have been influenced by landowners, in terms of their taste and knowledge of new ideas, and in terms of their social network. This particular approach to garden fashions reveals the complex nature of adapting new ideas, showing the influence of landowners as individuals and as a group. This chapter will investigate the potential implications of the choice of particular designers and styles as a measure of the landowners’ status and ability to spend, but also as a reflection of the ‘message’ they were attempting to convey through their gardens.

7.1 PARKS AND GARDENS: ADAPTING NEW FASHIONS

A common characteristic of country estates is the presence of a park and garden, in fact it defines a landed property as an estate instead of a farm or villa (Olde Meierink, 1984; Federatie Particulier Grondbezit, 1996). The especially created gentleman’s pleasure grounds expressed the owner’s knowledge of garden fashions.
Chapter 2 showed that by 1800 garden fashions in the Netherlands were largely dominated by the so-called landscape style. Contrasting with the rigid geometries of the formal French style that previously had been in fashion, the landscape style was characterised by irregularity and a love for nature. The popularity of the style lasted for over a century, defining the landscape of many Dutch estates. Three kinds of landscape style have been recognized by Dutch landscape historians: early (1760-1820), romantic or full (1820-1870), and late (1870-1900) (Albers, 1998, p. 12; Van Groningen, 1999, p. 243). Around 1900 the landscape style was challenged by a new interest in geometry that resulted in the mixed garden style and eventually also in the architectonic style.

Case studies of extant gardens help to demonstrate the wider changes in design fashions and what aesthetic choices were made by the new landed elite in practice on individual estates. They furthermore help to illustrate the particular working method of leading designers. Appendix IV gives an overview of all gardens by professional designers in the study areas (also see Appendix V for a chronological history of the main designers). Information on the gardens and parks has been found through the cadastral ledgers, sale advertisements, design plans, contemporary drawings, fieldwork, interviews with current landowners or estate managers, and literature. For both study areas three case studies were selected. In Utrecht the gardens at Molenbosch, Huis te Maarn and Hooge Vuursche will be discussed, and in Twente the gardens at Het Amelink, Egheria and De Boekel. My reasons for choosing these particular estates as case studies are as follows.

Understanding of the different kinds of landscape style has been enhanced through the exploration of the gardens at Molenbosch and Het Amelink. Molenbosch was created for an Amsterdam businessman around the middle of the nineteenth century; its parks and gardens were laid out by J.D. Zocher jr. in the romantic style and have been little altered since his commission. Het Amelink was created at the start of the research period, and stayed within the ownership of the same family for over a decade. The succeeding owners added to the character of the gardens through their own gardening and the employment of various designers. Knowledge of the so-called mixed style has been gathered from studying the gardens at Huis te Maarn and Egheria, respectively designed by Pieter Wattez in 1906 and Leonard Springer in 1911. Huis te Maarn was created for the same family that owned Het Amelink, the Blijdensteins. Egheria estate near Oldenzaal was the property of an industrialist family from Almelo. Finally, attention was paid to the architectonic style of the early twentieth century which was evident at the gardens of De Hooge Vuursche and De Boekel. De Hooge Vuursche was designed for the navy officer Den Bosch by Dirk Tersteeg at the same time that Springer created Egheria. The small garden at De Boekel was of a later date, made by the Belgian designer Louis van der Swaelmen during World War II.
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The discussion of case studies thus investigates the development of garden fashions in practice, revealing how the environment, date of creation, choice for designer and the character of estate owners had implications for the garden laid out. Furthermore, for the sake of comparison, the discussion of these case studies is followed up with a reflection upon noble estates through the exploration of a specific garden, namely Weldam near Delden. This estate was owned by members of the national nobility, who drastically altered the aesthetic layout of their landed property in the 1880s.

CASE STUDY: HET AMELINK, Lonneker/ Enschede
Chapter 6 already discussed Het Amelink estate in terms of size, ownership and land accumulation. Due to the early landscaping and the many alterations of the gardens it furthermore forms a good case study for discussing garden fashions through time. The estate tenant book of Het Amelink shows that in 1800 there was a garden pavilion and two small irregular ponds (HCO, 233.1, no. 245). Although still modest the garden can be seen as the first landscape garden at the estate of a Twente industrialist. Between 1800 and 1808 the Blijdensteins planted over 3,000 trees on the estate, including silver pine (HCO, 233.1, no. 456). In 1809 the designer G.A. Blom (1765-1827) was probably employed to design the garden, but the estate records are unclear herein (Olde Meierink, 1984, p. 58).

Figure 7.1: Aerial photo of Het Amelink estate, 2005. Photographed by Paul Paris. With kind permission.
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The records do show, however, that the owner Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein (1780-1857) was responsible for laying out most of the garden. In the 1820s he created a flower garden with grape vines, planted various deciduous and evergreen trees near the house and created ‘an avenue from the fountain to the [road] Oldenzaalsche Dijk’, and in the 1830s he furthermore created an acacia wood near the bleach-works and planted oak and pine trees across the estate (HCO, 233.1, no. 58 & 456). In a letter to their daughter, Benjamin’s wife Catharine wrote in 1842 that ‘we have built a hothouse full of flowers’ and ‘your father is still busy planting along the main road where one walks on a meandering path’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 108). The family’s personal papers also include a copy of a short poem which is suggestive of this interest in landscape design: ‘Go, planters, make a mountain, a wood, or merry valley. Your diligence is for a generation that is still to come’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 58). Such sentiments indicate not only a sense of the immediate pleasure to be gained from creating an aesthetically appealing landscape, but also a dynastic interest in the development of the estate for the future. It is this sentiment that greatly determined the landscaping of Het Amelink throughout the research period.

After Benjamin Willem’s death in 1857 the estate passed to his son Albert Jan (1829-1896), who extended the property. In the 1880s the garden designer Dirk Wattez (1833-1906) most likely made a design for Het Amelink (Olde Meierink, 1984, p. 58). Comparing the cadastral maps from 1832 with topographic maps from 1880 help to identify the garden layout at that time. It appears that the ponds were enlarged, and that a meandering path was created along the ponds, passing through woodland and crossing a lawn. Family letters reveal that in the ponds swam carp, pike and bass (HCO, 233.1, no. 108).

In 1912 Albert Jan’s son, Helmich Benjamin Blijdenstein (1869-1919), wrote to the firm H. Copijn & Son that ‘I have recently become the owner of the country estate ‘Het Amelink’ in Lonneker and it appears to me that due to the growth of various conifers, trees and shrubs, alteration of the lay-out is necessary […] as you know various tree species in beautiful specimens are present at Het Amelink, and the grouping as well as the shading of colours has many times been praised’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 152). Copijn constructed hothouses for flowers and the cultivation of peaches and grapes and replanted several large deciduous trees (HCO, 233.1, no. 251). Olde Meierink (1984, p. 58) mentions other alterations to the park and the ponds, but was unsure whether these were by Copijn or Hugo A.C. Poortman (1858-1953) who worked on the estate in 1928. However, from documents relating the exploitation of the fish ponds in 1916 we must attribute them to Copijn (HCO, 233.1, no. 250). In a newly created parkland to the west of the mansion Copijn had dug out a third pond. The pond was connected to the other ponds via small waterways. In the smallest pond artificial rockeries and waterfalls had been created, elements of the late landscape style that remained popular into the twentieth century.
(see section 7.2). Further alterations made in 1928 by Poortman probably included the creation of vistas.

From the early 1800s until the 1920s the aesthetic landscape at Het Amelink estate was extended and increasingly developed as a landscape park. Alterations by the owners themselves and professional designers employed were focused on creating an ‘exceptionally beautiful estate, with tremendous woodlands, [and] reflecting ponds amidst high clusters of trees ... the love for nature is evident in the layout that is marked by a great diversity in evergreens and deciduous trees’ (a local newspaper cited by Olde Meierink, 1984, p. 58). New additions, following the extension of the estate, and alterations therefore strengthened the character of the estate as a landscape park, without giving into new fashions that would have diminished the harmony of the park. It showed the owners’ understanding of gardening and their awareness of creating an estate for the future.

CASE STUDY: MOLENBOSCH, Zeist
The Amsterdam banker Johannes Bernardus Stoop (1781-1856) created two estates on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug: Berghuisje (1831) and Molenbosch (1837). For both estates he commissioned Jan David Zocher jr. (1791-181870) to design a park in a romantic style. Moes (1991, p. 121) gives the impression that Stoop owned an extensive estate, including the mansion Molenbosch with gardener’s shed in Zeist and a hunting lodge and pavilion on top of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug. This is incorrect. The latter two buildings were part of Berghuisje estate, and Stoop thus owned two separate estates of relatively modest size.

As the location of Berghuisje on top of the ice-pushed ridges proved to be less than ideal, Stoop purchased 17 hectares of woodland (mostly pine) along the main road in Zeist in 1835, land that previously had been unavailable to him. Although a mansion was not built on this property until 1850, a park with gardener’s house was present in 1837 (Rhoen, 2002, p. 182-186). A drawing by P.J. Lutgers (Figure 7.2), who described many country houses in the province of Utrecht in 1869, and topographic maps of the 1880s show the layout of the park. A large curving pond was dug out, the soil used to raise nearby grounds. On one of these artificial hills the mansion was later built (Figure 7.2). This way of estate building, i.e. designing a parkland before the construction of a house, could therefore also mean that the owner wished to observe the best location for his mansion within this designed landscape. Hence, this example illustrates the influence of landscape design on the process of creating an estate, as discussed in the previous chapter.

Lawns stretched out at the front and back of the house. Shrubs, evergreens and deciduous trees were planted in clumps on these lawns with close to the house several solitary trees such as a
Japanese nut tree, a sequoia and a tulip tree. Across the estate various walks were created through mixed woodland (including some pine trees of the former woodland here). In the northern part of the property lies a large walled vegetable garden and a vegetable cellar in an artificial hill (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 293).

Figure 7.2: The Molenbosch estate in Zeist, 1869.
Source: Lutgers, 1869.

In 1869 Lutgers wrote that ‘Molenbosch […] owes its beautiful lay-out to the talent of Zocher’. The lay-out at Molenbosch was representative of most Zocher designs, including Schoonoord (Zeist, 1820), Hoog Beek en Royen (1824), De Breul (1824), Sparrenheuvel (1825), Heerewegen (1848) and Wildbaan (1857). Stoop not only hired Zocher for laying out the aesthetic landscape, but also for designing the mansion in 1849-1850 and a coach house in 1854-1855 (Moes, 1991, p. 54; Rhoen, 2002, p. 184). No other designers have worked at Molenbosch. Later owners constructed several follies in the park, for example in 1898 an ornamented chicken house was added and in 1989 a small wooden chapel was built after a design from G. van Laar’s *Magazijn van tuinsieraaden* (Repository of garden ornaments, 1802; see next section) (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 269; Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 176).

In the twentieth century a large apartment building was constructed in the northern part of the estate, which has greatly affected the layout. Nevertheless, Molenbosch still has many characteristics of a romantic landscape park. Such parks greatly mark the *nouveaux riches* estates along the major road in Driebergen and Zeist. All these estates were easily seen from the
road, and it seems that showing off one’s property was the norm. The example of Molenbosch thus contrasted with Het Amelink. Whereas the first can be seen as a depiction of what was fashionable at one specific moment in time, the latter showed the evolution of a landscape park over a period of 120 years.

**CASE STUDY: HUIS TE MAARN, Maarn**

In previous chapters Huis te Maarn has already been mentioned in terms of ownership, social network and the manner in which the estate was created. Reference was made to the gardens laid out by Pieter Wattez in 1906-1907 for the Blijdenstein family.

Van Groningen (1999, p. 324-331) described Wattez’s design for Huis te Maarn, as well as that for neighbouring Ruiterberg estate (1916-17), as architectonic. Whereas this is true for the Ruiterberg, Huis te Maarn was distinctively laid out in the mixed garden style. This style was largely based on the work of French garden designer Eduard André and English garden designers such as Humphrey Repton and J.C. Loudon, as was previously discussed in Chapter 2. It erased the abrupt transition from the park to the house (in the landscape style located in a smooth lawn) by creating geometric flower gardens and parterres near the house.

![Figure 7.3: Huis te Maarn estate in the 1920s. (North is on the left)](image)

Source: Estate Archive Huis te Maarn. With kind permission of J. van Notten
Symmetry lay at the base of the design for Huis te Maarn, which was shaped like a drop (Figure 7.3). This drop-shaped figure can be seen as a heritage of the late landscape style although in such gardens a variety of such shapes were created. To the northeast of the house Wattez laid out a geometric terraced garden with benches, vases and hedges in an extensive lawn (Figure 7.4). The avenues and paths were laid out in white gravel.

Trees and plants played an important role in the design (Figures 7.3 and 7.4). Along the avenues that surrounded the lawn, up to the point where they meet a curving path across the lawn, and along this path so-called ‘little soldiers’ (taxus topiary) were planted. At the junction of the avenues and the smaller paths stood symmetrical groups of trees and bushes. Furthermore, on both sides of the terraced garden a red beech tree was planted. Clusters of trees, including blue cedars, on the lawn were added to enhance the vistas cut in the heath, offering views over the Utrechtse Heuvelrug towards the village of Maarn. From the house a few beech lanes cut into the pine forest to the south and were crossed by a lane of red beech trees. Avenues marked by beech trees furthermore surrounded the northern part of the lawn. This distinctive use of trees and the creation of vistas is another legacy from the landscape style, which was beautifully blended in with geometric features. This example thus illustrates the character of the mixed garden style at relatively small estates, which was rather different than at noble estates (see case study of Weldam).
To the southwest of the gardens Wattez created a tennis court, a common sight at estates of that period (see also case study of De Boekel). In 1914, the teahouse that stood on top of the hill was replaced by a large mansion, designed by the Amsterdam architect Jan Stuyt, and moved to the tennis court (Estate Archive Huis te Maarn). A few alterations were made in later times. For example, the topiary along the avenues was replaced by beech trees, probably because it was too costly to maintain. On the whole, however, the present-day gardens still illustrate Wattez’s design in the mixed garden style. Like Springer (see case study Egtheria) Pieter Wattez generally worked in the landscape style, often altering existing parks that were originally designed by his father Dirk Wattez, for instance at Kalheupink, Het Teessink, De Welle, De Haer and Kotten. In these cases Wattez generally maintained the original character of the landscape park, adding some modern features. Olde Meierink (1985, p. 74) has argued that both father and son did not design in the mixed style, and whereas this is true for the father, it is certainly not true for the son. However, it is only at new estates established around 1900 that Pieter created gardens in the pure mixed garden style.

**CASE STUDY: EGHERIA, Oldenzaal**

On the ice-pushed ridges east of Oldenzaal lies Egtheria estate, created in 1909-1910 for H.E. ten Cate, director of several textile mills in Almelo. Earlier, in Chapter 6, it was shown that the land market in Almelo was dominated by the presence of the noble estate Huis Almelo of the Van Rechteren Limpurg family, and that consequently several newly wealthy from Almelo invested in properties near Oldenzaal.

The mansion and coach house in cottage style were designed by the architect Karel Muller (Oversticht/ Smeets, cd Losser). The surrounding gardens were laid out in 1911 by Leonard A. Springer with whom Muller also worked at other commissions (Moes, 2002, p. 88; see section 7.3). The garden design of Egtheria was characterised by a formal flower garden and a rosarium slightly to the northwest of the house (Figure 7.5). The intricate system of rounded paths connected the geometric part with the landscape park further to the north of the house. The park consisted of curving paths, tree belts and lawns with clusters of deciduous and exotic trees. To the east of the mansion Springer furthermore created a walled garden with hothouses and a vegetable garden.

Springer generally designed in the landscape style in which he could express his love for trees (Moes, 2002). Hence, most of Springer’s designs were for the landscape parks to which he sometimes added geometric features, often on request of the estate owners, as will be discussed further in the following sections. Egtheria was probably one of Springer’s best gardens in the mixed style. However, when compared to Huis te Maarn, the mixture of geometric and landscape features is in less harmony, as the landscape park still seems to dominate the whole.
Figure 7.5: Aerial photograph of Egheeria estate, circa 1911. Seen from the southeast.
Source: Special Collections Library, University Wageningen. No. 01.415.05

Figure 7.6: Aerial photograph of Egheeria estate, 2005. Seen from the northwest.
Photographed by Paul Paris. With kind permission.
As such, the working method and stylistic preference of the designer employed influenced the way in which a garden was created. Both Huis te Maarn and Egheria are defined as gardens in mixed style, as are the gardens at Weldam, and although they have similar characteristics they also incorporate stark differences. Here these differences were largely based on the designer employed, yet in the case of Weldam other factors also have been important, which will be dealt with below.

In 1943 a bombardment destroyed the Egheria villa and parts of the gardens. Consequently, the geometric garden with the rosary was ruined and later replaced by a lawn with a naturalistic water feature (Figure 7.6). At present the aesthetic landscape of Egheria is that of a landscape park with a mixture of evergreens (e.g. pine and spruce) and deciduous trees (e.g. oak, beech and weeping willow). The flowerbed in front of the house was also reshaped into a drop-like figure. The walled vegetable garden is still intact.

CASE STUDY: DE BOEKEL, Enschede
In 1840 Hendrik ter Kuile, major of Enschede, purchased a block of land northeast of Enschede. At the time it was ‘a barren heath plain from where you could see Germany’ (Mini ter Kuile, 1941, House Archive De Boekel Estate). The estate records furthermore revealed that in 1844 several hundred oak and beech trees were bought for the estate, and that in 1848 a small farm was purchased to serve as a weekend home. Topographic maps show that a small woodland for recreational walks was created around that time (Historische Atlas Oost-Nederland, 1830-1855; Bonne-maps, 1881, 1882). In 1906 the family employed the architect Karel Muller to design a chalet-like summer house. It was a small country home without gas, water and electricity (Mini ter Kuile, 1941, Estate Archive De Boekel; Figure 7.7).

After De Boekel estate passed onto Harrij ter Kuile and his wife Maria Geertruid van Heek in 1915, the new owners recruited the Belgian garden architect Van der Swaelmen (1883-1929) to design a garden in the modern architectonic style. Van der Swaelmen had fled Belgium during World War I, and found refuge in the Netherlands (Van Beusekom, 1991, p. 29; Oversticht, 1995, p. 51-54). During his stay in the Netherlands Van der Swaelmen gave lectures on modern garden architecture, and at one of these lectures he met the Ter Kuiles. The family’s choice for employing Van der Swaelmen was that – in contrast to the designers Springer and Wattez – he could design a so-called sunken garden (Mini ter Kuile, 1941, Estate Archive De Boekel). After designing a plan for De Boekel, Van der Swaelmen probably stayed at the estate frequently to oversee the laying out of the garden (ex. inf. Steinmeijer, 2005).
To the east of the house, Van der Swaelmen designed a symmetrical oblong garden, bordered by taxus hedges and consisting of a terrace, an inner garden with a square pond, a vegetable garden, an orchard and a tennis court. It illustrated Van der Swaelmen’s theories on garden design, namely that a garden needed to be a combination of beauty and utility, that it should be a product of ‘our intellect and our need to organise’ and had to adjust to the surrounding natural environment (Van der Swaelmen, 1916, p. 124-125).

From the conservatory ran a path of Bentheimer sandstone, laid out as flagstones. Via several steps near the house, the path ran through the sunken inner garden and the shallow pond (only 15 cm deep) towards the orchard and vegetable garden. Around the east, north and south side of the inner garden Van der Swaelmen created borders that he planted with various ‘wild flowers’ (Figure 7.8), an idea he took over from English Arts & Crafts designers such as Thomas Mawson and Gertrude Jekyll (Smeets, 2005, p. 10-15). The walls of the borders were also constructed of Bentheimer sandstone, with brick walls on the inside for support. The principle of the borders continued along the pond. Here, perennial plants such as azalea and rhododendron and a few trees (including magnolia and pruned conifers) were planted. In the pond floor eight holes were created in which water lilies were potted. Between the lawn and the pond sandstone pavement was made with a sitting area on each side. To the east of the pond lay a geometric rose garden. Here, the path leads through a gate in the taxus hedge towards the utility gardens and the tennis court.
Figure 7.8: The main house at De Boekel estate seen from the southern wild flower border, circa 1980.
Source: Estate Archive De Boekel. With kind permission of the Steinmeijer family.

The symmetric organisation of the garden with the sandstone path as axis, and the interesting variation in relief, colours, shapes and materials (lawn, water and planting) give the garden a fascinating spatial structure. It represents new tastes in garden fashions in the early twentieth century, marked by the desire to bring the house and its surroundings in perfect harmony. Van der Swaelmen’s design greatly resembles gardens laid out in the Arts & Crafts style in England and bears many similarities with gardens in the so-called architectonic style as advocated by Dirk Tersteeg (see case study Hooge Vuursche).

In Twente, such gardens were rare, in part reflecting the fact that in the period 1900-1920 few estates were created. Furthermore, the owner’s choice of a foreign designer and a modern style garden is remarkable, particularly seeing the strong social network of the Enschede industrialists that seem to advocate the employment of well known designers like Wattez and Springer who designed more natural gardens (see above, and sections 7.2 and 7.3).

CASE STUDY: DE HOOGE VUURSCHE, Baarn
In 1911 merchant navy officer Johannes Adrianus van den Bosch and his second wife Baroness van Hardenbroek employed the garden designer Dirk F. Tersteeg (1876-1942) and the architect Eduard Cuypers (1859-1927) to create a new estate along the Hilversumsestraatweg in Baarn (Leeuwin, 2003, p. 127-128). Tersteeg’s work at Hooge Vuursche (Figures 7.9 and 7.10) was one of his earliest designs and one of the earliest architectonic gardens in the Netherlands. Other designs by him can be found at Het Bouwhuis, Het Stokhorst, Het Hexel, De Eekhof, Prins Hendriksoord, and probably at De Hoogt.
The architectonic style is characterised by the desire to bring the house and its surroundings in perfect harmony, as was done at Hooge Vuursche by Cuypers and Tersteeg. The unity of the home and the garden showed in the style of their layout and in the use of many built objects in
the garden (steps, walls and ponds). The garden became an extension of the house. A series of ponds, a cascade and a fountain lay at the heart of the design for Hooge Vuursche. Douglas spruces, beech trees, oak trees, and rectangular lawns completed the picture. Such green planting needed to accentuate the symmetry and regularity of the design (Schreiber, 2004, p. 13). Two symmetric paths line the geometric garden.

The architect of the house, Cuypers, was so enthusiastic about the garden that he frequently wrote about it in his magazine *Het Huis Oud en Nieuw*. In 1911 he stated that ‘step by step the terraces lead down to the garden, while through connection with the garden architecture, brick staircases from the slope gradually pass the fountain and water features and lead to the surrounding forest. Through these gradual transitions [the designers] tried to express the notion of a stately home into the architecture of the house and of the garden as a whole; a stately home in which the intimate, comfortable aspects of the homely life were connected and mixed with the life in the free nature’.

In the 1940s the gardens were altered by D. Haspels, a former co-worker of Tersteeg (Schreiber, 2004, p. 17). He planted large rhododendrons on both sides of the lower basin, and blocked the vistas from the terraces by planting spruces.

**Fashions at nouveaux riches estates**

The discussion of case studies in Twente and Utrecht was used to illustrate the choices made by the newly wealthy in terms of designers and styles, and to explore how these choices transformed the landscape. From Chapter 6 it has become clear that in Utrecht most nouveaux riches estates were created between 1820 and 1880, whereas in Twente most dated from the period 1860-1900. Of course, the date of establishment had consequences for the layout of the aesthetic landscape. After studying the aesthetic landscape at nineteenth- and twentieth-century estates the following conclusions can be drawn. Parks characterised by irregular water features, curving paths and lawns with tree clumps dominate the aesthetic appearance of nouveaux riches estates, reflecting the date of establishment. Through time, new ideas were brought in, but overall the character of the landscape park created by such designers as J.D. Zocher jr. and Hendrik Copijn, was maintained. This was illustrated by the case studies of Het Amelink and Aardenburg, but also appeared at the majority of estates in the study areas.

Even at the turn of the century, designers like Leonard Springer and Pieter Wattez still largely worked in the landscape style. Particularly at existing nouveaux riches estates, their plans for altering the aesthetic landscape was much in tune with the character of the place. In other words, this meant that new ideas like geometric rosariums were shaped into the existing design, often close to the house, whereas the naturalistic features were maintained. Although many scholars
already speak of the mixed garden style in such cases, it is better to speak of a landscape style with added geometric features. One can truly speak of the mixed style in cases like Egheria and Huis te Maarn, when the designers were creating entirely new estates. Here, the use of geometry near the house and irregularity further away was designed in harmony. Although the mixed style had reintroduced the geometric garden around the house, it was thought by some designers, such as Dirk Tersteeg and Louis van der Swaelmen, that this should be taken further. They created gardens that were an extension of the house with many architectonic features (i.e. sitting areas, steps and ponds). The case studies of De Hooge Vuursche and De Boekel illustrated that these new ideas could be executed in very different ways. Whereas the latter was largely based on Arts & Crafts ideas with wild flower borders as important facets, the first was marked by a strong geometry, both in the planting and the built objects.

As a comparison between the new and old landed elite in their choices for designers and styles, the Weldam estate will now be studied.

**CASE STUDY NOBLE ESTATE : WELDAM, Delden**

Although aware of enduring trends in garden design the nobility often retained faith in an established elite of designers, whose ideas reflected their traditional training. The German designer Carl Petzold (1815-1891), for instance, designed several gardens in Twente. From 1852 Petzold had worked as park and garden inspector for Prince Frederik of the Netherlands at his Muskau estate in Germany, and at his Dutch properties near The Hague. Consequently, Petzold was also recruited by friends of the Prince.

In 1878 Petzold designed a new garden for Maria Cornelia baroness Van Heeckeren van Wassenaer and Willem Carel P.O. count Van Aldenburgh Bentinck at Weldam, strong supporters and friends of the royal family. Maria Cornelia had received the estate from her parents at Twickel as a marriage gift that year. A map of the estate in 1877 showed the area around the castle (approximately 150 by 220 metres) as barren, except for a few conifers, hazel trees and horse chestnut trees (Estate Archive Weldam, separate document). Petzold proposed a design in a late landscape style incorporating clusters of trees, curving paths and many water features (Figure 7.11). In his plans the existing drive way to the castle was eliminated and replaced by a great lawn with curving paths. Furthermore, he wanted to create a ‘naturalistic’ image by filling in parts of the canal to the front of the house and digging ponds on the other sides of the existing moat. However, the design was never executed. Oldenburger-Ebbers (1995-2000, p. 158) suggested that the family discarded the design as being old-fashioned. In the 1880s, however, the landscape style was still very popular and the idea of making a clear distinction between the gardens near the house and the park further away was still not widely adopted in the Netherlands. It can be argued that Petzold’s landscape design was not in harmony...
with the geometric lay-out of the moated castle area. Instead, the Van Aldenburgh Bentinck family chose to employ another designer who introduced the mixed garden style into the Netherlands: Edouard André (1840-1911).

The Parisian garden architect André designed a garden based on the principles of the seventeenth-century French geometric style, including flower beds, a 145 metres long beech berceaux, a labyrinth and topiary (Figure 7.12). From 1886 this lay-out was executed by André’s pupil Hugo A.C. Poortman (1858-1953), who then remained in the employment of the Van Aldenburgh Bentinck family as head gardener until 1915 (Springer in *Onze Tuinen*, 17 August 1923). During this time he also received commissions to design or alter gardens at other great noble estates in Twente, for instance at Twickel and Nijenhuis (Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1995, p. 209; Zijlstra, 1986, p. 41). In the 1920s he also created a garden in mixed style at Warmelo estate and altered the geometric lay-out of the woods at Huis Diepenheim.

*Nouveaux riches vs. nobility*

Although married to the daughter of a local industrialist Poortman generally only worked for the nobility. He was employed by *nouveaux riches* families in Twente on only three occasions: by the Jannink family at Scherpenzeel (1913), the Blijdenstein family at Het Amelink (1928) and the Ledeboer family at Beeklust (date unknown) (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 180-182). Two of these
commissions were not on newly created estates but on large, previously noble estates. This seems to indicate that Poortman’s choice of employers was not restricted to nobility but simply to great landowners of (noble) estates. It was therefore an issue about particular styles suiting particular types and scales of estates. From archival evidence it appears that other newly wealthy did not try to employ him. In contrast, they primarily hired designers like Springer and Wattez. This was not because the newly wealthy could not afford Poortman, but it was rather an issue of social network (Poortman was well integrated in the landed nobility) and of estate size (Poortman did not work at small estates).

Poortman’s commissions in Twente were largely the result of his link to André and later to the Weldam estate. His social relations clearly played a part in his employment. The importance of social networks is further illustrated by the fact that both Petzold and André were employed by related families in Twickel and Weldam. The choice of a design to be executed, however, reflected the personal taste of the owners in relation to the existing landscape (Two of André’s plans for the orangery garden at Twickel and Petzold’s plans for Weldam were discarded) (Estate Archive Weldam; Estate Archive Twickel). Furthermore, the given examples showed the suitability of particular styles at large estates, and therefore influenced the choice for specific designers. This explains why the nouveaux riches employed different designers. The nobility typically chose to employ designers with a traditional education and who were known to them through their social network, including Petzold, André and Poortman. Not only in the choice of designers did the two groups differ, but also in the appearance of the estates. Despite these differences, however, it has also become clear that both groups were characterised by a love for the landscape design. Within their own circles at least, the recreational use of land – particularly the establishment of gardens, parks and hunting grounds – provided an important opportunity for the display of both wealth and taste. In this basic desire, at least, there was common territory between old and new money.

This section investigated the way in which new garden styles were chosen by estate owners through time, using case studies of six nouveaux riches estates and one noble estate. In the next sections attention will be paid to the diffusion of these ideas through – amongst others – the employment of specific designers and how the choice for such employment was linked to the social network of estate owners.

7.2 DIFFUSING NEW GARDEN FASHIONS

From Chapter 2 it has become clear that Dutch garden design was largely influenced by foreign ideas. This raises the question about the manner in which landowners and garden designers alike could learn about new fashions. Several ways have been identified that possibly contributed to the diffusion of new garden fashions during the period researched. These included visiting
modern gardens and areas of natural beauty, reading novel text books (both foreign and Dutch) and attending exhibitions on horticulture.

**Travel**

It seems clear that the popularity of travelling played an important role in the diffusion of new garden fashions. Elite tourism was not a new phenomenon in the late eighteenth century, but from this time onwards it became more universal and its character changed. Earlier destinations on the so-called Grand Tour included the many country houses and gardens near Florence, Venice and Rome, and the royal gardens at Versailles and Vaux le Vicomte near Paris. From the 1750s, however, the British Isles acquired increasing fame, both abroad and domestically, as the landscape style gained in popularity (Dixon Hunt, 2002, p. 90).

Belle van Zuylen, in 1769, was one of the first Dutch travellers to visit England to see gardens and parks laid out in the landscape style. From England she wrote to her aunt outlining the English fashion of using artificial ruins in gardens, which became popular in the Netherlands during the nineteenth century. Other eighteenth-century Dutch visitors to England included Jacob van Boreel van Beeckestein, J. F. W. baron van Spaen van Biljoen and Johan Meerman (Tromp, 2000, p. 2). The latter had stayed in the British Isles for six months in 1774 and 1786. Based on these travels he wrote *Eenige Berichten omtrent Groot-Britannien en Ierland* (Some Messages about Great Britain and Ireland), in which he detailed the designs of the parks and gardens he had visited. According to Tromp (2000, p. 2), the letters, diaries and other writings of these elite travellers played a considerable part in spreading the ideas of naturalistic gardening in the Netherlands.

Prior to 1800 the audience for travel publications was chiefly drawn from the same elite circles as the travellers themselves. During the course of the nineteenth century, however, the newly wealthy began to follow their lead in travelling. Some, indeed, became quite experienced travellers. Early in the twentieth century the Enschede industrialist Jan Bernard van Heek and his wife Edwina Burr Ewing were frequent visitors to Germany, but also travelled in Britain, Italy, Egypt, Norway, Russia and Turkey (Van Heek, 1996, p. 26, 40-41). It is also likely that the sons of Dutch industrialists and other businessmen who went to England, Germany and France for their commercial training also learned about new fashions in gardening and design. For example, Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein (1839-1914) lived in London for twelve years (circa 1858-1870) when working there for the Twentsche Bank. During his stay he frequently visited the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew, becoming close friends with its director. Contact between the two was maintained even after Blijdenstein moved back to the Netherlands (Schelvis, 1991, p. 212-216). He subsequently created a large pinetum in the English fashion and established a collection of exotic fruit and flower plants at his Vogelensang estate near
Hilversum. Blijdenstein’s son Willem Benjamin (1867-1929) was in turn sent to London. On returning to the Netherlands at the beginning of the twentieth century he and his wife Lida created an estate on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, which they named Hampstead Heath (it was later renamed Huis te Maarn – see above; Huis te Maarn Estate Archive, *History of the estate* by owners Van Notten-Blijdenstein, 1983). There is no specific evidence of a strong English influence on the garden design in this case, but it is possible that the incorporation within the garden of a sloping terrace with steps was based on ideas derived from the English Arts and Crafts style. It certainly has no counterpart in other known designs by Pieter Wattez.

Estate owners were not alone in their travels. In 1806-1807 the garden architect and nurseryman Hendrik van Lunteren (1780-1848) lived in England for a year where he became acquainted with the English landscape style. The garden designer Lodewijk W. Copijn (1878-1945) was married to an English woman and consequently visited the country for extended periods, in the process learning particularly about the Arts & Crafts style (Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 44-45). Britain was not the only source of foreign inspiration during these years. In the 1910s Leonard A. Springer frequently visited Germany, particularly Sauerland, Spessart and Eifel, where he explored both parks and gardens, and the surrounding landscape (Figure 7.13). The role of designers in spreading new ideas will be considered in more detail later in this chapter.

*Figure 7.13: Designer Leonard Springer in the German Spessart-mountains*

*Source: Onze Tuinen, 25 January 1924*
Publications – guides and pattern books

Already in 1700 Roger de Piles informed the public that prints and books on art were ‘the depositories of all that is fine and curious in the world’ and advised that ‘for those that to be more happy, and more gentleman-like, would form their goût by the study of good things, and have a reasonable tincture of the fine arts, nothing is more necessary than good prints’ (quoted by Clayton, 1995, p. 11). Similarly, during the 1800s the diffusion of new ideas within the Netherlands was aided and stimulated by an ever-increasing number of publications. Some were illustrated volumes authored by professional writers and painters who had travelled through the Netherlands and were intended primarily as guides for other visitors. In 1829-30 M. Mourot travelled through the eastern part of the province of Utrecht painting pictures of country estates and buildings. Also relevant were the descriptive accounts of J.B. Christemeijer (1837), P.J. Lutgers (1869) and J. Craandijk (1888) who travelled through various parts of the Netherlands documenting the country estates which they visited. Lutger’s book on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug, in particular, was extensively illustrated with pictures of new country estates and their associated landscape parks (Figure 7.2).

A type of publication more specifically aimed at the gardener or garden designer was the pattern book, offering examples of designs that could be copied and adapted. Dixon Hunt (2002, p. 130) argues that such books were instrumental in the ‘democratic spread of fashion’. Initially, key commentaries on foreign fashions were translated into Dutch, or designs derived from foreign sources were simply re-used in Dutch texts. Thus in 1802, for example, G. van Laar published his Magazijn van tuinsieraaden (Repository of garden ornaments) containing many examples and plans of garden pavilions, ornaments and follies, including boats, bridges, temples, benches, tents, hermitages and chapels, chiefly ‘based on the most distinguished foreign works’ (Figure 7.14) (Van der Broeke & Meulenkamp, 2003, p.13). In particular, the work drew heavily on German and English publications on the landscape style, supplemented with a few Dutch examples (Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 45). The original publisher of the Magazijn was J. Allart of Amsterdam, who also published a book on ‘exotic and deciduous trees for improving English woods and gardens’ by J.C. Krauss (1802). The two books were often advertised together in newspapers.

In his bibliographic review of publications on garden fashion L.A. Springer was highly critical of Van Laar’s pattern book: ‘The plans are generally tasteless. Although published in 1802, it belongs to the eighteenth century and has all the faults of that time’ (1936, p. 68) It is not clear what Springer meant by this, but it appears that he foremost criticised the unskillful plans. Dixon Hunt (2002, p. 133) also notes that Van Laar’s ‘draughtsmanship is crude, the proposed construction materials often cheap and flimsy’. However, the whole purpose of the publication was to make garden fashions available to a wide public, not merely the elite. It was perhaps
understandable, therefore, that in both presentation and content a premium was placed on economy. This does appear to have had the intended effect, as the publication was repeatedly reprinted until 1867. It is also possible to point to known structures in Dutch gardens that derive directly from designs in the *Magazijn*. This was true of the folly chapel or dovecote on the Sandwijk estate in De Bilt (Figure 7.14) and the chapel on the Molenbosch estate in Zeist (Van der Broeke & Meulenkamp, 2003, p. 41; Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, p. 176).

![Folly chapel or dovecote of Sandwijk estate, De Bilt.](image)

*Figure 7.14: Folly chapel or dovecote of Sandwijk estate, De Bilt.*

*Source: G. van Laar (1802) Magazijn van tuinsieraaden*

Another important pattern book was J.Ch. Krafft’s multi-lingual picture book *Plans of the Most Beautiful Picturesque Gardens in France, England and Germany* published in 1809. It contained many plans for creating such gardens together with examples of ‘edifices, monuments, fabrics, etc., which contribute to their embellishment, of every kind of architecture, such as Chinese, Egyptian, English, Arabian, Moorish, etc.’ (Krafft 1809, title page). Springer (1936, p. 80) subsequently acknowledged the importance of Krafft’s work on the spread of new tastes in garden design in the early nineteenth century.

*Publications – text books*

Whilst pattern books provided examples of garden design, a growing body of other texts combined attention to new fashions in gardening with more practical advice on how to achieve
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the desired effect. Here, a selection of text books is discussed to give an idea of their contents. One of the most important of these works was *Nederlandsche Tuinkunst* (Dutch Garden Art) published in 1837 ‘for owners of gardens and country estates’ (Anonymous, 1837, title page). In the preface the anonymous author wrote that ‘the developments in horticulture, in garden design and bulb-growing’ had all been so extensive in the early nineteenth century that existing garden handbooks in Dutch had become useless (Anonymous, 1837, p. v). The book, therefore, sought to meet the clear need amongst landowners and nurserymen for advice on these new developments. The three-volume handbook showed how to create a new estate in the landscape style, giving detailed descriptions of lawns, paths, ponds, the grouping of trees and garden ornaments, including hermitages, ruins, gazebos and belvederes.

Other important nineteenth-century works include H. Witte’s *Handboek voor den bloementuin* (Handbook for the Flower Garden) of 1866 and *Tuinen, villa’s en buitenplaatsen* (Gardens, Villas and Country Estates) of ten years later. Both of these volumes contained echoes of an earlier era in the extensive use made of foreign designs, deriving chiefly from German publications such as R.W.A. Wörmann’s *Der Garten-ingenieur* (The Garden Engineer) of 1864 (Zijlstra, 1986, p. 93). Witte, however, offered advice only on the layout of the main elements of a garden design, without any accompanying information about planting. He was thus subsequently criticised by Springer, who argued that a better choice of examples would have improved the book’s usefulness as a manual for garden design (1936, p. 97). Witte’s publications were, however, sufficiently popular with contemporaries to merit reprinting.

Later textbooks which introduced the newly fashionable mixed garden style and the architectonic style included H. F. Hartogh Heys van Zouteveen’s *Boomen en heesters in parken en tuinen* (Trees and Plants on Parks and Gardens) of 1908, A.J. van Laren’s *Decoratieve tuinbeplanting* (Decorative Garden Plants) of 1913 (Figure 7.15) and J. Bergmans’ *Vaste planten en rotsheesters* (Perennial and Rock Garden Plants) of 1924. Of these only Hartogh Heys van Zouteveen was a professional garden designer; probably a student of Springer (Geenen & Roeleveld, 1982, p. 97). Van Laren was the curator of the Amsterdam Hortus Botanicus and Bergmans had gained experience in gardening as director of the royal nursery in Dedemsvaart (Woudstra, 1997, p. 164; *Onze Tuinen*, 1923, p. 213).

In his books, Van Laren promoted phytogeographic planting, i.e. the grouping of plants according to their natural environment (Woudstra, 1997, p. 164). His book on decorative planting provided many examples of different types of planting, including suggestions for rose gardens, rock gardens, herbaceous borders and flower beds, all in the style of the Arts & Crafts gardens then popular in the Netherlands. Its popularity was such that it was reissued in a second, extended edition, which was advertised in the magazine *Onze Tuinen* (Our Gardens) with the
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grand claim that as ‘a source of gardener’s joy’ it had no equal amongst Dutch books (Onze Tuinen, 1923, p. 258, 395).

Figure 7.15: Illustration from A.J. van Laren’s Decoratieve tuinbeplanting (1913)

The majority of Dutch textbooks would have appealed mostly to gardeners, nurserymen and those landowners interested in gardening. These books contained little discussion about the broader history of garden design and were not themselves pioneers of new fashions. Rather, their importance lay in outlining the methods by which already popular garden styles could be recreated in practice. They thus followed the ideas of design pioneers already working on landed estates, rather than providing new inspiration. The practical emphasis of most textbooks also meant that it was not until Springer’s works of 1895 and 1898 that ideas about the theory of garden and park design were circulated in the Dutch language. In his 1895 article Springer discussed contemporary education in gardening: ‘In what way has garden art been taught at our horticultural schools up to now? Predominantly it was based on copying pictures and plans from this or that book; … through the repeating copying [the student] was practiced in making curving lines … following earlier examples. Thus a plan was made; [the student] was never taught why’ (Springer, 1895, p. 52). Springer reacted against the continuing re-use of plans and examples derived from foreign sources by writing an original history of garden design intended to encourage a new perception of the subject as an art form rather than merely a technical skill (Moes, 2002, p. 107).

Questions remain as to how new ideas were discussed and developed into fashions that became widely adopted. Springer’s bibliography (1936) indicates that initially new ideas came chiefly
from abroad. Springer himself was particularly enthusiastic about key foreign texts including Humphrey Repton’s *Essays on the Change of Taste in Gardening* (1812), William S. Gilpin’s *Practical Hints Upon Landscape Gardening* (1832), A. Alphand’s *Les promenades de Paris* (1867-68), E. André’s *l’Art des jardins* (1866) and H. E. Milner’s *The Art and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (1890). Thus, about Gilpin’s work Springer said that it was ‘A good book, especially concerning the basic form of the tree clusters. Petzold must, although he does not speak about it, have known this book, seeing the form of his planting’ (1936, p. 72). Petzold was a German designer working at noble estates in the Netherlands, see Chapter 2. Milner’s work he called ‘a beautiful work with planting plans and lists of needed species’, and of André’s book he said that ‘For years this well-known work has been the book that was studied by every upcoming garden architect, particularly in France and Belgium, but also in our country. In his work André stood up for re-using symmetric forms of earlier time periods, in which he saw a future’ (Springer, 1936, p. 74, 76). Inspired by such a diversity of works, Springer designed gardens throughout the Netherlands and actively wrote articles and books about the art of gardening, as mentioned earlier. Often he discussed the development of Dutch garden design with other designers in national magazines.

**Publications – magazines**

A distinctive forum for more active discussion between professional designers and others interested in trends in gardening was provided by various specialist magazines established from the 1840s onwards, including *Maandschrift voor Tuinbouw* (Monthly Magazine for Horticulture) from 1845; *De Bouwwereld* (The Building World) from 1901, *Huis Oud en Nieuw* (The House Old and New) from 1903, and *Onze Tuinen* (Our Gardens) from 1905.

It seems commonly to have been the case that designers advanced their particular viewpoint through one particular magazine. This was evident during the transformation of taste that took place around 1900, which inspired heated discussions between the older and younger generations of designers concerning the use of geometrical features in garden designs and the relationship between house and garden design. Whereas some participants in the discussion were prepared to concede the house design should be a primary influence upon the appearance of its garden, others, including Springer and Poortman were insistent on retaining ultimate control over the layout of the garden. Springer thus praised Poortman’s work as it did ‘not suffer from the anglomania evident in the work of many younger colleagues, nor the far-fetched, heavy, German, modern business, that some, particularly amongst building architects, try to force upon us’ (*Onze Tuinen*, 17 August 1923).

Springer was clearly unsympathetic towards new developments in Dutch gardening during the early years of the twentieth century, as advocated by young designers such as Tersteeg, who
favoured close co-operation with the house architect and argued that the design of house and
garden should be in harmony. Geometrical elements in the work of these younger designers
were based less on older examples and were more a distinctive product of modern ideas. In the
magazine *De Bouwwereld*, for instance, Tersteeg (1906) promoted the architectonic garden style
whilst simultaneously criticising Springer’s work as conventional, old-fashioned and at odds
with the architecture of newly-built country mansions. Another vehicle for Tersteeg’s ideas was
the magazine *Huis Oud en Nieuw*. This was established in 1903 on the initiative of the architect
E. Cuypers, who was also a frequent contributor, promoting his favoured designs for both
houses and gardens. In 1912, for example, the magazine included several articles on the interior
and exterior of the mansion and gardens at De Hooge Vuursche estate near Baarn, where
Cuypers and Tersteeg were working together (Figure 7.9). This self-promotion and overt
expression of opinion drew criticism from fellow architects, and in later issues Cuypers’ articles
were published anonymously.

In 1923, in an article on Dutch garden design, Geertruid Carelsen (granddaughter of J.D. Zocher
jr.) made her own contribution to the debate on the relationship between house and garden
design. She stated strongly that garden design was important in its own right and rejected the
influence of architectural fashions (*Onze Tuinen*, 12 October 1923). Returning to her theme she
noted that ‘even in England, the homeland of the once revered landscape style, people have
succumbed to the temptation of the “mixed style” (i.e. the mixing of living and dead materials
in garden architecture; author). On the one hand they have created “wild gardens”. On the other
they concentrate on the formation of “geometrical gardens”, in which complicated mathematical
lines are the main issue and plants have hardly any purpose’ (*Onze Tuinen*, 30 November 1923).
Such comments were typical of the forceful exchanges which took place between followers of
the landscape style and of modern fashions, such as the architectonic style through the pages of
national magazines over a period of several decades. The discussions were related to
developments such as the establishment of villas and public parks. Whereas the landscape style
worked well for large public parks, it proved to be unsuitable for the smaller gardens of villas
and other urban housing. Here, the architectonic style was favoured (Deunk, 2002, p. 59).

Gardening magazines not only acted as a platform for the spread of new ideas about garden
design, they were also important as a means of advertising products and accessories such as
fashionable garden plants, flagstones, wooden pavilions and even prefabricated villas. This, of
itself, provides a guide to changes in garden fashions. For example, during the 1920s the large
number of advertisements in *Onze Tuinen* for rock gardens and alpine plants is evidence of the
then current fashion for such perennial plants and rockeries. The various magazines and other
publications, at national and regional level, were also important as a means for individual
designers to advertise their services. The guide for the Utrechtse Heuvelrug by W. Kraal, for
example, contained many advertisements, not only for regional nurseries and garden architects, but also for contractors, interior designers and even the sale of land and villas. Typical of advertisements for the first group was that for Johan van Zijl: ‘Layout and management of gardens. Delivery of all kinds of flowers and flower arrangements. Seed merchant.’ (Kraal, c. 1935). With the large number of country estates in the area, Van Zijl and other local gardeners and nurserymen probably enjoyed good business. The rise of estate building in this part of Utrecht thus gave rise to the founding of many companies to meet the needs of the new estate owners.

National magazines were particularly used by young, upcoming designers to advertise their talents. As well as contributing to *Huis Oud en Nieuw* as a correspondent, Dirk F. Tersteeg also promoted his business through paid advertising in the magazine (Figure 7.16). The advertisement clearly illustrated Tersteeg’s style of designing and use of materials. The firm of H. Copijn and Son and the German garden architect Otto Schulz were amongst the most prominent advertisers in *Onze Tuinen* in the early 1920s, with the latter including a list of all his commissions since 1897, including several country estates in Utrecht. Schulz’s advert of 1923 highlighted his establishment of an independent office in Bilthoven where, according to his own description, he specialised in designing Japanese gardens, rose gardens, rock gardens, orchards and vegetable gardens (*Onze Tuinen*, 14 September 1923, p. 217).

Figure 7.16: Advertisement from D.F. Tersteeg.
Source: *Huis Oud en Nieuw*, 1912.
In various ways national and regional magazines thus played an important role in the diffusion of ideas, whether through publicising debates between designers, or by publishing their articles on planting and designs, or by providing advertising space for garden products and garden designers. Products and services were also promoted through other forms of advertising, including nursery catalogues. Some of these became quite important publications in their own right, for example Van Lunteren’s list of orangery plants of 1819, Zocher’s catalogue of 1835 and the 1923 catalogue issued by H. Copijn and Son. But it was also important for both the public and garden professionals to sell new products and ideas for themselves; this was the distinctive role of the exhibition.

**Exhibitions**

Exhibitions of various types were important for displaying new trends in garden design, and the potential for innovative use of particular plants and trees. As was the case with the publications discussed above, neighbouring European countries led the way. An important early source of inspiration to Dutch gardeners was the Exposition d’Horticulture in Ghent, Belgium, first held in 1809. Until exhibitions began to be held in the Netherlands from the 1860s onwards, the Ghent exhibition was an important opportunity for Dutch designers and nurserymen to display their products and ideas to an audience that included many interested visitors from the Netherlands. As late as the 1920s references to exhibits at Ghent were a common feature of the magazine advertising by designers and nurserymen noted above. Other important foreign exhibitions included the annual Flower Show held in London at the Crystal Palace from 1851 and the world horticultural exhibition that took place in Paris in 1867. It was at the latter venue that carpet beddings with complex mosaic patterns were first publicly displayed as an element within the layout of the landscape style (Zijlstra, 1968, p. 90).

From the 1860s national and international exhibitions were held in the Netherlands and in 1887 the International Horticultural Exhibition took place in Amsterdam. Such events quickly became established as important venues for leading designers such as Springer and Copijn to display their work. Potentially their impact extended beyond the immediate audience visiting the exhibition, as exhibits were also reviewed in the gardening journals. In 1923, for example, Copijn’s exhibit at the Amsterdam flower exhibition was praised for revealing a new side of the firm’s work: ‘That the firm of Copijn is capable of creating extensive, monumental designs, it has proved many times and in many ways. Here now it shows its mastery when it comes to making something beautiful of a small plot of land in a large city’ (*Onze Tuinen*, 28 September 1923) (Figure 7.17).

There was also a parallel development of regional gardening exhibitions during the latter half of the nineteenth century. In venues such as Zeist, these exhibitions played an important role in
introducing new trends in national and international fashion. In 1909, for example, the weekly garden magazine *Buiten* (Outside) reported in great detail on the large horticultural exhibition held on the Schoonoord estate in Zeist, which it considered ‘an important event in horticulture in [the Netherlands]’ (*Buiten*, 1909, p. 440-442, 452-454, 464-467, 478-482). Following foreign examples the exhibition at Schoonoord was first held in August and September 1906, becoming the first large horticultural exhibition of its type in the Netherlands. Its success showed that ‘our national horticulture is in no aspect inferior to foreign horticulture’, but also on a more basic level just how popular all aspects of horticulture and garden design had become in the Netherlands (*Buiten*, 1909, p. 440-442, 452-454, 464-467, 478-482). Exhibits included planted displays – one of which, a rose garden designed by Hendrik Copijn was to remain as a permanent feature of the estate’s garden – and designers’ plans for gardens being created elsewhere. *Buiten* reflected on the latter: ‘Here too, one can see that our garden architects are not inferior to foreigners. However, many visitors can learn here, that designing and executing a garden … needs special knowledge and education, and that not every architect, even when an excellent constructor of houses, is capable of laying out an accompanying garden’ (*Buiten*, 1909, p. 466).

![Figure 7.17: The exhibit of H. Copijn & Son for the Groote Bloemententoontoonstelling (Large Flower Exhibition) in Amsterdam, 1923](image)

*Source: Onze Tuinen, 28 September 1923.*

From this brief exploration it has become clear that sources of new ideas about garden design and the ways in which they were diffused to a widening audience – that included not only
design professionals, architects and nurserymen, but also enthusiastic amateur gardeners – were varied. However, it is chiefly the influence of the former group upon the evolution of garden design that has exercised previous scholars. The next section investigates whether this particular focus is justified or whether the owners of estates also merit some credit.

7.3 THE PIONEERS: PROFESSIONALS AND PATRONS

In the Dutch context garden histories have paid specific attention to the part played by a small group of prominent professional designers – individuals such as Zocher, Wattez, Springer and Tersteeg – at the expense of any equivalent consideration of the influence of their patrons upon the evolution of design (Van Groningen, 1999; Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1992, 1995, 1996; Albers, 1987, 1997; Zijlstra, 1986, 1987). It can be argued, however, that the character and experience of individual estate owners and their social networks also exerted an important influence upon landscape taste and the philosophy of garden design, not least through the choices they made about the employment of particular designers to work on their estates. In England this has already been acknowledged (Mowl, 2000; Williamson, 1995). It was not uncommon for landowners to design their own estates. In exceptional cases these enthusiastic and often knowledgeable amateurs set new trends in garden design. Two Herefordshire landowners, Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight even challenged the prevailing dominance of the landscape style of Brown and Repton by advocating the Picturesque Style, in which the landscape was dramatic, natural and wild. In the Dutch context there do not appear to have been any landowners who equalled Price and Knight in their impact on debates. Perhaps this is why Dutch scholars have largely ignored the potential impact of landowners on garden fashions. Yet the discussion of the case studies earlier in this chapter has made clear that in individual cases landowners themselves were actively involved in estate design and often made informed choices about employing particular designers associated with a particular gardening style. It seems important, therefore, to consider further the ways in which landowners shaped the diffusion of fashions in garden design, whether as individuals, or (in Section 7.4) as a group whose existing social networks influenced the spread of ideas and choices made about garden design.

It is certainly possible to point to individual cases where it was the estate owner rather than the designer he employed who played the leading role in defining the style of a new garden. In the late eighteenth century Johan Georg Michaël, grandfather of J.D. Zocher jr., was the first to create a park in the landscape style in the Netherlands. Michaël must have been aware of the style, yet he was not the one who initiated this bold move. In fact, his client, Jacob Boreel had sent him to England specifically to study a number of landscape parks, with the aim of ensuring that he learned how to lay out a park in that style (Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1991, p. 73, 75). This example is not unique and it is possible to identify other instances where individual landowners seem to have had an impact on estate designs, as in some of the case studies at the start of the
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It seems certain that many estate owners were amongst the audience reached by books and magazines about gardening, although the estate archives studied have not yielded any specific details which would allow such influences to be identified more precisely.

Aesthetic enjoyment of estate landscapes was not confined to strolling over the grounds or drinking tea with friends. Many estate owners were themselves actively involved in maintaining and beautifying their property. Typically, the men were more concerned with the condition of the trees on the estate, whilst women were responsible for flower and vegetable gardens (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 106). Hammer-Stroeve who interviewed many women of Enschede industrialists noted that they were all very proud of their gardens, one conversation partner even said: ‘that was really your duty, looking after your garden’. It was not uncommon, moreover, for landowners to be actively involved in laying out the design of their estates. The case study of Het Amelink has already shown that the owner Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein was largely responsible for the first, modest, estate design at the start of the nineteenth century. Other examples where owners were responsible for the layout of the estate include the Stameren estate established by the Wendelaar family in 1904-05 on the barren hills near Maarn. The physical work of recreating the plan within the landscape was undertaken by the Nederlandse Heidemaatschappij (Dutch Heath Company) which was hired to plant the woods and the estate’s forester Veldhuizen who established the paths (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 331). It is also likely that the gardens at De Tangh near Rhenen were the product of the owner’s creativity (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 332). The garden was laid out in 1927 in the architectonic style with several terraces to the east and south of the mansion. However, whereas the Blijdenstein’s influence was particularly important in that it resulted in a design that was very innovative for its time, the landowners in the other examples quoted were creating gardens that followed the established design conventions of their times. At the very least, however, activities show awareness amongst landowners of what was fashionable, and that they were capable of laying out designs that reflected current design trends.

It was also the case that when estate owners employed a designer, the choice of who to hire was usually carefully considered. As noted above, the unusual choice of the Belgian designer Van der Swaelmen by the Ter Kuile family at De Boekel clearly reflected the family’s wish to have a modern sunken garden. In the 1930s the estate went to N.H. ter Kuile and his wife Mini, who kept the garden in perfect condition. Thus, she writes in her garden diary that ‘after 1945 I replanted the borders and added many deciduous trees’ (Estate Archive De Boekel). Mini even drew some garden designs, which illustrate that she was greatly inspired by Van der Swaelmen’s design for De Boekel. Unfortunately, other estate archives have not offered insights that could have given a direct view on how they were influenced.
Nevertheless, it seems that A.A.H. Boissevain of Prins Hendriksoord was well aware of the specific talents of individual designers. When reorganising the large landscape park at his estate he employed the firm of Hendrik Copijn and Son (1906-10). Hendrik’s father, Jan Copijn had designed the original park for the previous owner Prince Willem Hendrik of Orange in 1873. Hendrik, who had learned the trade from his father, was thus a very appropriate choice of designer to execute work that would update the design of the park, yet maintain a sense of harmony with the existing plan. In 1909-10, however, Boissevain turned elsewhere – in this instance to Tersteeg – when seeking a designer for a flower garden in a more modern style to the south of the mansion. Thus whilst maintaining the character of the landscape park, the owner made sure that his property also incorporated a garden in the latest fashion, designed by its strongest and best known advocate.

More than once professional designers had to adapt their ideas to meet the wishes of employers who favoured ‘that which they have seen abroad or find depicted in foreign books’. Thus ‘the craftsmen are forced to follow fashion’ to gain employment (Springer, in Onze Tuinen 1927). Geenen and Roeleveld’s analysis (1982, p. 177) of Springer’s own behaviour reveals that ‘regarding fashion movements and the wishes of employers [Springer’s] attitude [was] in practice not always strictly principled and consistent’. In other words, Springer sometimes compromised his own stated theoretical principles of design, and altered his draft designs to meet a client’s wishes. The same authors also suggest that the rose garden or rosarium was introduced into the Netherlands through the persistence of estate owners (Geenen and Roeleveld, 1982, p. 229). This might mean that the mixed garden style, as seen in designs by Springer and Wattez, was not simply a reflection of individual designer’s innovative ideas, but rather of landowners’ tastes and their desire to be fashionable. Thus, it appears that when employing a designer, estate owners often demanded a certain look, even when this meant forcing the designer to include aspects of a new style which he did not personally favour. As Springer (1886, in Het Nederlandsche Tuinbouwblad) also observed: ‘The public does not ask “What is beautiful?” but “What is fashionable?”’.

It was true, on the other hand, that employing a designer of note gave the owner a certain status in his social circle. As a result it is unclear exactly how many parks in Utrecht were actually designed by J.D. Zocher jr., but it seems likely that the numbers have been inflated as a result of landowners claiming that their estate was a Zocher design (Appendix IV). The prevalence of such doubtful claims suggests the importance of conferring upon an estate design the status associated with the name of a professional and respected designer, for example at Ma Retraite and Schaerweijde. Employing well-known designers was thought to bring social status and advancement. But there were also other considerations that related to knowledge of the designer and his works. In this latter respect the social networks of estate owners may have been
important. Their choice of designer may in part have been influenced by the examples of work seen at the houses of family and friends. In turn this network of social contacts may also have influenced the geographical distribution of estates designed by particular garden designers. It is to these themes that the following section turns.

7.4 DESIGNING A REGION

Previous discussion has suggested that some designers were chiefly active within a particular geographical region. It seems possible that this spatial concentration was, at least in part, a reflection of the pattern of social contacts within the group of estate owners who were their major employers. Particular well-known designers, including Wattez and Springer in Twente, and Zocher and Copijn in Utrecht seem to have enjoyed a particular popularity within a specific area. But it is also interesting to look at the other side of the picture, to study occasions when apparently less popular designers were preferred. Such choices may in part have been based on necessity – perhaps the landowner could not afford other more popular designers. But sometimes they may have been a reflection of the owner’s specific taste in garden design.

The particular and enduring relationship that sometimes developed between a designer and a group of clients with family and commercial connections can be illustrated by brief consideration of the work of Wattez. In 1872 Dirk Wattez was commissioned by the Van Heek family to design the public Volkspark (People’s Park) in Enschede. Why the Van Heeks chose to employ Wattez is not known, but from this point onwards he worked frequently for the family and their Enschede friends. His first garden design for a private landowner in Twente was in 1874 for the Van Heeks at Het Stroot, the family’s main estate. Next Wattez worked for other industrialists including the Blijdensteins (1881), Geldermans (1881), Ter Kuiles (1885) and Janninks (1889). After this period during which Wattez was commissioned by many different industrial families he subsequently worked primarily for the Van Heeks from the 1890s onwards (at Het Bouwhuis, De Kolk, De Kotten, Schuttersveld, Het Teessink and IJzerhaar) (Figure 7.19). Moreover, the next generation of Van Heeks frequently commissioned Pieter Wattez, Dirk’s son, to design their gardens. In 1907 Pieter was employed by Willem Benjamin Blijdenstein and Alida van Heek at Huis te Maarn. Alida’s brother Jan Bernard (Zonnebeek estate) and cousin N.G. van Heek (De Tol estate) also employed Pieter to design their gardens (Zijlstra, 1987, p. 39-40).

A young designer such as Pieter Wattez clearly benefited from his father’s success. Following in his footsteps as head of the family’s nursery and as a garden designer Pieter was thus hired by a group of established clients and their families, often to remodel the parks created by his father. Not only did the Van Heeks invite Pieter to work on their estates, but the Geldermans also commissioned him to alter parks previously designed by his father. Social contacts between
landowner and designer were thus transferred from father to son. This was also evident in other designer families, including Zocher and Copijn. In 1902 Hendrik Copijn redesigned the park at the Aardenburg estate of the Van Eeghen family, who had employed his father Jan in 1860 to produce the original landscape park (RDMZ, 1982, p. 3). Similarly, Hendrik modified his father’s gardens at Prins Hendriksoord in 1906-1910. Together the Copijns, father and son, were responsible for the landscape design on fourteen *nouveaux riches* estates in Utrecht and five in Twente. The employment of the firm of H. Copijn and Son at the Amelink estate has been discussed in detail above, but the firm also designed the gardens at other estates owned by the Blijdenstein family or their relatives, namely Hakenberg (1927), Helmer (1920) and Nijehuss (1922).

Not all young designers, however, started with the advantage of following in their father’s footsteps. Springer, for example, had to build up his own network of contacts and clients. It has often been argued that Springer’s entry into business in Twente was achieved through his friendship with the architect Karel Muller, who was employed to build country houses on *nouveaux riches* estates, and whose two sisters were married to members of the Gelderman family (Olde Meierink, 1984, p. 54; Moes, 2002, p. 87). Although this contact resulted in many commissions from the Geldermans, Springer had actually worked in the region before his first work for that family. This was in 1901 for O. Stork at Oosterhof, in 1906 for B.W. ter Kuile at Het Welna and in 1911 for H.E. ten Cate at Egheria (Figure 7.19). In 1912 Springer and Muller were asked by Herman Johan Hendrik Gelderman and his wife Augusta Muller to create a large arboretum: Poort-Bulten. The following year Herman and Augusta employed the pair at their main estate of Kalheupink near Oldenzaal (Figure 7.18). Subsequently, Springer designed the parks and gardens at various other Gelderman family estates (De Hulst, Scholtenhaer, Hulsbeeke, De Haer and Boschkamp) and worked for other families within the same social circle, including the Ter Horsts, Scholtens and Molkenboers (ex. inf. Smellink, 2003).

These family contacts seem thus to have played an important part in shaping the strong geographical clustering that can be observed in the working areas of the elder and younger Wattez and Springer (Figure 7.19). Whereas the former two worked primarily for the industrialists of Enschede, the latter was most frequently hired by those of Oldenzaal. Olde Meierink (1984, p. 54) argued that although Springer ‘received … frequent assignments in Oldenzaal, … he found it difficult to obtain a foothold in Enschede’. It is questionable, however, whether Springer made a serious effort to obtain assignments in Enschede, as Dirk and Pieter Wattez already dominated the scene before he got to Twente. It is therefore more likely that he focused on other areas where newly wealthy clients were to be found. Springer’s contact with the Geldermans meant that he found his particular niche around Oldenzaal.
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Figure 7.18: Designer Leonard Springer in one of his creations: Kalheupink near Oldenzaal
Source: Special Collections, University of Wageningen

It was argued above that Pieter Wattez owed much of his work in Twente to his father’s legacy. A closer view of Figure 7.19, however, shows that the distribution pattern of Pieter’s commissions was much more scattered than that of his father, reflecting the success and proliferation of family estates. As a result of the locational constraints and strong family links created by the land market (see Chapter 6) younger members of the Van Heek, Jannink and Ter Kuile family established their own country estates at a distance from the parental estate close to Enschede. Consequently, Pieter, who worked mostly for the younger generations, had a wider working area than did his father.

In Utrecht the distribution of garden commissions was less clustered, although all the estates designed by the three professionals whose work is mapped on Figure 7.20 were in the eastern half of the province where the majority of new estates were created. J.D. Zocher jr. worked almost exclusively on estates in the municipality of Zeist, but Hendrik Copijn and Springer planned and replanned the design of estates across a wider area. This reflected the way in which nouveaux riches estate building in the region had spread from a small area around Zeist to the entire Utrechtse Heuvelrug during the course of the nineteenth century (see Chapter 6). Of course, the social contacts of the estate owners again influenced the working area of the designers, but this was less marked than the pattern seen in Twente.
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Figure 7.19: The geographical distribution of gardens designed by the professional designers D. Wattez, P.H. Wattez and L.A. Springer at nouveaux riches estates in Twente.
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Gardens by Jan David Zocher jr.:
1. Ma Retraite (for J. van Marwyk Koooy, 1833)
2. Schaerweijde (for Van Loon family, 1858)
3. Hoog Beek en Royen (for Voornbergh-Van Loon family, 1824)
4. Sparrenheuvel (for W.H. Backer esquire, 1825)
5. Schoonoord (for D’Aumale van Romondt-Hangest)
6. Molenbosch (for J.B. Stoop, 1837)
7. Heerewegen (for J.A. van der Mersch, 1848)
8. De Breul (for J. Kol, 1824)
9. Wildbaan (for G. Luden, 1857)
10. Berghuisje (for J.B. Stoop, 1837)

Gardens by Hendrik Copijn:
1. Prins Hendrikoord (for A.A.H. Boissevain, 1906)
2. Den Engh (for B.B.J.E. Vermunt, 1919)
3. Villa Nuovo (for E. de Pesters esquire, 1873)
4. Schaerweijde (for N. Pols esquire, 1900)
5. Schoonoord (for D’Aumale van Romondt-Hangest)
7. Hydepark (for H.M.J. van Loon, 1885)
8. Beukenhout (for Kneppehout van Sterkenburg family, 1873)
9. Aardenburg (for Van Eeghen family, 1902)

Gardens by Leonard A. Springer:
1. Dennehof (for C. Hubers, 1909)
2. De Paltz (for L. Rutgers van Rozenburg esquire, 1883)
3. Ter Wege (for H.H. van Notten, 1905)
4. Ma Retraite (for J. van Marwyk Koooy, 1897)
5. Schaerweijde (for Van der Wijck family, 1921)
6. De Breul (for P. Reineke, 1913)
7. Bomia (for Kol family, date unknown)
9. Anderstein (for Van Beuningen family, 1913)
10. Darthuizen (for Pauw van Wieldrecht family, 1918)

Gardens designed by:  
- J.D. Zocher jr. (1791-1870)  
- H. Copijn (1842-1923)  
- L.A. Springer (1855-1940)

Figure 7.20: The geographical distribution of gardens designed by the professional designers J.D. Zocher jr., H. Copijn and L.A. Springer at nouveaux riches estates in the province of Utrecht.  

Clearly, people in the same social network often commissioned the same designers. Sometimes, however, an estate owner chose to employ a different professional designer. From the case study of De Boekel it appears that this need not be a question of financial necessity, but rather a reflection of personal taste and a desire to express individuality. Thus, although the social circle of the Ter Kuile family would have readily brought them into contact with the work of Springer and Wattez, they specifically chose to employ a lesser-known designer who could create a
garden in the Arts & Crafts style. Neither Wattez, nor Springer were likely to have responded positively to such a commission. Indeed, Springer despised the Arts & Craft Style as a temporary fad that was not a form of art.

**SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS**

This chapter started with recapping evidence for the various motivations for land investment among the newly wealthy in Utrecht and Twente. Generally, a mixture of reasons, both commercial (forestry, agriculture, industry, house rental) and personal (hunting, recreation, entertainment), resulted in the purchase of land. Nevertheless, the personal aspect gained importance during the course of the nineteenth century, as most new landowners were not reliant on income from the land. Consequently, aspects of conspicuous consumption increasingly mattered.

Six case studies of gardens at *nouveaux riches* estates and one of a noble estate were used to reveal the choices made by the new landed elite in terms of garden styles and designers. From this it appeared that the old and new landowners were rather separate social groups, who had a very different taste in garden design and a different choice for designers. Whereas the nobility preferred traditionally schooled designers who were able to lay out extensive parks and gardens, the newly wealthy generally chose garden architects who were capable of creating a beautiful aesthetic landscape at a relatively small estate. New fashions were of importance, although at existing estates such new features as mosaic flower borders (‘carpet bedding’) or rosariums were added to the park without greatly altering the character of the place, whereas at newly created estates the gardens were often designed entirely after new fashions. Linking this to the topography and distribution pattern of estates, seen in Chapter 6, this means that the areas of extensive estate building during the nineteenth century (e.g. along the main road in Zeist or close to the cities of Enschede and Oldenzaal) were mostly distinguished by landscape parks with lawns, tree clusters and irregular water features. Modern designs in the mixed garden style or the architectonic style generally appeared on twentieth century estates, located at more isolated sites.

After these case studies, which gave a detailed insight into the nature of landscape aesthetics in the study areas, the thesis investigated the various methods of how new ideas were diffused: through travel (both domestic and foreign), publications (pattern books, text books and travel guides), magazines, exhibitions and unions of professional designers. However, in most of its aspects garden fashion in the Netherlands between 1800 and 1950 followed foreign examples. Compared to England, France and Germany the country was late in taking up new fashions and in establishing exhibitions, garden magazines and a horticultural union. Throughout the nineteenth century most professional designers and landowners simply copied foreign examples.
Chapter 7. The Aesthetics of Estate Landscapes.

Even Dutch pattern and text books were based on foreign publications. From the 1880s more discussion arose on the subject of garden design, stimulating a more original and creative approach to the aesthetics of landscape. But even then, heated discussions of the representatives of the landscape style versus the architectonic style reflect developments seen previously in England and Germany. Nevertheless, as the field of garden architecture became more professional from the 1880s and the ideas were diffused through a larger spectrum of publications and exhibitions, a larger group of people became informed about trends in garden design. Changing attitudes towards gardens furthermore meant that they were seen as a form of social display and a recreational space. Both processes might also explain why in Twente a large number of professional designers had been frequently employed, as country estates of the newly wealthy largely arose after 1870.

So far, Dutch scholars have understated the role of landowners in the diffusion of new ideas and in general attributed the introduction of new fashions to professional designers. A few examples from the research areas have shown, however, that the landowners had actually a significant impact. Some landowners were creative themselves and were responsible for the lay-out of the estate. Others, who did employ a designer, dictated exactly the form of the landscape they wished to see created. Furthermore, it is clear that the social network of the landowners influenced the working area of the designers. In Twente it appeared that Springer was employed particularly by industrialists with an estate around Oldenzaal, whereas Dirk and Pieter Wattez were more frequently commissioned to design and alter gardens around Enschede. As such the social network of the owners resulted in a spatial clustering of commissions.

Now that we have seen how gardens in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Utrecht and Twente were laid out, and how ideas for new styles were diffused, we turn to the way in which these created landscapes were actually used by their owners and their guests. Chapter 8 deals with the various issues of recreation in the landscape, both as a form of conspicuous consumption and as an expression of personality and enjoying the countryside in a private atmosphere, which in turn might have had implications for the aesthetic layout of the landscape.
Chapter 8.
Leisure in the Landscape

INTRODUCTION
The Belgian garden designer Louis van der Swaelmen identified several recreational uses of the landscape which he considered a necessity at country estates (Van der Swaelmen, 1916, p. 124-125). These uses included tennis, swimming, walking, horse riding, gymnastics and hunting. Such leisure in estate landscapes, particularly the establishment of gardens, parks and hunting grounds, provided an important opportunity for the display of both wealth and taste. Undoubtedly, the manner in which the aesthetic landscape was laid out influenced the way it was used, and vice versa. Changes in design often reflected alterations in the way the landscape was intended to be enjoyed. Water sports, such as fishing, swimming and rowing (Figure 8.1) enjoyed an enduring popularity and were common activities in landscape parks throughout the period studied here. In contrast, the tennis court was a new element in gardens of the early twentieth century.

Figure 8.1: Family Neervoort van de Poll in the gardens of Beukenstein.
Source: Special Collections Wageningen
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This chapter deals with various aspects of the recreational use of estates, whether regarded as an act of conspicuous consumption or more private enjoyment of leisure time. Strolling over the grounds or shooting in estate woodland not only offered an opportunity to show off one’s status and knowledge of what was fashionable to relatives, friends and business associates, it increasingly became a personal, intimate experience. The first section of this chapter explores some of the ways in which the planned parks and gardens were experienced. This is followed by an exploration of a specific aspect of leisure, namely hunting and shooting. The chapter ends by briefly looking into the expenses incurred in creating these landscapes.

8.1 EXPERIENCING PARKS AND GARDENS

The aesthetics of the estate landscape were highly valued by the elite families, for whom recreation and entertainment played an increasingly important role in their lives. This section will focus on the way that the aesthetic landscape was experienced by estate owners and the ways in which this changed through the research period.

Prior to the nineteenth century the gardens of the elite were largely objects of display to be shown off to guests and enjoyed not only by the owners, but also by others (Williamson, 1995, p. 59). To some extent this remained true in the nineteenth-century Netherlands. More recent interviews with several Enschede estate owners revealed that they were all very aware ‘that a garden, an orchard and a well-kept park could illustrate the wealth of the owners’ (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 106). Owners often invited family, friends and business contacts to their estate. The banqueting house at Zwitserse Huis near Leersum, for example, was used to ‘receive relatives who, while enjoying a pipe, or a fragrant cup of tea or a refreshing glass of wine, wish to delight in unspoiled nature’ (Christemeijer, 1837, p. 168; Figure 8.2). Thus whilst maintaining your network of personal and business contacts you could show off the latest alterations in your garden, expressing your taste and knowledge of garden fashions. As will be noted below, such knowledge often focused initially on the use made of follies and other garden elements to express allegorical meaning, whereas later in the nineteenth century interest grew in the knowledgeable display of rare or expensive trees and plants.

Walking in the company of friends or family, owners could enjoy the beauty of the landscape which they owned and had helped to create. Garden pavilions at some distance from the main mansion offered the prospect of a moment of rest during the walk: ‘Wholly hidden in the green, stands a lovely white tent; those who tire can rest here and the pleasure of an aromatic cup of tea will give them new strength’ (Buiten, 1909, p. 441).
Walks through the aesthetic landscape of the estate were not merely recreational, but also philosophical and educational. The romantic philosophy that was apparent throughout nineteenth-century Europe also affected the use of gardens in the Netherlands. Romanticism implied an escape from reality into an ideal natural landscape in which people could express their individual feelings and enjoy freedom from the constraining rules of society (Geenen & Roeleveld, 1982, p. 16). This meant that more and more estate parks and gardens were not solely for display. The garden was also a place of peace and tranquility that the owners enjoyed on their own. The landed elite expressed their sentiments towards the natural beauty that they found in estates in letters and diaries. Referring to the family’s main estate at Het Amelink, Geertruid Blijdenstein-Van Heek wrote in a letter to her daughter in 1891 that: ‘I long intensely for the outdoors. It is so beautiful there. The nightingales sing wonderfully. Everything is in bloom’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 150). Such sentiments in effect, make more sense of the design fashion of that time, when estates were increasingly surrounded by woodlands to create a secluded, private space to enjoy.

The romantic philosophy also encouraged a reading of landscape which saw in it a symbolic representation of aspects of human emotions. The garden historian E.A. de Jong (1998, p. 124) argued that ‘the park brings ecstasy, makes the visitor attain salvation, … and brings him peace that gladdens the heart’. Variation in relief, vegetation and light in the park, and the follies that the visitor passed during his walk would evoke romantic, melancholic or joyous moods, encouraging self-reflection. Thus hermitages and ruins in the middle of the darkest and most isolated part of estate woodland symbolised human mortality (Nederlandsche Tuinkunst, 1837, p. 52-61). Other
garden features were intended to invoke more specific associations. Thus, for example, in 1883-1884 Louis Rutgers van Rozenburg, esquire, of the De Paltz estate commissioned Leonard Springer to design a labyrinth centred around a hermitage. Inside the hermitage stood a statue of a monk and a water tank on top of the roof was used to create a waterfall, apparently symbolising the parting of the Red Sea (Meulenkamp, 1992, p. 69).

Planting, too, was valued for its symbolic meaning. Conifers acted as substitutes for the Italian cypress trees of classical landscapes, oak trees symbolised power and strength, and pine trees, introduced into the Netherlands in 1750, became popular for their association with Switzerland (Blijdenstijn, 1992, p. 44). When walking through the gardens, the visitors were thus expected to have a good knowledge not only of contemporary fashions and taste, but also of classical architecture and ancient mythologies. Often there was a defined route that one needed to follow in order to best understand this picture. Sometimes monuments themselves bore inscriptions indicating the ways in which a landscape was intended to be viewed and interpreted, alternatively the landowner himself would take his visitors through the grounds, explaining the different features and views.

The poet T.J. Kerkhoven (quoted by J.B. Christemeijer, 1836, p. 25-28) wrote that by walking through a landscape park ‘we are strengthened to carry life’s burdens, … man becomes man again … and a new life force will flow through our veins’. Contemporary novelists such as Jacob van Lennep (1840) and Tine van Berken (1894) also emphasized the wonderful feeling of being in the outdoors. A guest at the Groeneveld estate near Baarn wrote the following poem in the guest book as an ode to the newly created landscape park:

De wandelaar, hier bekend sinds jaren,  
Staart vol verbazing in het rond;  
Vindt bergen waar eens bosschen waren,  
Vindt beken waar een heuvel stond.-  
De visschen, die in vijvers zwommen,  
Doorkruisen breeden waterkommen;  
't Wild dat zich ophoudt in deze Streek,  
Denkt in een paradijs te woonen.

The traveller, familiar here for years,  
Looks around in amazement;  
Finds mountains where once woods were,  
Finds streams where once a hill was.-  
The fish, which swam in ponds,  
Roam across broad water bowls;  
The game that appear in this Region,  
Thinks to live in a paradise.

Written by a guest at Groeneveld estate near Baarn in 1834.  
Source: HUA, Family Archive Huydecoper, document 646.
The gardens and parks of the landed elite in the nineteenth century were commonly laid out in the landscape style (see Chapter 7) in which various tree species were on display. Woods and groups of trees typically consisted of deciduous trees including beech, oak and elm, mixed with evergreens such as fir, pine and cypress. Species preferred when placing solitary trees on lawns included the common or coloured horse chestnut, red oak, brown beech or lime (Nederlandsche Tuinkunst, 1837, p. 40-41). Whereas, previously, particular trees were preferred for their symbolic associations, from the 1870s landowners started collecting tree species for their educational and scientific value. Sometimes owners would place signs beneath parkland trees specifically to identify interesting specimens; they also created arboretums as collections of specimen trees. The collection of tree and plant species marked the transition to a more rational, scientific approach to conspicuous consumption and experience of the aesthetic landscape. Symbolic elements formed only a minor part and instead greater attention was paid to the creation of a mixture of beauty and utility. The most notable example of tree collecting within the two regions studied here is the arboretum of Poort Bulten (Figure 8.3). It was created in 1912 by the landscape designer Leonard Springer, in close co-operation with its owners, the Gelderman family of Oldenzaal (Plan of Poort Bulten, SCL, document 01.418.01). Initially, the arboretum consisted of a large variety of conifers, but it was soon extended with other species, both deciduous and evergreen. These included specimens from the Caucuses, China, Japan and North America, such as sequoia, tulip tree, catalpa, redwood and dove tree (Moes, 2002, p. 89). The trees were arranged by family, colour and the shape of their leaves.
Overall, the recreational use of parks and gardens reflected a mixture of the conscious display of wealth and taste, and of a more personal desire to experience the tranquillity and spirituality of the countryside. The extent to which the possession of a garden reflected a desire for private space as opposed to a public statement of taste seems to have varied over time, but at any point it would have also reflected the specific aims and aspirations of individual estate owners.

8.2 ASPECTS OF HUNTING AND SHOOTING

Leisure in the estate landscape was not restricted to strolling through the gardens. Estates were also valued by their new owners as sites for more active recreational activities. Here particular attention will be focused on hunting and shooting, both as a reflection of their popularity and of their impact upon the landscape. Prior to the nineteenth century hunting and shooting had been activities largely reserved for the nobility and the lords of manorial districts (Renes, 2005, p. 23). During the period studied here, however, the sport was opened up to members of the middle class. Hunting and shooting were permitted only on an individual’s own land or on land for which they had rented the hunting rights. In addition, the pursuit of hunting and shooting generally required possession of a hunting permit purchased from the national government. In the Dutch language no clear distinction is made between hunting and shooting, both being referred to as jacht (hunting).

The 1857 law regulating hunting and fishing established a variety of permits, based on the kind of hunting to be undertaken (Staatsblad no. 78). For hunting woodcocks, quails and waterfowl an annual permit cost five guilders. Alongside this so-called ‘small hunting permit’ (kleine jacht-akte) there were also two types of ‘great hunting permits’ (grote jacht-akte). These allowed hunting of deer, hare, pheasant, partridge, wood pigeon, woodcock, grouse, water snipe, duck and other waterfowl. Thirty guilders had to be paid for a permit that allowed every kind of hunting: with hounds, with falcons, with guns and with nets. A permit excluding hunting with hounds and falcons cost fifteen guilders (Figure 8.4). Permits were not, however, needed for hunting on country estates if the area involved was completely separated from its surroundings by walls, hedges or moats (1857 Hunting Law, article 12).

Permits were issued by regional legal districts, which recorded permit holders in ledgers. Analysis of these ledgers revealed that the most expensive permit was rarely issued and that the new landed elite chiefly purchased the fifteen-guilder permit for shooting and netting. In contrast, the nobility and royalty still organised special hunts on a grand scale, including the pursuit of wild boar and deer, and drives organised by the Veluwsche Jachtvereniging (Hunting Society of the Veluwe) (HUA, 1001, no. 4393).
The name, age and place of residence of each individual to whom a permit was issued were recorded in the ledgers, giving an insight into the social side of hunting (HUA, 79, no. 7527-7528). Hunting and shooting are confirmed as almost exclusively male recreations. The ledgers also reveal the participation in hunting of many different members of the extended families making up the landed elite. For instance, in the ledgers of the Amersfoort District between 1903 and 1914 the De Beaufort family of Leusden and Woudenberg were particularly well represented. A dozen male family members aged over 18 years were named amongst the approximately 80 individuals issued with permits. In addition, sons younger than 18 years and resident at the parental home were allowed to accompany their fathers without having a permit in their own name (Hunting Law, article 7). The ledgers show, however, that in most instances young men purchased a hunting certificate as soon as they turned 18 years (HUA, 79, no. 7527-7528).

The area of the Utrechtse Heuvelrug where most newly created estates were located appears in the ledgers of Amersfoort and Rhenen. They record the permits issued both to members of the local nobility (e.g. Count Schimmelpenninck, Baron Taets van Amerongen, Count Bentinck) and to various owners of nouveaux riches estates, including Boissevain (Prins Hendriksoord), De Beaufort (De Boom), Rutgers van Rozenburg (De Paltz), Pauw van Wieldrecht (Pavia) and Van Beuningen...
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(Anderstein). The social side of hunting, that is who hunted with whom is not directly revealed in these ledgers. However, from the hunting diaries (1881-93) of Count Godard J.C.G. van Aldenburg Bentinck it appears that he hunted in company not only with other nobility, but also with gentry families including Pauw van Wieldrecht and De Beaufort (HUA, 1001, no. 2047). They also hunted together in the hunting society that was founded in Amersfoort in 1879 (Bas, 1880, p. 341; HUA, 1001, no. 4393).

Figure 8.5: Detail of the hunting permit ledger of the Amersfoort district in 1903.
Source: HUA, 79, no. 7527.

No such permit ledgers have been located in the Overijssel archives. However, surviving hunting diaries reveal something of the scale of activity and the passion clearly felt by some Twente industrialists for hunting as a pursuit (e.g. HCO, 233.1, no. 149). For instance, the hunting diary of Helmich Blijdenstein illustrates the application of businesslike precision to recording the type and weight of animals killed, the gun used and the location of the hunting ground. Helmich kept records of his hunts from 1879 to 1905, starting at the age of 10 years. Archival evidence and interviews with descendants in both Utrecht and Twente has shown that it was (and still is) common that sons joined their fathers and grandfathers on shoots and hunts from such a tender age (HCO; Van Heek
Family Archive; ex. inf. J. Van Notten, 2003). In this way the customs and etiquette of hunting were passed on from generation to generation. Etiquette forbade the killing of young animals, pregnant females, or females with young (Craandijk, 1959, p. 15). The 1902-03 regulations of the Holterberg hunting society (Holterberg is no. 26 on Figure 8.8) stated that if ‘anyone deliberately or thoughtlessly shoots young game then he will be fined to a maximum of 2.50 guilders’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 149). Hunting was thus regarded not only as a sport, but also as an exercise in nature management. Regulated hunting served as pest control and prevented poaching.

Game was a delicacy for estate owners, but also a gift for numerous others, including family and friends, business contacts, estate servants, tenants and station chefs [Meaning of this last term unclear]. Hunting diaries include long lists of game disposed of in this way, mainly hare, but also rabbit and pheasant. This was one aspect of the social side of hunting. But the companionship of the hunt was also important. Helmich’s diary, for instance, showed that he frequently hunted with relatives and friends in Twente, including G.J. van Heek, J.B. van Heek, E. ter Kuile, G.J. Jannink, J.B. Ledeboer and A. Ledeboer, all Enschede industrialists. This association reflected the close society of Enschede’s newly wealthy. The industrialists themselves established hunting societies, held hunting parties and frequently joined each other on hunts on their estates (Figure 8.6).

Figure 8.6: Hunting party with G.J. van Heek and sons at Lankheet, 1898.
Source: Family Archive Van Heek, Stichting Edwina van Heek, Enschede
By contrast with the apparent position in Utrecht, there is no evidence to suggest that the industrial *nouveaux riches* of Twente hunted with the local nobility. Whilst it was the case that between 1897 and 1952 the owners of Twickel, Count R.F. van Heeckeren van Wassenaer rented out hunting rights to a large number of ‘commoners’, including many local industrialists, this seems to have been an entirely business arrangement, implying no social contact (Twickel Estate Archive, no. 3177-3178).

Twente’s *nouveaux riches* thus chose to hunt within their own social circle, reinforcing the point made in Chapter 5 about the internally coherent nature of the group. To attend an organised hunt at one of the societies involved required membership or invitation by a member. In 1840, for instance, Jan ten Cate was invited to hunt with the Enschede Sorority (*Enschedese Societeit*). Exceptionally, he asked his cousin Lida Blijdenstein to join him. Jansen’s (1996b) suggestion that Lida hunted regularly rests on this evidence. This would be very unusual for a woman at this time (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 48). It is not certain, however, whether Lida accepted the invitation and whether this would imply full participation in the hunt, or simply involvement in associated social gatherings.

The hunting and shooting season generally started in August or September and continued until the end of January. In his diary Helmich Blijdenstein noted on 12 November 1892: ‘Hubertus hunt. 16 Hunters shot 23 hares, 5 partridges and 2 water snipes’ (HCO, 233.1, no. 149). Typically, industrialists hunted hares, partridges, rabbits, wood pigeons, woodcocks, grouse, water snipe, pheasants, quails and ducks. Occasionally they went on fox hunts and sometimes shot deer. The total numbers of animals shot by Helmich from 1884 to 1904 as recorded in his diary are presented in Table 8.1. On average he killed approximately 100 animals per year. Compared to Count Godard van Aldenburg Bentinck of House Amerongen, however, this was modest. The latter reported an annual average game kill of over 500 animals (HUA, House Amerongen Archive no. 2047). A member of the Van Heek family bore the nickname Vossen-Van Heek, that is Foxes-Van Heek (Figure 8.7) such was the frequency and success of his hunting (ex. inf. Van Notten, 2003). It should also be noted, however, that such enthusiasm was not universal. Some *nouveaux riches* families such as the Geldermans of Oldenzaal seem to have refrained from any form of game sports (ex. inf. Van Brandwijk, 2002).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hare</th>
<th>Partridge</th>
<th>Rabbit</th>
<th>Woodpigeon</th>
<th>Woodcock</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Grouse</th>
<th>Pheasant</th>
<th>Duck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: The amount of game killed annually by Helmich Blijdenstein, for the years 1884-1904.
Source: HCO, 233.1, no. 149.

Figure 8.7: G.J. van Heek at Het Stroot, late nineteenth century.
Source: Estate Archive Huis te Maarn. With kind permission of J. van Notten.
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The evident popularity of hunting amongst estate owners in Twente and Utrecht points to a need for investment in game production and protection. Archival evidence has shown that in both regions the newly wealthy often employed gamekeepers as key members of their estate management staff (e.g. House Amerongen, the Holterberg hunting society, the Van Heek family at the Zonnebeek estate and the Van Beuningen-Van Heek family of the Anderstein estate). More directly relevant in the current context are the associated investments in the creation and maintenance of extensive hunting grounds. ‘Foxes’ van Heek’s love of hunting, for instance, led him to buy over 400 hectares of land around Haaksbergen, known as Assink and Lankheet (HCO, 166, years 1841-1955). He also possessed hunting grounds to the south of Enschede and rented the hunting rights of part of the Twickel estate. Van Heek’s hunting grounds on the Twickel estate lay to the south of the village of Delden (shown on a sketch map of the hunting grounds of Twickel; Twickel Estate Archives, no. 3180).

Van Heek was not alone in his acquisition of land for the purpose of hunting. The creation of hunting grounds throughout eastern Twente had a significant impact on the existing rural landscape.

Figure 8.8: The location and name of hunting grounds mentioned in Helmich Blijdenstein’s hunting diary, 1879-1905.
Source: HCO, 233.1, no. 149.
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However, hunting grounds were not specifically identified as such in the cadastral ledgers. Instead, they formed part of a composite estate landscape of woodland, heathland and agricultural land. It is difficult, therefore, to determine precisely how extensive the hunting grounds were. Some indication of their scale and distribution can, however, be obtained from the grounds used by Helmich Blijdenstein, as recorded in his diary (Figure 8.8). For example, the hunting grounds at Haagsche Bosch (no. 5) extended over approximately 44 hectares (HCO, 233.1, no. 318).

Particularly in the vicinity of Oldenzaal, many of the hunting grounds mapped were the property of the Blijdenstein family themselves (e.g. Het Amelink, De Welle, Haagsche Bosch and Het Welna), whilst some were owned by other industrialists (e.g. Het Stroot and Holterberg). With the exception of Holterberg, the hunting grounds mentioned in the diary were all in the vicinity of Blijdenstein’s main estate near Enschede (marked in red on Figure 8.8). Unfortunately no surviving hunting diaries have been located for newly wealthy families in Utrecht, but from other archival sources and interviews with descendants it appears that most hunting took place on the Utrechtse Heuvelrug.

During the nineteenth century, hunting grounds, in common with other elements of the designed landscape went through a series of stylistic changes. Hitherto hunting had occurred primarily in so-called sterrenboszen, woods with star-shaped systems of lanes. At the junctions of the lanes the hunters would observe and shoot the game. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries existing sterrenboszen remained in active use (e.g. Slot Zeist; GAZ, Slot Zeist Archives no. 38). A few new examples were also created (e.g. Huis te Maarn; Huis te Maarn Estate Archives). Increasingly, however, it became popular to hunt in more natural woods and other landscapes – including heath land, open meadows and agricultural fields – that were already present on the estates. This variety of terrain, cover and landscape offered a more challenging hunt, involving different types of game. Consequently, rhododendrons were specially planted within woods to provide extra cover for pheasants, tracts of heath land were kept open for hunting grouse, and meadows and fields enclosed by hedges provided good quail hunting. Such changes largely resulted from the growing quality and precision of guns used in game shooting (Williamson, 1995, p. 133) and from a philosophical preference in wider society for things of a more natural character.

Other landscape elements that reflected the popularity of hunting were the many lodges and rifle ranges to be found on estates. Indeed, hunting lodges were sometimes the first buildings to be erected on a newly established estate, as was evident at Berghuisje estate in Utrecht and De Hooge Boekel in Twente. In 1898 Helmich van Heek employed the Enschede architect G. Beltman to design a hunting lodge at De Hooge Boekel estate (HCO, 166, 3822). Twenty years later his
descendants added a more substantial country house. The Lankheet estate was also created primarily for hunting. Here the Van Heeks built a lodge in the Norwegian style, where they often entertained hunting parties (Figure 8.9). The lodge still exists in the woods of the Lankheet estate. In Utrecht hunting lodges were also present at Huis te Maarn, Berghuisje and Anderstein.

Rifle ranges (schietbaan) were a more specialist product of shooting as a leisure activity. Here individuals could practice their skills by shooting clay pigeons, or at targets set out at the end of the range (Craandijk, 1950, p. 19; Rhoen, 1998, p. 54). The areas involved were typically 25 to 150 metres long and 2.5 to 6 metres wide. In 1885 the Pauw van Wieldrecht-Voombergh family applied for a permit to establish a rifle range at their Pavia estate in Zeist, which was given on October 30th. A month later a rifle range had been laid out on cadastral plot E219 (Rhoen, 1998, p. 55). After the purchase of the Dijnselburg estate in 1892, the son of the family, M.I. Pauw van Wieldrecht, also created a rifle range. It was shown in the cadastral ledger of Zeist as plot B4019 (Cadastral ledger of Zeist, 1892). The Denneberg estate in Driebergen provides an example of a rifle range established for a shooting society, dating from 1900 (Steenwijk, 1992, p. 124-125). A rifle range was also mentioned in Helmich Blijdenstein’s hunting diary, although it is not known where in Twente it was located. Other references to rifles range in Twente have not been found.

Hunting and shooting thus left a mark on the natural landscape in many ways, including the planting of exotic trees and plants, the creation of staged arenas for shooting, and the construction of hunting lodges and rifle ranges. The extent of hunting grounds meant that their impact upon the
landscape was substantial. Hunting and shooting were also an important element in the network of social contacts which bound sections of the *nouveaux riches* together. This pattern of social contacts reinforces the earlier observation that the industrialists of Twente were a coherent and largely self-contained group, whereas in Utrecht there was greater contact between the nobility and the *nouveaux riches*.

8.3 BEAUTY AND UTILITY

On the one hand it is clear that gardens and parks were not simply valued for their beauty, but on the other it was also the case that hunting grounds included elements of purely aesthetic planning. As the English landscape historian Tom Williamson (1995, p. 119) has noted: ‘members of the elite society … were creating landscapes with a wide range of functions. Parks were homes, farms and forestry enterprises as well as being works of art’. Thus, for example, cows and sheep performed a utilitarian function in keeping lawns short through their grazing; they were also valued for their milk, meat and wool. Yet keeping animals was not merely an economic exercise, it also had aesthetic potential. Swiss cows, for instance, were often favoured in the Netherlands as they helped to create the illusion of a Swiss alpine landscape (Figure 8.10).

![Figure 8.10: Cows graze the lawn at Nieuw-Sterkenburg estate, 1869.](image)

Source: Lutgers, 1869.
Similarly, the naturalistic ponds found in many landscape parks were not only valued for their beautiful appearance, but also for the possibility they offered of swimming, fishing and rowing (Figures 8.1). The designer Van der Swaelmen even transformed part of an existing landscaped pond into a swimming pool at Castle Meldert in Belgium in 1911 (Smeets, 2005, p. 20).

The combination of beauty and utility can be further explored through consideration of the uses made of woodland. As previously noted, many nouveaux riches landowners planted tracts of woodland within their parks, where they formed important elements in the design of both aesthetic landscapes and hunting grounds. The value of woodland in landscape design seems to have increased later in the nineteenth century. As most estates created by the nouveaux riches were increasingly located close to the urban fringes and to other country houses, privacy was often at a premium. Thus at De Hooge Boekel, an early twentieth-century estate sited close to Enschede, woodland was planted around the perimeter of the estate to create seclusion, establishing a private space where the family could enjoy the countryside in peace (Figure 8.11). The case of De Hooge Boekel, which was replicated elsewhere, also reveals the use made of woodland within the park, creating vistas to give shape and a sense of scale to relatively small estates (see Chapter 6).

![Figure 8.11: De Hooge Boekel estate, depicted by Anco Wigboldus (1977)](source)
Source: Van der Wyck & Enklaar-Lagendijk, 1983, p. 120.

Yet woodlands were also planted for its economic value. Coppice wood, that could be regularly harvested, was evident on many estates, often located between full-grown park trees. In the Netherlands oak, alder, birch and willow were most frequently used in coppicing, but use was also made of ash, maple, beech, acacia, horse chestnut and poplar. In 1817 a Dutch magazine praised the use of acacia as coppice wood as it not only yielded quality firewood and stock fodder, it was also
suitable for hedging and increased the fertility of dry and sandy soils (Buis, 1985, p. 669-670).

Perhaps as a result of such praise, estate records for Het Amelink show that acacia woods were planted there in the 1830s (HCO, 233.1, no. 456).

In the nineteenth century many estate owners in both Utrecht (e.g. Huis te Maarn, Anderstein and Molenbosch) and Twente (e.g. De Hooge Boekel, Zonnebeek, Egheria and Lankheet) invested in extensive pine woods for commercial production. In several cases the fast growing evergreens were sold for use as pit props in coal mines in the south of the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany. The local nobility also sought to profit from such enterprises. A sale advertisement for wood from the Amerongen estate offered ‘oak, poplar, beech, heavy spruce (suitable for mine, timber and hedge wood)’ (HUA, 1001, no. 1400). The archives of nouveaux riches estate owners yield no figures documenting the scale of timber sales, or the income derived in this way. However, a member of the Van Heek family recalled that mine closures in the Dutch province of Limburg had caused the family considerable financial trouble, as they lost their main market for timber (ex. inf. Van Heek, 2003).

Woods, both deciduous and evergreen, ponds and lawns thus served a variety of recreational and commercial purposes for their new owners. The recognition that even essentially ornamental estates were sometimes regarded as a source of income focuses attention on to the financial aspect of estate management. It seems appropriate, therefore, to also consider the extent of investment made in estate development and the employment of professional landscape designers.

8.4 THE PRICE OF TASTE

Previous chapters have shown that many newly created estates were located on poor quality heath land, much of it previously owned by communal organisations. This helped to minimise the cost of acquiring land itself as much was sold ‘for ridiculously low prices, sometimes less than 100 guilders per hectare’ (worth approximately 600 euros now; Bijhouwer, 1943, p. 136). By comparison, good quality land could be much more expensive; the purchase of only 17 hectares of woodland in Zeist in 1835, for example, cost Johannes Bernardus Stoop some 8,000 guilders (worth approximately 50,000 euros now; Rhoen, 2002, p.183).

Nevertheless, creating and maintaining the estate and any alterations in the style of house and garden could be costly. As might be expected, building or renovating the main house was the main item of expenditure on many estates. For instance, Jan Bernard Blijdenstein spent 25,426 guilders on improving his mansion near Enschede between 1806 and 1808 (HCO, 233.1, no. 229). More
than a century later, in 1922-23, his relatives the Blijdenstein-Van Heek family built a new mansion consisting of three living rooms and seven bedrooms on the Het Amelink estate. Almost 76,000 guilders were spent on this project, designed by the architect S. de Clerq (HCO, 233.1, no. 254). There is thus little reason to doubt the judgement of a contemporary garden critic that ‘creating a new landed estate cost much effort, money and time’ (Nederlandsche Tuinkunst, 1837, p.25-26). Indeed, the writer advised elderly would-be landowners to purchase or rent an existing estate, as this was much cheaper and easier than creating their own estate from scratch. Rental costs were, however, sometimes considerable. The Veldheim estate (Figure 8.12), including a mansion, stables, coach house and park was sold in 1848 for 10,700 guilders. But the new owner was able to recoup this investment quickly by renting it out for an annual fee of 2,300 guilders (Rhoen, 1999, p. 10).

Figure 8.12: Veldheim estate in 1869
Source: Lutgers, 1869.

The scale of spending on the development of a house on many estates created an impression that investment in landscaping of the parkland was sometimes a secondary consideration. The garden designer Springer criticised landowners who ‘willingly spend thousands and tens of thousands [of guilders] to build a house and decorate its interior, but generally … prefer not to spend hundreds [of guilders] on the garden or the park’. The quality of the latter inevitably suffered for ‘even though the designer has so much knowledge and a feel for beauty, with an empty or tight purse even the smartest can do nothing’ (Springer, 1886, cited by Geenen & Roeleveld, 1982, p. 155). Evidently
new landowners were not always willing to hire a professional designer or to pay substantial sums to lay out a garden, even though such expenditure could send out a powerful message about the owner’s wealth and awareness of the latest fashions.

The bills of professional designers give a good indication of the costs involved in laying out a landscape park. Moes (2002, p. 245-246) notes that for a public park in Deventer, Overijssel, in the 1880s L.A. Springer received 300 guilders for his plan and 200 guilders for executing his ideas on the ground. This was, however, only a small proportion of the total expenses for the creation of the park, estimated at 16,400 guilders. Earlier, in 1852, K.G. Zocher had designed a garden of 10 hectares on the Blikkenburg estate for the Huydecoper family. His bill gives a detailed insight into the financial side of creating an estate on this scale (HUA, 67, no. 1287). For reshaping the contours of the grounds and planting he asked 500 guilders, for excavating the canals and ponds he charged over 2,000 guilders, and he asked for 580 guilders as fees for himself and his assistant. Zocher planted rhododendrons, 200 evergreen bushes and trees (balms fir, ordinary fir, silver fir and pine), 250 deciduous trees and bushes (various species and varieties not further specified on the bill), a large number of flowers (including hydrangea, peony rose, azalea, dahlia and various roses), and fruit trees and bushes (apple, pear, raspberry, gooseberry, and red currant). In total 586 guilders were charged for the plants supplied for the park, flower borders and orchards. The overall bill for the project amounted to 4,600 guilders.

Zocher’s account also makes clear that designers themselves often arranged the supply of trees and plants. A bill from J.D. Zocher jr. to one of his clients in 1835 showed that individual seedlings of live oak (Quercus Virginia) and willow oak (Quercus Phellos) cost respectively 40 and 50 cents (Twickel Estate Archive, no. 3016). Poplars were relatively expensive, ranging from 75 to 90 cents. Pinus or pine trees varied greatly in price: Canadian pine was 75 cents, Argentinean pine only 25 cents. In 1885 the German designer C.E.A. Petzold billed the owners of the Twickel estate in Twente for supplying almost 37,000 plants and trees, including honeysuckle, maple trees, frutux, lime and oak. The price for these woody plants was 20 German schillings per item and the total bill came to 7485 German marks (Twickel Estate Archive, no. 3067). Petzold’s low price per plant or tree, irrespective of species, had been arranged with the owners of Twickel and reflected their purchase of Petzold’s entire stock (Jansen, 1988, p. 37).

Commissioning a professional designer to lay out a park and garden could, therefore, require substantial financial investment. Not all landed families could or would pay out such money. Some 40 per cent of the total of 98 newly created estates known to have been established in the province of Utrecht between 1800 and 1950 appear to have been laid out by a professional garden designer.
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(see Appendix IV). In Twente the proportion seems higher at 56 per cent of the total, that is 47 estates. In some cases a professional garden designer was employed more than once. The frequency with which gardens were redesigned gives some sense of how important it was for some new landowners to keep up with fashion. For instance, at Prins Hendriksoord near Den Dolder the owners called in designers in 1873, 1906-10 and 1909-10, and at Het Stroot near Enschede various designers were commissioned in 1874, c.1900, 1920, 1925 and 1950 (Van Groningen, 1999, p. 307-311; Olde Meierink, 1984, p. 56; Olde Meierink, 1985, p. 71-73). At Het Amelink successive members of the Blijdenstein family employed G.A. Blum in 1809, D. Wattez in 1881, the firm of H. Copijn & Son in 1922 and H.A.C. Poortman in 1928. From archival sources it appears that the owners also spent much time gardening themselves (see Chapter 7). At 19 parks in Twente and nine in Utrecht professional designers are known to have been employed more than once to design or alter the layout.

The absence of evidence to indicate the commissioning of a professional designer for 60 per cent of new estates in Utrecht and 44 per cent in Twente does not, of course, mean that their parks and gardens were not laid out to a premeditated plan. Such designs may have been executed by regional amateur designers, house architects, estate head gardeners and estate owners themselves. In most instances this would have represented a cheaper option than employing a specialist professional garden designer. The total annual wage for the head gardener at Slot Zeist in 1865, for example, was just over 200 guilders – less than the fee received by some professional designers for the basic plan of even a relatively modest estate (HUA, 67, no. 718).

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

The country estates of the newly wealthy in Twente and Utrecht increasingly assumed a recreational character. They became the site of a range of leisure activities, including rowing, tennis, hunting, shooting and walking. The newly established landscapes were thus consumed by their owning families in a number of different ways. During the early decades of the nineteenth century emphasis seems to have been placed on the beauty of the landscape and the symbolic meaning of individual elements, including follies and trees. By the 1880s a scientific approach was more in evidence as landowners started collecting tree, plant, flower and fruit species for their botanical educational value. There are also indications that over time recreational use of estates became more of a personal experience. Investments in the creation and modification of an aesthetic landscape came to be viewed less as an opportunity for conspicuous consumption and more as a means of meeting the owner’s own need for pleasure and enjoyment. This was reflected in the creation of a landscape which placed greater emphasis on privacy and seclusion. Trees were used both to screen the estate
from unwanted outside intrusion, yet also at the same time creating vistas which when viewed from inside the estate gave an enhanced sense of the scale of the property. Changes in estate design were thus a reflection both of trends in fashion per se and of changes in the ways that owners made use of their land.

This chapter has also paid considerable attention to hunting and shooting on landed estates as an important dimension of their recreational use. This is not a topic that has previously been widely studied by garden historians or historical geographers. Yet it is clear that interest in game sports was sometimes a factor in the creation or enlargement of estates. Innovations in weapons technology and changing attitudes to nature ensured that the design of hunting grounds themselves changed, with an impact on the overall appearance of estate landscapes. Hunting grounds ceased to be formally designed elements within the landscape as a desire for different types of hunting and shooting experience extended the sport to several different environments. Hunting thus became a factor in the management of woodlands, heath and meadows. It is also important to acknowledge that hunting was an important force in maintaining social relations between landowners – principally within the ranks of the *nouveaux riches*, especially in Twente – that are elsewhere cited as an influence upon the spread of attitudes towards estate management and design.

It has also been argued that for some new estate owners the creation and maintenance of a recreational landscape was sufficiently important to justify the substantial expenses often involved in land purchase, and the construction of a house and gardens as discussed in the previous and present chapters. However, whereas the former was invariably the work of a professional designer, this was less likely to be the case for the surrounding park. Remarkably, in Twente relatively more landowners employed professional designers than in Utrecht. The previous chapter has shown however that such employment did not necessarily mean a drastic change in the appearance of the estate as some owners were often quite cautious in the ways they altered original estate designs, employing designers who could refresh a design while remaining true to the spirit of its original design, even in cases where it had become distinctly old-fashioned.

An important aspect of this chapter is that it, again, illustrated the coherency and strong social links of the Twente industrialists. We shall now investigate this group more deeply through a comparison with similar individuals abroad: textile industrialists in the county of West Yorkshire.
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Country Estates of Industrialists:
An International Comparison

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the thesis so far the main focus of attention has been on the specifics of estate development and design in the two Dutch case study regions. It seems appropriate, however, to attempt to place the specific experience of the Dutch *nouveaux riches* into some wider perspective. By comparing people like the Ter Kuiles, Blijdensteins, Storks and Geldermans with a similar social group abroad, this chapter aims to provide a better perspective on the motivations, actions and taste in landscape aesthetics of this Dutch social group. In particular, some potentially interesting comparisons may be made between the largely industrial *nouveaux riches* of Twente and some of their British counterparts.

Previous chapters have shown that the new landed wealthy of Twente predominantly consisted of textile industrialists from local towns who had a marked interest in the various aspects of landownership, including agriculture, forestry, hunting, and the laying out of parks and gardens. They were characterised by their strong social coherence and their own particular taste and knowledge of garden design. As such, they stood out in Twente as a new elite. The importance of creating aesthetically pleasing landscapes on their new estates was reflected in the payments made to employ professional designers and to establish parks and gardens in fashionable styles.

To truly understand the nature of Twente’s new landed elite, however, it is important also to compare them to other individuals of similar backgrounds: self-made men whose fortunes derived from finance, commerce and industry, and who invested in landownership. In this respect comparison with aspects of the British experience seems particularly appropriate. This is not only because the Industrial Revolution started here and many newly wealthy became substantial landowners, but also because research on industry, new money and landownership is more advanced in Britain than in the Netherlands. Hence, knowledge obtained from work by scholars such as Thompson (1963, 1988, 1990, 1992) and Rubinstein (1981, 1987, 1992) can be used to inform comparisons between the two countries. Moreover, as has been previously noted, in the specific area of garden and park design Britain was a major influence upon thinking in the Netherlands of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
It seems appropriate also to focus on another successful textile district, which in the British context also gave rise to a new group of wealthy families and individuals who invested large sums in the acquisition of land and the creation of luxurious country homes. Such an area was the present-day county of West Yorkshire. The analysis of West Yorkshire that follows is structured around the main questions that have informed the thesis as a whole, it thus aims to document the key characteristics of the new landed elite, the distribution pattern of the country estates which they owned and established, and the use made of these estates as sites of recreation and conspicuous consumption. The ultimate objective of this chapter is, therefore, to consider what was distinctive about the Dutch experience and what parallels can be drawn with the ideas and attitudes of an emergent industrial *nouveaux riches* elsewhere in western Europe.

**9.1 THE WEST YORKSHIRE TEXTILE INDUSTRY**

In the nineteenth century the present-day county of West Yorkshire was part of the larger West Riding of Yorkshire. The areas of major textile production – in and around the urban centres, including Bradford, Leeds, Huddersfield and Halifax – were, however, largely confined within the smaller area that is today's West Yorkshire. The boundaries of the latter can, therefore, be conveniently used to define the study area (Figure 9.1).
The origins of textile production in West Yorkshire lie in a long proto-industrial phase of home-based cloth-production in the uplands of the region. From the end of the eighteenth century, however, the scale of the industry increased rapidly with the application of water- and later steam-power to mass production. The construction of steam-powered spinning mills and, subsequently, weaving sheds created a new urban focus for the industry. A variety of different types of cloth were produced, including cotton, worsted and woollen cloth. But it was the latter two which predominated. Particular districts within West Yorkshire also came to specialise in the production of specific textiles. Thus by 1800 the districts of Halifax (Figure 9.2) and Bradford accounted for 60 per cent of the national production of worsteds (Holroyde, 1979, p. 61). During the course of the nineteenth century the region remained one of the most important seats of production for woollen and worsted cloth in Britain and, indeed, in Europe.

As the textile industry flourished it also fostered the rise of a variety of related industries. These included dye and bleach works, but also engineering companies supplying steam engines (both stationary and locomotive), tools, machines and structural ironwork (Burt & Grady, 2002, p. 133-135). At the same time, West Yorkshire also developed an important commercial sector, focusing
not only on trade in textiles, but also banking and stock trading. The growth of West Yorkshire’s textile industry, furthermore, went hand in hand with rapid population growth. In Leeds the population rose from 30,669 in 1801 to 101,331 in 1851 and to 160,128 in 1881 (White’s Directory, 1853, 1894). Similarly, Bradford grew from 6,393 in 1801 to 52,501 at mid-century and 68,371 by 1881 (White’s Directory, 1853, 1894). These towns thus ‘shared the nineteenth-century urban characteristics of rapid growth, … and a greater concentration of power, status, professional and financial services than the surrounding countryside’ (Yasumoto, 1994, p. 52).

In comparison, the processes of industrialisation and urbanisation in Twente occurred at a later date and developed on a smaller scale (see Appendix VI). For example, Enschede, which became the leading textile town in Twente, was only a small village in 1801 with 1,835 inhabitants. As late as 1883 its recorded population remained low at only 5,801. Two years later, however, after the incorporation of the surrounding built-up area the population had risen to 12,118 (Hammer-Stroeve, 2001, p. 24). Demographic developments in the two regions thus reflect differences in the timing and scale of economic progress. Moreover, Twente’s relatively late development as an industrial region seems to have precluded the economic diversification seen in Yorkshire. Twente did develop a modest commercial sector, including an important bank, but its economy remained dominated by textile production.

9.2 THE NEW LANDED ELITE OF WEST YORKSHIRE

The diverse character of the West Yorkshire economy, which included several interrelated strands of commercial and industrial enterprise, was reflected in the social structure of the group of newly wealthy, which will be analysed in this section. In the context of this thesis only those who invested in land have been studied. In total 85 individuals have been identified as creators or purchasers of a country house estate in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century West Yorkshire. The entire list is reproduced as Appendix III; a representative sample is included here on Table 9.1.

Inclusion in the list of 85 is based on the possession of a country estate of at least 10 hectares or 25 acres in West Yorkshire, and on the extent of a family’s wealth and social status. Such information, as well as indications of the origins of individuals and families, has been gathered from diverse sources. These include archival material from the West Yorkshire Archive Service, contemporary directories such as Kelly’s or White’s, regional histories (e.g. Burt & Grady, 2002; Crump, 1931), family biographies (e.g. Law’s work on the Fielden brothers: 1995a, 1998), and contemporary studies of the Holdens, Fosters and Gotts in Fortunes Made in Business (Anonymous, 1884).
### Table 9.1: A sample of West Yorkshire’s new landed elite (see Appendix III for a full list).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>Source of money</th>
<th>Geographical Origin</th>
<th>Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armitage</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Created Holme House (1820s) and Banney Royd, Huddersfield (1902), design by Edgar Wood. Holme House sold to Sir Henry Ripley in 1840s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baines</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Created Weetwood Lodge (1870-75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blayds</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Oulton Hall (bought in 1790s, remodelled and extended 1810-12). Gardens by H. Repton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottomley</td>
<td>Textiles: mohair</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Shelf Hall, Bradford (1860s), Woodleigh Hall, Rawdon (1869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>Textiles: worsted</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Bought Cliffe Castle (1830s) in 1840s and rebuilt it in 1874-78 (architect George Smith) and in 1880-82 (architect Wilson Bailey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosland</td>
<td>Banking and textiles</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Crosland Lodge (1830-50) and Royds Wood (1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossley</td>
<td>Carpet manufacturing</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Belle Vue, Halifax (1848), Manor Heath Mansion (1852-53), Bermerside House (1872). Gardens at Belle Vue designed by Paxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Corn trade</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Headingley Castle (1843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbarn</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Woodsley House (1840-41) by John Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielden</td>
<td>Textiles: cotton</td>
<td>Todmorden</td>
<td>Dobroyd Castle (1869). House by John Gibson, gardens by Edward Kemp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Textiles: worsted</td>
<td>Queensbury</td>
<td>Prospect House (1827), Whiteshaw (1840s), Littlemoor (1890s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gott</td>
<td>Textiles: wool</td>
<td>Calverley, near Bradford</td>
<td>Bought Armley farm and created country estate in 1803. Designed by H. Repton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Textile pin and machine accessory manufacturer</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>St. Ann’s Tower (1860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>Textiles: wool</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Oakworth (purchased 1870s), Woodlands (established 1866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Park Hill (Wetherby), Meanwood Towers (Leeds, 1867) by E.W. Pugin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Flax-spinning</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Leased New Grange estate in Headingley in 1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murgatroyd</td>
<td>Textiles: worsted</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Created Bankfield, Cottingley (1848) and Broadfold (1877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Bought Roundhay Park in 1804 and created new house in 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Oxley Hall (Weetwood Villa; 1861-67), Spenfield House (1877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>Textiles: wool</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Milner Field (?), Crow Nest, Lightcliffe (1867)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugden</td>
<td>Textiles: worsted</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Eastwood House (1819), purchased Steeton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetley</td>
<td>Brewery</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Fox Hill (1863)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9.1 documents the financial and geographical background of around one-third of the total population of newly landed families identified in West Yorkshire. It indicates that the majority of the new landowners were local businessmen from a wide range of professions, including textile manufacturers and merchants, bankers, engineers and brewers, reflecting the economic variety of the region. As might be expected, therefore, the new landed elite of West Yorkshire came from a more varied economic background than their counterparts in Twente.

Heading this group were individuals such as the Fielden brothers, Samuel, John and Joshua of Todmorden, who ran a successful spinning and weaving business on the border between Yorkshire and Lancashire. In 1865 the partnership was valued at over £1.1 million. Each of the three brothers had a personal fortune of approximately £500,000, equivalent to about £100 million at today’s monetary values (Law, 1998, p. 79). In John Bateman’s list of great landowners in 1883 – which included only those owning at least 3,000 acres in England with an annual value of at least £3,000 – we find John Fielden of Grimston Park (2,974 acres in Yorkshire worth £6,272). Few others could match their wealth. Bateman’s list does, however, help us to identify other particularly wealthy individuals amongst West Yorkshire’s nouveaux riches. These included Sir George Armitage of Kirklees Park (3,274 acres worth £8,700 annually); William Marshall of Cookridge Hall (over 3,000 acres worth £2,010 annually); and William Foster of Hornby Castle (1,884 acres in Yorkshire worth £1,098 per year; and over 10,000 acres in Lancashire). At his death in 1884, Foster left a financial estate of £1.4 million (Nicholas, 1999, p. 36).

Yet it is also clear that people not included by Bateman amongst his great landowners also possessed both money and land. For example, John Thomas Hemingway left an estate of £306,500 in 1926, although it has been suggested that his real worth was nearer to £500,000 (Lutyens, 1981, p. 108-109). Leeds mill owner Benjamin Gott and Keighley machine-maker Prince Smith II both left over £1 million at their deaths, respectively in 1840 and around 1900. More limited, but still substantial for its time, was the fortune of Thomas Stuart Kennedy, partner in the engineering firm of Fairbairn in Leeds and owner of the Meanwood Towers estate. Kennedy died in 1894, leaving £80,578 (Sheeran, 1993, p. 118, 128, 134, 138). Compared to the Holdens and Fieldens his wealth was modest indeed. However, when compared to Twente industrialists his wealth was quite substantial. Throughout the nineteenth century the pound was equivalent to around 10 guilders. This makes it easy to calculate the relative worth of Dutch financial estates such as that of Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein who left over 300,000 guilders (c.£30,000) at his death in 1857 and his son Albert Jan who left approximately 730,000 guilders (c.£73,000) in 1896 (HCO, 233.1, no. 74, 127). Only the very wealthiest amongst Twente’s industrialists, such as Gerrit Jan van Heek, whose share
in the firm Van Heek & Co grew from 70,000 guilders (c.£7,000) in 1859 to over 4 million guilders (c.£400,000) in 1896 could compare with successful Yorkshire businessmen (Van Schelven, 1984, p. 150-151).

Chapter 5 noted that Twente industrialists had interests beyond their own individual businesses, particularly in fostering regional development through improvements in rail, canal and road networks. Investments in such projects were clearly intended to reduce the isolation which the region suffered and, in turn, enhance the development prospects for their own textile enterprises. Such entrepreneurial investments were also evident in West Yorkshire where, as in Twente, most of the newly wealthy originated from, and resided within, the area itself. Thus, William Foster of the Blackdike Mills in Queensbury strongly promoted the construction of the Bradford to Thornton railway in order to open up the district (Anonymous, Volume II, 1884, p. 26-27). Both Foster and John Fielden of Todmorden were also directors of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company, a key element of the transport infrastructure linking two major textile districts. The Twente and West Yorkshire industrialists thus exhibited a common interest in the related development of their own personal business empire and the fortunes of their home region.

It is important to acknowledge, however, a wider social dimension to the evident interest displayed by both British and Dutch industrialists in local and regional development. One specific mark of this was the interest which a few individuals displayed in the creation of model housing, or even entire villages, as a means of improving social and sanitary conditions for their workers. An important Dutch example of this form of investment is the model village of Lansink in Enschede created by the industrialist C.F. Stork in the 1910s (Oversticht, cd-rom Enschede). Significantly, Stork’s ideas were based on foreign examples, particularly those of English garden villages. Earlier counterparts are, indeed, to be found in West Yorkshire. The best known of these is Saltaire near Bradford, established in the 1850s by Sir Titus Salt (1803-1876). The other model village in West Yorkshire is Akroydon in Halifax, created by Edward Akroyd from 1861 onwards (Figure 9.3). The creation of Lansink, Saltaire and Akroydon reflected the importance of the textile industry in economic and social development, as well as a philanthropic paternalism.

The creation of model villages, however, was exceptional in both study areas. Other aspects of charity and paternalism were more common and became an important facet of the ‘nouveaux riches’ new social lives. For example, White’s Directory of 1894 reports that in ‘about 1869 Sir Francis Crossley baronet presented to the town [of Halifax] £10,000 for the Infirmary and Dispensary, and £10,000 for a Loan Charity’. In previous years the family had built a set of Almshouses in the town
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(White’s Directory, 1894, p. 1332). Of the industrialist John Fielden it was said that ‘his interest in local affairs has always been very great, and the town [of Todmorden] has much cause to remember the many useful local undertakings with which he has identified himself’ (Anonymous, Volume I, 1884, p. 435). Fielden had, for example, built at his own expense a coffee tavern and club-room for the use of the people of Todmorden. Comparable examples of this relatively modest scale of social investment – which was not, of course, entirely disinterested – might be cited from Twente, in part reflecting wider notions of industrial paternalism evident throughout much of western Europe during the nineteenth century.

![Figures 9.3: The model village Akroydon in Halifax. Photographed by author, June 2004.](image)

The Dutch and English case study groups greatly differed from each other, however, in their social networks and the degree to which they enhanced their social status. The industrialists of Twente seem to have been characterised by a strong internal social coherence, as revealed in intermarriage, business links and common membership of hunting and agricultural societies. They thus formed a new social group that established few contacts with the established nobility. The experience of the West Yorkshire *nouveaux riches*, however, seems to have been more varied. An example of intermarriage can be found in Keighley, where the Methodist Isaac Holden married Sarah Sugden of a Keighley industrial family. Such examples are, however, few, although it appeared that most marriages occurred between families of equal rank – for example Samuel Fielden married Sarah Jane Yates, daughter of a Liverpool merchant, and John Murgatroyd jr. married Claire Hawley

No evidence has, however, been found that would indicate that any of the families studied here became linked to the existing nobility through marriage. Yet it was the case that the wealthiest industrialists sometimes themselves acquired titles and sought social contact with established landowners. For instance, Robert J. Foster, who purchased Stockeld Park estate near Whetherby in 1886, regularly hunted together with regional gentry and noblemen including Lord Harewood and William Ferrand esquire of the St. Ives estate near Bingley (YAS, DD170, no. 35).

It was also the case, as in Twente, that new estates in West Yorkshire were established by members of existing landed families. The Edwards family, for example, already owned the Pye Nest estate near Halifax, established by John Edwards esquire in 1771, with a house designed by the famous Yorkshire architect John Carr. Two generations later Henry and Captain Joseph Priestley greatly extended the family’s landed property by respectively buying Hope Hall in 1850 and creating the new estate of Castle Carr in 1852-53 (Wild, 1976, p. 107).

It seems, therefore, that the newly wealthy of West Yorkshire were a group which consisted primarily of local businessmen from a variety of professions, but which shared a keen interest in wider economic and social development at a regional and national level. There is a lack of evidence for inter-marriage and strong social links. Although the current thesis could not accommodate further archival research into the genealogy of the newly wealthy in West Yorkshire, it is advised that such research is done in the future. From the available documents, however, it appears that due to their differences in wealth, landed property, religion and the consequent fragmentation of social contact the group was less internally coherent than the nouveaux riches of Twente. Attitudes towards landownership and motives for investment were correspondingly varied, which influenced the choices made regarding the location of estates and the uses to which this land was put. It is to the first of these themes that the next section turns.

9.3 DISTRIBUTION PATTERN OF NEW COUNTRY ESTATES, 1800-1950
The country houses and estates to be discussed in West Yorkshire had to meet several criteria for inclusion in this study. The size of the land holding had to be at least 10 hectares or 25 acres (as discussed in Chapter 1), including a mansion and a garden or park, and it needed to be established as a country estate between 1800 and 1950. The size criterion differs from that used by Bateman (1887) and modern scholars such as Bettey (1993), Rubinstein (1981, 1987, 1992) and Cannadine.
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(1990, 1994), namely that an estate should be over 3,000 acres. As was noted in Chapter 1 such a focus on extensive landed properties ignores the smaller country estates created by the newly wealthy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Merchants, bankers and industrialists who did not rely upon their land as a primary source of income generally owned relatively small estates, as was also the case in the Netherlands. Thus by focusing on smaller estates and comparing them with their Dutch counterparts this thesis also contributes to the study of British country estates. The factors that are seen to have influenced the distribution pattern in Twente will now be explored for West Yorkshire: distance to city, infrastructure, communication, land availability, existing landownership, the physical landscape and social networks.

In West Yorkshire 90 country estates have been identified as meeting the criteria given above (Figures 9.4-9.6). This means that some of the 85 families identified as new estate owners must have owned several properties; these included the Akroyds (Bankfield and Millbank Hall), the Oxleys (Oxley Hall or Weetwood Villa and Spenfield House) and the Fosters (Whiteshaw, Littlemoor and Prospect House). For an overview of all newly created estates and their owners see Appendix III.

**Travel, transport and communication**

As in Twente, the newly created estates in West Yorkshire were generally located at a short distance from the industrial towns and near major transport routes to offer quick and easy access to urban places of business. In the 1840s Leeds was connected by rail with Bradford and Skipton, linking to the Lancashire and Yorkshire railway in Skipton, thus getting a connection with Manchester. In later years, other industrial towns such as Dewsbury, Huddersfield and Wakefield also received rail connections with Leeds (Raistrick, 1970, p. 147). Such connections were important for the businessmen in terms of economic progress, but also enabled them to venture further away from their business when establishing a country estate.

Nevertheless, approximately 50 per cent of the estates shown on Figure 9.6 were located within a 5-kilometre radius from the major urban centres of Bradford, Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield and Keighley, and almost 90 per cent of the total was situated within a 10-kilometre radius of these towns and cities, but such a radius around the major industrial centres covers almost the entire region of the West Yorkshire textile.
For 80-90: see inlay map
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Figure 9.4: Estates established during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the present-day county of West Yorkshire.

Thus members of the Crossley family, successful Halifax carpet and rug manufacturers of Dean Clough mill in Halifax (Figure 9.1), created estates at the very edge of the town: Bermerside (no. 56; Figure 9.4), Manor Heath Mansion (no. 58), and Belle Vue (no. 60). Similarly, Henry Oxley and his son, both bankers in Leeds, built mansions to the north of the city: Weetwood Villa or Oxley Hall (no. 17) and Spenfield House (no. 15). Sometimes the distance to the town was so small, for instance at Woodsley House (no. 23), that within a few years of being established the mansion was surrounded by new urban development.

In most cases, it appears that West Yorkshire businessmen preferred to stay within a close range of their own place of business. Even estates such as Carleton Grange (no. 26) and Dobroyd Castle (no. 66) that were situated in more remote parts of the region, were in fact located near to the individual owner’s business. Dobroyd Castle, for example, was the property of the Fielden family of Todmorden. From the castle in its elevated position the family could look down over their factory in the valley (Anonymous, Volume I, 1884, p. 435). With their increasing success and wealth, families like the Fieldens also invested in purchasing existing noble estates in neighbouring counties or even further away (see below). However, these properties were generally used to ‘enjoy the hunting..."
In other instances, improvements in communications offered the opportunity to work at a greater distance from the office. Several families were early investors in the installation of telegraph and telephone links, for instance Louis John Crossley of Halifax (in the 1880s) and Sir Isaac Holden of Keighley (Sheeran, 1993, p. 83-84). The latter, with prosperous wool combing factories in Bradford and parts of France, had settled down in West Yorkshire in the 1870s in the modest Oakworth House, the family home of his second wife Sarah Sugden (Anonymous, 1884, Volume I, 39; Sheeran, 1993, p. 83-84). His improvements to the house included the installation of a telegraph and an internal phone network. Such cases were, however, unusual and it seems that the advent of telegraph and telephone services was not a factor in encouraging a widespread development of mansions in isolated locations.

**Existing landownership and land availability**

In Twente we saw that the apparent dominance of the established elite in one part of the region influenced the pattern of distribution of newly created estates in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although in West Yorkshire noble and gentry estates seem to have been more widely
spread (Figure 9.7) the presence of established land holdings also constrained the opportunities for new estate development. Particularly noticeable are the several large estates established prior to 1800 to the east and north-east of Leeds – including Harewood House, Temple Newsam, Lotherton Hall and Bramham Park – and to the south of Wakefield – for instance Woolley Hall and Bretton Park. The landholdings of families like Lane-Fox (over 15,000 acres), Wentworth (over 20,000 acres) and Lascelles (almost 30,000 acres) were locally dominant (acreages in West Riding, after Bateman, 1887). The potential for creation of new estates in these areas was correspondingly limited; although some existing estates were ultimately purchased by newly wealthy families. The motives for such purchases are discussed in section 9.4.

Figure 9.7: The distribution of country estates and houses in West Yorkshire – distinguishing those established before and after 1800.

The influence of an established landed class upon the location of new estate developments suggests some parallels with the circumstances already observed in Twente. In the latter case, however, estate development was greatly encouraged by the dissolution of the marken, which released substantial amounts of land on to the market during the nineteenth century. There was no transformation of systems of landownership on a similar scale at this time in West Yorkshire. Here
the main enclosure movements had chiefly taken place before the 1800s. Some moorland did, however, remain to be enclosed during the nineteenth century. A minority of would-be landowners was able to capitalise on the opportunities this represented to obtain large areas of land at minimal cost. The enclosure of moorland to the north-west of Halifax, for instance, enabled Captain Joseph Priestley Edwards to invest in land on a grand scale in 1852. Together with later extensions he thus created the Castle Carr estate of 1500 acres (WYAS Calderdale, no. CAC7; Wild, 1976, p. 108). Similarly, the enclosure of the village common in Oulton enabled the merchant banker John Blayds to extend his estate at Oulton Hall (see below). The ‘inclosing [of] Lands in the Manor and Township of Headingley-cum-Burley’ in Leeds in 1829 also provided the trigger for the establishment of a number of small country estates (Daniels, 1999, p. 242; Repton, 1809; WYAS Leeds, WYL160/DB 170; Hall, 2000, p. 36-38). But these were relatively isolated instances compared with the general privatisation of land seen in nineteenth-century Twente.

**Physical landscape**

Perhaps the greatest contrast between the two study areas lies in the character of the natural environment. In Twente upland sites were valued for their aesthetic qualities; in this generally low-lying environment the elevations of up to 80 metres found on the ice-pushed ridges introduced a welcome element of variety into the landscape. This combined with the low purchasing cost of the land, much of it released through the division of the *marken*, made these districts popular as the location for new estates. In West Yorkshire the relief was of a different order and the uplands – often high, windy, remote, desolate and unmanageable moors – were unlikely locations for the development of landscaped parks and gardens. Indeed, only a few mansions were situated on land above 200 metres, for instance: Millbank Hall (no. 65; 1820s), Dobroyd Castle (no. 66; 1869; Figure 9.8), Broadfold House (no. 67; 1894), Castle Carr (no. 68; 1860), Whiteshaw (no. 69; 1840s) and Longlands (no. 75; 1884).

In all these instances, however, the mansion was situated on the edge of the relief, overlooking a valley. The estate itself might extend onto the higher moors. For example, Dobroyd Castle was built in 1869 to the west of Todmorden, standing on the flanks of the Pennines with views over the Calder Valley. The castle was surrounded by a park consisting of a large lawn with several solitary trees, tree belts, two irregular lakes and various walks (WYAS Calderdale, FPL 6; Figure 9.8). On the moors the Fielden family had their hunting grounds. Equally, Upper Shibden Hall, built for the Stocks family at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was characterised by its dramatic position 300 metres above the Shibden Valley. The park included picturesque plantations and a viewing tower (Sheeran, 1993, p. 88).
Nevertheless, the majority of new country estates in West Yorkshire were established on grounds below 100 metres. In these lower lying areas, however, locations with contrasting relief were often desired. As in Twente such landscapes were valued as they offered great potential for creating stylish and interesting gardens and parks. William Francis Tetley’s estate at Foxhill in Meanwood Valley to the north of Leeds, for instance, was situated so that it not only ensured quick access to Tetley’s brewery in Leeds, but also overlooked the valley giving the owner a picturesque view of the hillside with mature woodland, boulders, ferny hollows and picturesque steps (Sheeran, 1990, p. 182). Other examples of such locations include Arncliffe Hall in Headingley, Buckstone House and Woodleigh Hall in the Aire Valley, and Whinburn near Keighley. Thus, as in Twente, relief was important both for dramatic effects in the immediate landscape of the park and for extensive views over the surrounding environment. Topography – particularly the low hills of the Pennine flanks – may thus have contributed to the clustering of estates in the west part of the region over the east.

In practice, the location of individual estates and the resultant distribution pattern of the population as a whole reflected a series of different influences. The concentration of activity in the spa town of
Ilkley (Figure 9.5), for instance, was largely the result of a railway connection established in 1865 (Muir, 2001, p. 201), which minimised the duration of travel to Leeds and Bradford. It was also stimulated by the sale of land by the Middleton Estate from the 1860s (CAA Ilkley, 2002, p. 26), and the health benefits of Ilkley as a spa town set amidst attractive moorland, which was also extensively used for shooting. The country houses and villas of Ilkley were situated on the flanks of Ilkley Moor, often in close proximity to each other. The high density of country houses around the town gave this development a suburban character. In this it can be compared to the string of country houses established in Driebergen and Zeist in the province of Utrecht. Substantial houses were built for the *nouveaux riches* in Ilkley from the 1870s onwards. One of the latest, and largest, of these, Heathcote (1906; no. 80 on Figure 9.5) will be discussed in more detail in section 9.6.

### 9.5 PURCHASING EXISTING ESTATES

Alongside the creation of new estates by the newly wealthy in West Yorkshire, it was not unusual for them to purchase existing noble and gentry properties (Figure 9.9). As the creation of a new estate often involved painstaking piecemeal land accumulation, many amongst the newly wealthy preferred to purchase an existing estate. Indeed, often this was the only way to acquire a substantial property located close to one of the region’s major urban centres.

Benjamin Gott, for example, acquired the modest Armley House estate (no. 7) near Leeds in 1803; Major Johnston Jonas Foster of Queensbury bought Cliffe Hill (no. 11) near Lightcliffe in 1854, and Sir Titus Salt acquired the neighbouring Crow Nest estate (no. 12) in 1867 (Daniels, 1999, p. 245-250; Anonymous, Volume II, 1884, p. 53-54; Sheeran, 1990, p. 162). Other examples include Upper Shibden Hall (no. 15), purchased by the colliery owner and brewer Michael Stocks, who replaced the old building with a new house in 1800-20. Similarly, Oakworth House (no. 21) was created for Sir Isaac Holden in the 1870s on the site of an older house; and Steeton Hall (no. 20; renamed Currerwood) became the property of Sir Swire Smith, worsted spinner, in 1895 (Anonymous, Volume I, 1884, p. 39; Sheeran, 1990, p. 162). At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Nicholson family purchased Roundhay Park in Leeds (Figure 9.12). In 1818 they built a new mansion and created a large landscape park (WYAS Leeds, WYL 59, no. 9). Remodelling or replacing the house and altering the grounds was thus common practice after such changes in ownership.
In some instances, possession of a noble or gentry estate was also sought after to ensure a higher status in society, particularly by the wealthiest of nouveaux riches. Thus the Economist (16 July 1870) noted that ‘social consideration is a great and legitimate object of desire, and so great is the effect of this visibility of wealth upon social consideration that it would pay a millionaire to sink half his fortune in buying 10,000 acres of land to return a shilling per cent, rather than live upon the whole without land: he would be a greater person in the eyes of more people’. Most writers on British ‘new money’ have thus suggested that the investments in large landed properties reflected the aspirations of the wealthiest newcomers for entrance into the landed elite (Thompson, 1963, p. 20, 23; Rubinstein, 1987, p. 145-146; Wilson, 1971, p. 220). This was reflected, for instance, in the auctioning of the noble estate of Grimston Park in the 1870s. Set in the Vale of York the estate extended to 2,875 acres, including a limestone mansion, a park of 600 acres and several tenanted farms and cottages. It was auctioned in July 1872 (with a reserve of £200,000), and immediately spurred a bidding competition between William Henry Foster of Queensbury and John Fielden of Todmorden. Eventually Fielden’s bid of £265,000 was accepted (Law, 1995a, p. 209-210). The fact that both parties were prepared to pay well above the reserve shows that the purchase of existing, noble estates was a serious matter.
Amongst the wealthiest of West Yorkshire’s *nouveaux riches* it was indeed common to buy existing properties both inside and outside West Yorkshire (particularly in neighbouring Lancashire and other parts of Yorkshire). Thus, in 1861 John Foster of Black Dike Mills in Queensbury purchased Hornby Castle in North Lancashire for £205,000 (Anonymous, Volume II, 1884, p. 39). The medieval castle was surrounded by an estate of over 11,000 acres. Other examples include Stockeld Park (bought by Robert Foster in 1886), and Wiganthorpe Hall (property of Sir Isaac Holden) (Anonymous, 1884, Volumes I, p. 2-44 & Volume II, p. 4-56). These families all owned mansions in the vicinity of their businesses, but also chose to invest in more extensive landed properties, which they used for entertaining guests, shooting and hunting, and other forms of recreation. Most striking is the purchase of Somerleyton in Suffolk by Francis Crossley, and of Nutfield Priory in Surrey by Joshua Fielden in 1870 (Anonymous, Volume I, 1884, p. 440). Previously Fielden had lived at Stansfield Hall in Todmorden, but after entering Parliament he obviously felt the need for a more luxurious home closer to London (Law, 1995a, p. 209).

The acquisition of existing estates was also common among Twente *nouveaux riches*. However, from Chapters 5 and 6 it was clear that such investments did not seem to be motivated by a desire to enter noble society. Instead, the purchase of a noble estate generally served simply to extend the family’s property and was often an easier option than attempting to create a large new landholding. Specific aspirations for ennoblement were only infrequently expressed and were sometimes actively discouraged. In West Yorkshire, too, the desire for enhanced social standing should not be exaggerated. Few beyond the very wealthiest and most influential amongst the *nouveaux riches* aspired to acquire a title or to mix socially with the existing landed nobility. Nevertheless, status within their own social circle was certainly important to the newly wealthy of both Twente and West Yorkshire. In this context, ownership of land was a symbol of affluence, as was the creation of hunting grounds, and parks and gardens in fashionable designs. These particular aspects of landownership form the focus of the following section.

### 9.6 LEISURE IN THE LANDSCAPE

Many estates in both Britain and the Netherlands were acquired in part as sites for recreation. In the Dutch context previous discussion has highlighted the impact upon the landscape of activities including the creation of parks, gardens, arboretums and hunting grounds. Here we will briefly explore this last activity in the British context.

Traditionally hunting and shooting formed an important part of the social life of the established noble elite, not only as a gentlemanly sport, but also – or even more so – as a source of social
contact. To join a private hunt or shoot one needed a personal invitation from the landowner (Muir, 2001, p. 197). Hunting with hounds organised by hunting societies was, however, also permitted on other land, including farmland (Kendall, 1928, p. 56). Initially such hunts were reserved for the well-to-do gentry, but from the first half of the nineteenth century members of the newly wealthy also joined in. An advertisement from the Leeds Mercury (21 November 1824) announced the Halifax Hunt that was to take place in Harrogate country. Up to 300 horsemen and 3,000 people on foot took part in the hunt, revealing the popularity of the sport. Private hunts still took place in the region, for instance the Badsworth Hunt on the land of the Earl of Darlington and the Bramham Moor Hunt of Mr. George Lane-Fox of Bramham Park (Victoria County History, 1974, p. 486-487). For these private hunts an invitation was still required.

Shooting became equally popular, but for this ownership of large tracts of land, particularly moorland, was required. Before 1831 it was not permitted for commoners to shoot grouse or pheasants (Muir, 2001, p. 197). From then onwards new game laws opened the sport up to a broader public such as West Yorkshire’s wealthy middle class of industrialists. Yet, even then shooting was restricted to areas of large moorlands, such as Ilkley Moor and the Pennines. Shooting took place, for instance, at Castle Carr (Figure 9.10) that had been erected in 1859-72 as a country house and shooting lodge for Captain Joseph Priestley Edwards (1818-1868). Edwards had bought his first land in 1852 on the occasion of the enclosure of various moorlands in the area (Wild, 1976, p. 108). The following year he extended his property when obtaining the rights of Hunting, Shooting and Fishing in the townships of Warley and Oxenhope, accounting for over 1500 acres of connecting land. Game shooting occurred seasonally on the moors of the estate. Edwards also rented a shooting estate in Pertshire, Scotland (Wild, 1976, p. 107). That shooting grounds were valued highly, is illustrated by the sale particulars of Pye Nest estate in 1887, which made mention of ‘three miles of the best grouse moors in England’ (WYAS Calderdale, MISC 265).

The popularity of hunting and shooting was not, however, simply a reflection of an aspiration to join the landed gentry, nor did the activity ensure gentrification for those who aspired to it (Thompson, 1988, p. 270). Thompson argues furthermore that an ambition to enter into the landed elite (and the fulfilment of this ambition) ‘was confined to a minority who bought sizeable landed estates usually of around a thousand acres and upwards’. Thompson’s arguments thus supports the thesis’ evidence that only a small group within the new landowners studied here sought closer ties with the nobility. This minority included the wealthiest families amongst West Yorkshire’s commercial and industrial elite who often invested in the purchase of noble estates with extensive shooting grounds in the Dales and North Yorkshire Moors.
Robert J. Foster of Queensbury, for example, hunted regularly at Stockeld Park estate near Wetherby, where he owned most of the land from the 1880s onwards (YAS, DD170). Foster’s personal game books show details of hunts at Stockeld Park, Spofforth Hags and North Deighton, including the names of people with whom he went hunting - including Lord Harewood, William Ferrand esquire and R. Ramsden esquire - and those who received the game. On October 27th 1914, for example, six guns shot 31 wild duck, 442 pheasants, 1 woodcock, 5 rabbits and 4 snipes (YAS, DD170, no. 35). Estate account books also showed the yearly amount spent on the wage for
gamekeepers. For instance, in 1896 £105 was spent (compared to £127 for the whole household). In 1909 the expenditure for game keepers was over £700 (YAS, DD170, no. 3-4).

Already from this short account it has become clear that game sports were popular past-times amongst the Dutch and English newly wealthy, as they were amongst the nobility in both countries. It seems, therefore, that hunting and shooting were important aspects of landownership. Some differences can also be noted, however. The example of Castle Carr illustrated that the newly wealthy of West Yorkshire largely confined their shooting to the moors on the high, isolated hills. As such it contrasted with the situation in Twente, where the Blijdensteins and Van Heeks particularly appreciated a variety of landscapes, incorporating woodlands, moors, fens and even farmland. On the ice-pushed ridges around Enschede and Oldenzaal the industrialists planted woodlands with rhododendrons for extra cover for the hunted game, making the sport more exciting. Perhaps the differing findings in landscape for game sports simply reflected the differences in natural landscape. The ice-pushed ridges, although standing out in the flat terrain, were rather modest compared to the moors of West Yorkshire.

9.7 AESTHETICS OF THE ESTATE LANDSCAPE
Gardens and parks were key elements of the estates of the established elite and were equally important for the newly wealthy when developing their own landholdings. In Twente over 56 per cent of the nouveaux riches country estates were designed by a professional garden architect, illustrating the fact that these industrial families greatly valued the aesthetic landscape at their estate and often wished to keep up with garden fashions. It also reflected their strong link with the region and their love for nature and the countryside. The majority of estates were created from the 1870s in the then popular late landscape style. A few twentieth-century properties were fashioned in the architectonic style, which was largely based on the English Arts & Crafts style. This section will investigate the manner in which the newly wealthy of West Yorkshire paid attention to the aesthetics of their estate landscape, in terms of employment of professional designers, keeping up with new fashions, and the nature of these fashions.

All the newly built country houses of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century West Yorkshire possessed a surrounding garden, although landscape parks were only found on a minority of larger estates including Dobroyd Castle and Castle Carr (Figures 9.8 and 9.11). The gardens and parkland at Castle Carr were designed by Captain Edwards’ head gardener Mr. Ponto. They consisted of large lawns (including a croquet lawn), hills, woodlands with deciduous and evergreen trees and ‘great fountains capable of discharging water to a height of one hundred feet, reputed to be the
second highest in Europe’ (Wild, 1976, p. 108; Figure 9.11). After Edward’s death in 1868 (following a train accident), his son Lea Priestley Edwards continued the building of the mansion, employing the Halifax architect John Hogg, who also created spectacular ornamental water gardens.

Landowners and designers alike valued the aesthetic landscape as it reinforced the beauty of the whole estate. This is illustrated by a letter from the garden designer Henry Ernest Milner (1845-1906) of London to Robert Foster of Stockeld Park who hired Milner in 1891: ‘Dear Sir, I sent you on Friday the plan shewing the proposed arrangement of the grounds of Stockeld Park. … The grouping of the trees and cutting away of the useless ones can only be done effectually on the ground and much of the charm that might be given to this lovely place would depend on this grouping and to the undulation of the ground. … I have taken much pains with the design and I am quite satisfied that a very lovely place might be made.’ (YAS, DD170, no. 76). This example also relates back to the earlier point raised about the physical environment, namely the preference for an undulating landscape as a setting for an aesthetic design.

Evidence suggests that only a minority of the new gardens and parks of West Yorkshire were professionally designed, thereby contrasting with the situation in Twente. The example of Castle Carr quoted above showed that the original park was created by the estate gardener and at a later stage a regional designer was hired. In fact, many of the gardens were designed by the owners themselves, by a local amateur, or by the architect of the house. Professional garden designers who have worked for *nouveaux riches* in West Yorkshire are: Humphrey Repton (Armley House; Oulton Hall); Joseph Paxton (Bellevue, Halifax); John Hogg (Castle Carr); Pontey brothers/ company (Castle Carr); Smith, Gotthardt & Co (Cliffe Castle); Edward Kemp (Dobroyd Castle); Sir Edwin Lutyens & Gertrude Jekyll (Heathcote); R. Marnock (Milner Field); Thomas H. Mawson (Whinburn). Compared with Twente, such professional commissions were low in number, and in every Yorkshire case, these designers were employed by the wealthiest of *nouveaux riches*, for instance Gott, Prince-Prince Smith and Blayds.

Humphrey Repton was by far the most famous designer to have worked for newly wealthy clients in West Yorkshire. His employers (Benjamin Gott and John Blayds) were, however, no ‘vulgar upstarts’, but ‘leading figures in the Tory alliance in the region that cemented the connection of commercial and landed wealth’ (Daniels, 1999, p. 242). Daniels argued that with their prominent position in society came a corresponding need for visible demonstration of their wealth and status. The choice of a leading designer such as Repton suggests that they not only attached value to the aesthetic landscape and its symbolic function, but also sought to demonstrate their social and
cultural credentials to others. This was probably also true for the other individuals who employed professional designers.

Repton’s commissions at Armley House for Gott and Oulton Hall for Blayds were alterations of existing parks and gardens. In both instances the house and surroundings were modest before Repton redesigned the garden and advised on alterations for the house. In Repton’s Red Book for Oulton, 1809, he wrote that: ‘Oulton House was till very lately a mere farm house […] the style of building still maintains the humble character of a house on the verge of a Common, with neither the importance of a permanent country residence, nor the elegance expected in a more finished Villa’. Furthermore: ‘The change to be made in the character of this place can hardly be classed under the name of Improvement, it is rather a total creation of a new place’ (WYAS Leeds, WYL160/DB 170). The enclosure of Oulton common had enabled Blayds to extend his property, and much of the park that was to be designed by Repton was on this former common land, with a view over villagers’ cottages.

The use of tree belts, raised grounds, winding gravel paths and water features such as artificial lakes and rivers secluded the estate from the surrounding environment and created a peaceful pleasure ground on which cattle grazed (Figure 9.11). Repton’s design thus incorporated ‘utility, convenience and comfort’ (WYAS Leeds, WYL 160/ 179). Repton differed from earlier designers like Lancelot Brown, who preferred great lawns directly around the house and lakes with bare banks (see Chapter 2). Instead, Repton suggested a distinction between the area close to the house and the park, and emphasised that ‘it is common a fault in modern gardening, to leave the banks of water bare and naked under the idea of not hiding the water; but a pool on a lawn unaccompanied by trees and bushes is little better than a land flood on a wet meadow’ (Repton’s Red Book for Oulton Hall at WYAS Leeds, WYL 160/ 179). As such, Repton took the first steps towards a new landscape style, which was taken further by the Herefordshire landowners Uvedale Price and Richard Payne Knight (Chapter 2). In defining the relationship between house and gardens ‘Price advocated a threefold division - the garden immediately round the house was to be formal, the garden beyond to be in the landscape style, and the park to be left to itself. His idea was that the transition should be gradual…’ (Sir Reginald Blomfeld quoted by Zijlstra, 1986, p. 7). These ideas of the picturesque landscape park were also evident at the *nouveaux riches* estates around Bradford, Leeds, Keighley and Halifax. For example, at Roundhay Park (Figure 9.11) the Nicholson family had created a large park with a series of cascades through a wooded valley (known as The Ravine), pleasure gardens, canal gardens, crags, waterfalls, a ruined castle and a conservatory (WYAS Leeds, WYL 59, no. 9). Similarly, in the 1870s Edward Crossley had created a garden at Bemerside Mansion, Skircoat, including a broad lawn with tree clusters, a grotto, rock tunnel, rock garden and various flower beds.
The dramatic positioning of country houses at the top of a valley or crag, as discussed earlier, also derived from the picturesque mentality.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century another style in garden design became popular. It focused on establishing a greater coherence between the house and its surroundings, giving a sense of unity to the estate. The house was to be made of local building materials and the garden had to be considered in relation to the house. The latter was supposed to ‘look both orderly and rich. It should be well fenced from the outer world. It should by no means imitate either the wilfulness or the wildness of Nature, but should look like a thing never seen except near a house’ (William Morris quoted by Zijlstra, 1986, p. 42). The style, known as the Arts & Crafts style, was developed particularly by Gertrude Jekyll and practised by many others including Thomas Hayton Mawson (1861-1933). Mawson who started as a nurseryman in Windermere in the 1880s, was one of the leading Arts & Crafts designers, receiving assignments throughout Britain, and even in Europe and Canada.

It has been suggested that Mawson was employed by textile machine maker and millionaire Prince Smith III (who changed his name to Prince Prince-Smith) to design the gardens at his Whinburn
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estate to the north of Keighley. The house, built in 1897 by the Scottish architect James Ledingham, was situated on a steep bank overlooking the Aire Valley. At the time it was surrounded by a simple garden. When extending his house in 1912-13 by the London firm of Simpson and Ayrton Prince Smith III probably commissioned Mawson to design a new garden in the latest garden trend: the Arts & Crafts style (Sheeran, 1993, p. 97-98, 134). Although it is not certain that Mawson designed the garden at Whinburn, it is very possible, given the nature of the design and the fact that his firm later redesigned parts of the garden and had been employed by the Smiths before. The garden at Whinburn is characterised by a variety of terraces and staircases, making good use of the natural landscape.

The Arts & Crafts style was also evident at Heathcote, Ilkley (Figures 9.12 A-D). In 1906 the Bradford wool merchant John Thomas Hemingway employed Sir Edwin Lutyens (1869-1944) to design both house and garden. For the latter Lutyens sought the assistance of Gertrude Jekyll. Money for the project seems to have been plentiful; as Lutyens commented ‘This house was for a very rich man who could not spend money: until he met me! In an ultra suburban locality’ (quoted by Arts Council of Great Britain, 1981, p. 108-109). The main garden at Heathcote was situated at the back of the classical house. A large circular lawn with small flower parterres was bordered by a rounded, slightly sloping terrace. A variety of rhododendrons flowered on this terrace. The whole was secluded from the suburban environment by oak and beech trees. Vistas towards Ilkley Moor created a spacious feel. In this, at least, Heathcote was typical of West Yorkshire nouveaux riches estates. This quality was also noted by Sheeran (1990, p. 182) in connection with the country estate of William Francis Tetley, which was surrounded by tree belts cut through with vistas. This particular design ‘allowed the house to be on view from a distance, while shielding the ornamental grounds from the curiosity of passers-by, thus providing both display and privacy, a pressing consideration in what was becoming a more and more populous county. Woodland provided the solution in forming a sort of enclosed landscape in which views were internalised’ (Sheeran, 1990, p. 182). This suggests some clear parallels with the Dutch experience. Previous chapters have shown that particularly from the 1880s onwards estates in Twente were bordered by tree belts to offer seclusion, reflecting their location close to transport routes, to urban centres and to other nouveaux riches estates.
Landowners whose wealth derived from commerce and industry had little desire to seek further income from their land. They thus had no need for great tracts of land. Moreover, the land market at the time made it difficult to acquire a substantial landed property. Many estates were relatively small, few extending beyond 500 hectares. For people like the Akroyds, Fieldens, Holdens and Salts their country house was a personal retreat from the city valued primarily as a place of recreation. Privacy was obtained through carefully designed landscaping and planting, as noted at Heathcote. Views over the wider landscape around the estates and vistas including abbeys and follies gave the owner the illusion of grandeur and space. Such use of the landscape was also characteristic of the estates in Twente, and seems to be characteristic of country estates of the nineteenth century. However, the two study areas differ in that Twente (and the Netherlands as a whole) lagged anything up to 40 years behind Yorkshire in its adoption of new styles in garden design. The landscape park designed by Repton at Armley House and Oulton Hall at the start of the 1800s was copied by Dutch designers like Copijn, Zocher and Springer only from the 1830s and remained popular into the twentieth century. In contrast, the picturesque style never really developed in the Netherlands, although from the 1880s some estate owners incorporated artificial rockeries into their gardens. The dramatic relief found in West Yorkshire played an important role in the picturesque design of new estates, and although in Twente views from the ice-pushed ridges were an important
part of the landscape design, no examples exist that can compare to the Yorkshire cases. The natural landscape just did not support such designs.

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this chapter was to reveal the true character of the Twente industrialists by comparing them to individuals of a similar social group, namely the newly wealthy of West Yorkshire. In both regions the *nouveaux riches* had invested in the creation or acquisition of a country estate. The above account showed, however, that although seemingly identical, the two groups actually differed greatly from each other. Whereas in Twente a handful of families dominated the industrial elite, in West Yorkshire such an elite was followed by a large group of slightly less wealthy landowners from industry, finance and commerce. In West Yorkshire some 85 families had been identified as new money with a country estate in the region, substantially more than the dozen families in Twente. This difference in the number of newly wealthy and their social background reflects the difference in scale and proportion of the two areas as well as the nature of economic progress. This might also explain the presence in West Yorkshire of a small group of extremely wealthy individuals who invested greatly in landownership by creating new estates and purchasing existing noble estates, and who had ambitions to rise in the social hierarchy.

At first sight, the distribution pattern of estates in Twente and West Yorkshire, and the explanation of it, are very similar, marked by a tendency to stay close to the business enterprises and being influenced by the pattern of existing landownership. Furthermore, the improvement of transportation and the issue of travel was one of the most important factors that gave shape to the pattern in both areas. Also the undulating character of particular sites were valued for specific tastes in landscape design in West Yorkshire and Twente, even though in character slightly different (picturesque vs. landscape style). However, the distribution patterns are different in that the division of common land had a greater impact in Twente than in West Yorkshire. In fact, the location of new estates in Twente was often connected to the abolition of *marken*, whereas in West Yorkshire it largely depended on the general availability of land.

Furthermore, despite their small numbers, the Twente newly wealthy seem to have had a greater impact on the landscape through their extensive landownership resulting from the dissolution of the *marken*. By comparison, the newly created estates in Twente were larger than those in West Yorkshire. This, combined with the strong emotional link to the region meant that these estates not only served as personal retreats for entertainment and recreation, but that they also had a great economic value through issues of agriculture and forestry. In contrast the investments in land by
their West Yorkshire counterparts were on average relatively modest in acreage and were generally of a recreational character. Unlike in Twente, where activities like experimental agriculture and forestry characterised the *nouveaux riches*, in West Yorkshire the new landed elite seems to have paid limited attention to the economic side of the landscape on their estates. Some exceptions were formed by members of the top elite, families like the Holdens, Fosters, Salts and Gotts. The extent of their wealth and landed property was of such a magnitude that they stood well above the majority of new landowners in West Yorkshire, and in Twente. For them the investment in land was greatly based on their wish for social advancement and entering the landed nobility. Nevertheless, people like the Fieldens and Fosters did resemble the Van Heeks in term of wealth and landed property. The fact that the latter family had not similar ambitions illustrates the character of Twente industrialists who viewed themselves just so, as industrialists. Their priorities lay in their business and their families. In Twente, while the ownership of land and the appearance of the aesthetic side of the estate were important for status within their own social group, evidence suggests there was no wish to become part of the local nobility. Only in a few instances was this apparent, for example Rhoessing Udink.

Even though Twente families like the Van Heeks, Blijdensteins, Ten Cates, Geldermans and Ter Kuiles had large landed properties, the actual core of the estate was relatively small. This, together with the location, ensured that the appearance of the aesthetic landscape around the houses resembled that of most newly created estates in West Yorkshire. Trees and shrubs separated the house and its gardens from the surrounding environment, and vistas gave extensive views over picturesque aspects of the countryside. Thus, although the designs of the gardens within the core of the estate were styled differently, the outer ring that surrounded this core was designed similarly. In both regions much attention was paid to the lay-out of the garden, even when no professional garden designer was commissioned. The gardens at the country seats of West Yorkshire’s newly wealthy were designed either in the landscape style (e.g. Bankfield) or new trends such as the Arts & Crafts style (e.g. Whinburn and Heathcote) and the Picturesque style (e.g. Bermerside). On the whole, only a few professional designers were employed, with no designer dominating the scene. This contrasts with the situation in Twente, where more than half of the estates were created by professional designers and where Springer and Wattez dominated respectively the Oldenzaal and Enschede region. It is remarkable that in West Yorkshire there was only a small response by professional landscape architects to this new development in landownership, which could have given them many assignments. There is little evidence to provide insight into the reasons why this was so. It may well be that many professional designers preferred not to work for *nouveaux riches*, or maybe the new landowners simply did not wish to spend much money on the aesthetic landscape.
around their houses. Should the latter be the case, then it is a very different situation to Twente, where most *nouveaux riches* still had a strong connection with and love for the countryside, and spent much money on creating grand gardens and employed professional designers.
Chapter 10.
Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to enhance the knowledge on the development, organisation and regional distribution of country estates created between 1800 and 1950 in the Netherlands, focusing on the province of Utrecht and the region of Twente. Through its geographical approach towards estate ownership, estate building and the created aesthetic landscapes the thesis has also aimed to refine these themes and link them together, thereby exploring and reflecting upon the wider implications for Dutch and European studies of country estates. This chapter evaluates the extent to which these aims have been realised. It starts with comparisons between the two study areas Utrecht and Twente, summarising the key findings and their implications for the broader study of country estates. Subsequently, the chapter reflects upon the effectiveness and value of the study’s methodological approach, which incorporated elements from Dutch and British historical geography.

10.1 SUMMARY AND EVALUATION OF FINDINGS IN UTRECHT AND TWENTE
This thesis has been based on three key themes: **Landownership** (the nature and origin of *nouveaux riches* landowners), **Landed Estates** (creation, distribution and location) and **Landscape** (aesthetics and functionality). With respect to each of these three themes, this section assesses the significance of the research findings presented in Chapters 5 to 9.

**Landownership**
The thesis has dealt with a group of newly wealthy families and individuals from commercial, financial and industrial enterprises, who decided to invest in land. The rise of such individuals during the course of the nineteenth century has been observed in many Western European countries, particularly Great Britain. However, whilst such British scholars as Rubinstein (1981, 1987, 1992), Cannadine (1990, 1994) and Thompson (1963, 1990, 1992) have paid rather extensive attention to the newly wealthy as landowners, in the Netherlands much existing literature seems to have been focused on studying particular families (e.g. Jansen, 1996, 1997; De Bruin, 1986, 1996, 2003) or localities (e.g. Van Groningen, 1999; Hammer-Stroeve, 2001). By bringing together the results of such detailed studies, and adding new data from documentary evidence (particularly tax registers), this thesis creates a new overview of the nature of ‘*nouveaux riches*’ families in two areas of the Netherlands, Utrecht and Twente, thereby drawing attention to the differences between these regional communities of newly wealthy. Chapter 5 revealed that the newly wealthy of Twente were predominantly local textile industrialists for whom their own social circle was crucially important. This was particularly expressed by their inter-marriages and their aspirations to climb the social ladder in their own
group. The textile industrialists had strong rural links, which were expressed in their love for the countryside and their investments in land, both economic and recreational. In contrast, the new landowners in the province of Utrecht were largely financial businessmen from Amsterdam whose acquisitions of country estates primarily served for recreation in weekends and holidays. Inter-marriages did occur, although they were not as common as in Twente. The new landed elite in nineteenth-century Utrecht also included several families at the start of the century who sought to enhance their position in society through the purchase of noble estates, including Bosch (van Drakestein), Oosthuyse (van Rijzenburg) and Hooft (van Woudenberg). These families have been identified as part of an earlier phase of estate building, 1780-1820, illustrating how regional research can help to make further refinements to the phasing of estate building in the Netherlands. The main focus in Utrecht, however, has been on the Amsterdam entrepreneurs.

Distinguishing such differences between new landowners proved to be important in revealing and understanding their attitudes towards landownership, and the creation and design of estates. Their decisions about land investment generally reflected a series of interlocking considerations and motivations, from economic (e.g. forestry, agriculture, industry and rental income) to personal (e.g. strong social attachment with region, an interest in nature, recreation and social enhancement). The estate functions, listed in the cadastral ledgers, have acted as indicators for the owner’s intentions; further insight into the owners’ motivations has been gathered from personal sources such as letters and diaries. In Twente, the investment in land partly reflected the industrialists’ emotional bond with the region and their rural background. Their resultant interest in farming, forestry and the visual dimension of the landscape found expression in the attention they paid to their new estates. It was furthermore common that land was initially purchased as a direct adjunct to established industrial interests, for example at Schuttersveld, Rigtersbleek and Het Amelink. Often the new owners thus created a landscape that served both recreational and commercial purposes. In Utrecht, the estates predominantly served as personal retreats for entertainment and recreation. Some owners, such as Margaretha de Jongh, subdivided their estate and rented out country estates, thereby responding to the wish amongst newly wealthy from Amsterdam. Indeed, by the second half of the nineteenth century owning (or renting) a country estate had become a trend among the newly wealthy, and consequently their interest in landownership may also have reflected a wish to enhance their status, whether within their own group or into nobility. Furthermore, for both groups, the acquisition of country estates allowed the newly wealthy to escape increasing industrial pollution and urban congestion; particularly the hills were valued for their clean air and beautiful scenery. This was clearly expressed by members of the Blijdenstein family, but was apparent throughout the two study areas. This particular reason for land investment was also apparent in other urbanising countries in West Europe (e.g. Daniels’ study of Humphrey Repton, 1999).
Through the investigation of the new landed elite of Twente and Utrecht, the thesis has thus illustrated the value of specific and regionally focused empirical studies that take account of local circumstances and the nature of individuals and groups. This notion was strengthened by the comparison of Twente with the textile region of West Yorkshire in England. In the latter region a large group of newly wealthy (some 85 families) became established who derived income not only from industry, but also from commerce and finance. This variety in sources of wealth in turn reflected the nature of the regional economy which was both more complex and more established than its Dutch counterparts by the middle decades of the nineteenth century. The comparison furthermore revealed that differences in aspirations, motivations, attitudes and tastes also reflected national characteristics. For example, in England landownership was viewed as an important tool for obtaining a higher position in (noble) society (Thompson 1963, p. 20, 23; Wiener 1981, p. 127), as was evident amongst the wealthiest nouveaux riches in West Yorkshire (e.g. families like the Holdens, Fosters, Salts and Gotts). In the Netherlands this seems to have been less important as noble status and rights had degraded due to the French occupation from 1795. In the nineteenth century, therefore, only a few individuals showed a wish to enhance their social status by obtaining landed property and title.

**Estate building**

A variety of motivations thus lay at the base for investments in land. In Twente over 80 new estates were created, all of them by individuals identified as newly wealthy, and in Utrecht almost 100. In contrast to Twente, however, in Utrecht various established landowning families also created new estates during the course of the nineteenth century, including De Beauforts and Van Nellesteysens. In both areas, some newly wealthy chose to purchase existing noble estates, either to enhance their status, to extend their property or simply because it was easier than establishing an estate piece-meal.

Investigation of historic tax lists, however, illustrated clearly that the newly wealthy never really equalled the landed nobility in the amount of land owned and that their wealth was predominantly based upon their business assets rather than their landed property, thereby contrasting with the local noblemen. This point has already been made by Rubinstein in the British context, although he generally only studied newly wealthy with landed estates of at least 3,000 acres (1981, 1987). Nevertheless, the creation of new – relatively small – estates has had a great impact on landownership and on the existing landscape, at least in the Dutch context. A greater understanding of the regional distribution of landownership in the 1800s and early 1900s has been achieved through the mapping of new country estates. In the two Dutch regions the patterning of new estates largely concentrated on the sandy hills in the east, often close to urban centres and transport systems. Previous studies have emphasised the importance of the physical...
characteristics of the local environment, and the relative distance to urban centres that was increasingly diminished by improvements in transport (e.g. Blijdenstijn, 2005; Van Groningen, 1999; Olde Meierink, 1984, 1988). This research has proven that other factors also played a role in determining the choice for location, namely the family and social links of the new landowners, and the availability of land resulting from the division and sale of former common wasteland and the existing pattern of landownership. The differences in wasteland division between the two study areas have been important in terms of land availability and opportunities for new estate building; whereas in Twente many industrialists and noblemen alike profited from the release on to the market of a significant proportion of the 60,000 hectares of formerly communally-owned marke land, in Utrecht most communal lands had been privatised prior to the study period. Only the division of the meente of Leusden had significant effect. By comparison, in West Yorkshire most communal lands had been divided long before 1800 and most new estate activity depended on the availability of land purchased through conventional markets. The presence of some remaining tracts of unenclosed moorland did, however, create a few isolated opportunities for the establishment of relatively large estates (e.g. Castle Carr). This attention on the manner in which communal lands were divided and how it affected the land market, thus added to existing knowledge evident in Renes (1998b) and Hoppenbrouwers (2002) who primarily investigated the nature of the communal organisations during their time of existence.

This diversity in factors also influenced the way in which country estates had been established. A five-fold typology has been created, that builds upon Olde Meierink’s work (1984) on estates for non-permanent use (chiefly day recreation); semi-permanent use (typically involving an annual residency of less than three months, frequently during the summer); and permanent residence. The typology established in this thesis extends this knowledge by investigating the different manners in which an estate was established, from purchasing an existing estate to creating an estate piece-meal, sometimes as part of an industrial enterprise. The advancement of a five-fold typology proved to be valuable as it further indicated the importance of land availability and the way it entered the land market (e.g. piecemeal or en-masse), but also the financial situation of the owners and their personal wishes. Thus in Twente many newly wealthy showed the habit of first constructing a tea pavilion with a garden before building a large country house (for example Oldenzaalsche Veen and Hakenberg); it was even seen at the landed property of an Enschede family in Utrecht, namely Huis te Maarn. The significance of studying this variety of interlinking factors is further illustrated in the booklet Nederlandse Tuinkunst (Dutch garden art) from 1837 which stated that ‘the size of the estate to be established, depends upon the wealth, taste and preference of the entrepreneur, of the numbers of his household, and of the possibility to purchase the needed lands’ (Anonymous, 1837, p. 31).
Chapter 10. Conclusion

Landscape design

The choice for location and the process of estate building also had implications for the design and use of estate landscapes. The third theme addressed by this thesis is the exploration of the estate landscapes for leisure and the way in which they were laid out. Existing studies of Dutch garden history identified several phases in the evolution of gardening in the research period. During the entire nineteenth century the landscape style predominated, only to give way to a mixture of styles that were marked by a re-interest in geometric features. Eventually, in the early twentieth century, the architectonic style was developed in which garden designers and house architects worked closely together; gardens became extensions or outer chambers of the mansions.

Existing studies have paid specific attention to the role played by professional designers in defining and diffusing new fashions, giving the impression that landowners eagerly adopted these ideas at their estates (e.g. Zijlstra, 1986, 1987; Albers, 1984, 1997, 1999; Oldenburger-Ebbers, 1989, 1992). Indeed, key players like Leonard Springer and Jan David Zocher jr. have been important as designers working on estates throughout the country, but also as authors of articles in leading gardening magazines, and as such they were important arbiters of taste, as was revealed in Chapters 2 and 7. However, the detailed study of specific parks and gardens in Twente and Utrecht revealed new insights into the complexity of landscape design in practice, thereby raising the need to reflect more critically on the nature of relationship between the estate designers and the landowners.

Evidence has been found that some owners would claim their gardens as a Springer or Zocher design, showing the importance of the status associated with the name of a professional and respected designer, for example at Ma Retraite and Schaerweijde. Nevertheless, other examples illustrated the various ways in which the owners themselves were responsible for the layout of their estate landscape. Thus, the case of B.W. Blijdenstein at Het Amelink illustrated that landowners were active gardeners themselves, and that the landscape he created was maintained and enforced by his descendants. The commercial and social networks of landowners proved also to be of significance in shaping the working area of specific designers. This was particularly evident in Twente where the Van Heeks and Blijdensteins favoured Springer and the Geldermans exclusively employed father and son Wattez. Furthermore, landowners were also key decision-makers about whether to accept or reject a design offered by a professional (e.g. Weldam estate) and about who to hire. Landowners often knew full well that the choice of designer had implications for the style of design, and as such based their choice for designers on their particular wishes, as was evident at L. Rutgers van Rozenburg at Prins Hendrikoord.
Evidence from the Dutch and English study areas has also pointed out that the laying out of a
garden was also linked to the processes of estate building and the wider environment in which
an estate was created. The *nouveaux riches* country estates were relatively small and were often
located close to urban centres, transport routes and to other country estates, particularly from the
second half of the nineteenth century, for example at De Hooge Boekel near Enschede and
Heathcote near Ilkley. Hence, a belt of trees was created around the recreational centre of the
estate to seclude it from its environment, yet at the same time vistas were created in these tree
belts to obtain a feeling of spaciousness. In part, this need for seclusion also reflected the
increasing personal character of how the landscape was experienced. Changes in landscape
design therefore did not simply follow national and international trends. In fact, the wishes of
landowners, their way of experiencing landscape, and the local geography influenced how and
which styles were adopted and adapted and even could lead to new ideas in gardening. While
saying this, evidence also showed that in some cases succeeding owners of an estate disregarded
new trends and maintained and even strengthened the existing character of the gardens
throughout the research period, for example at Het Amelink estate.

Furthermore, the size of the new estates and the character of the Dutch landscape did not
accommodate garden fashions like the picturesque style that greatly marked the new estates in
West Yorkshire that were often located on the edge of imposing relief, for example Dobroyd
Castle, Arncliffe Hall and Whinburn. Not only could the local geography denote possibilities or
limitations for landscape design, it has also been observed that in areas of extensive estate
building the natural landscape has been dramatically altered. Thus the barren heath lands on the
ice-pushed ridges in Twente and Utrecht were afforested as part of the park landscape or
hunting grounds of the estate or for commercial wood production. Through a geographical
approach this thesis has thus viewed landscape design at country estates in a wider
environmental context, revealing an important interaction between the natural and aesthetic
landscape.

This thesis has furthermore addressed the popularity of game sports and their impact on the
landscape, an aspect of landownership that has received little attention from garden historians or
historical geographers. The popularity of hunting and shooting was evident in documentary
evidence such as letters, invites to hunts, ledgers of hunting permits and hunting diaries.
Particularly the hunting diary of Helmich Blijdenstein has been valuable as it illustrated the
wider notion that game sports were an important factor in the acquisition of land and that the
establishment of extensive hunting grounds could have a great impact on the natural landscape.
A variety in environments was preferred to diversify the sport, and the planting of
rhododendrons and other ground-covering, game-sheltering bushes served to increase the thrill
of it. Consequently, estate owners often hunted together at each others properties, for example
Helmich Blijdenstein regularly went shooting with his relative G.J. van Heek. This also illustrated an important conclusion of this thesis, namely the relevance of social relations.

The strengthening of social ties by hunting was also seen in West Yorkshire, as shown in the example of the Fosters of Queensbury, but the landscape context was very different. New landowners in West Yorkshire chiefly hunted on the vast open moorlands. The comparison has illustrated, however, that – as for the established elite – the advent of hunting played an important part in the lives of new landowners in both countries, as did the creation of parks and gardens on all *nouveaux riches* estates. A surprising conclusion from the comparison between the Dutch and English regions is that of the 85 new landowning families in West Yorkshire only seven individuals (or 8% of the group) are known to have employed professional designers to lay out their gardens and parks, thereby contrasting with the Dutch *nouveaux riches*: in Utrecht and Twente respectively 40 and 56 per cent of the newly wealthy had called in the help of professional landscape architects. Whereas in the Dutch regions newly wealthy with varying degrees of financial means chose to make such investments, in West Yorkshire those individuals concerned were all amongst the most wealthy and influential people. It is uncertain why there is such a contrast between the English and Dutch *nouveaux riches*; in this respect, English traditions of amateur gardening – often by extremely knowledgeable individuals – may be partly responsible. However, the degree of contrast between the English and Dutch case studies may also be somewhat overdrawn, reflecting, as much as anything, the limitations of our existing knowledge. In particular, the existing bias in the English literature towards the study of larger estates means that new, relatively small country estates have not been investigated in all their aspects. Hopefully, this contribution to the study of the *nouveaux riches* country estates in West Yorkshire will stimulate further research in this direction.

The preceding analysis has illustrated that the three thesis themes of landownership, estate building and landscape design influenced and were influenced by the each other. Thus, aspects of the land market, the social backgrounds of the landowners, the physical landscape of the region, and trends in garden design all contributed to processes of estate building and influenced both the distribution of the estates and their lay-out. Understanding of country estates has therefore been enhanced through a combination of geographical approaches, which will be assessed further in the following section.

10.2 REFLECTION ON THE INTELLECTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study of country estates has applied a geographical approach that prioritises a combination of Dutch and Anglo-American historical geography. Dutch historical geography is characterised by the study of the material landscape, particularly focusing upon the economic, residential and agricultural functions of the landscape, for example water management, cultivation schemes and
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land consolidation by act of parliament. From this Dutch tradition it used several methods for studying the material landscape, relying upon an extensive use of documentary evidence (e.g. Gottschalk, 1964; Harten, 1997), fieldwork (e.g. Spek, 2005) and maps for geographical interpretation (e.g. Renes, 1999). From the Anglo-American historical geography, the thesis furthermore incorporated approaches that viewed the landscape as layers of meaning and as cultural representations (e.g. Lowenthal, 1961, 1985 and 1991), thereby paying attention to the nature of the cultural group and individuals that have formed the landscape. In the past, scholars like Spek (2005), Renes (2004) and Williamson (1993, 1995) revealed the value of linking these two historical geographical approaches to landscape. In the context of this thesis, such a combination of approaches enabled the study of who the new landed elite was, where they established their landed properties and how they laid out the landscapes on their estates within a wider environment. As such the thesis presented new, spatial insights into the various issues of Dutch landownership, and uncovered the different ways in which the character of the landowners, the location and creation of country estates, and the fashions in garden design were linked to each other, as summarised above.

The research aims have been achieved through the exploration of these themes in a variety of different social-economic, geographical and environmental contexts. The findings of the Dutch examples were reinforced through the comparison with an English example, the present-day county of West Yorkshire, presenting a broader change in nineteenth-century European society, marked by processes of urbanisation and industrialisation. This study also illustrated the importance of taking account of local circumstances such as the landowner’s social background and the natural environment on the one hand, and of national processes, trends and attitudes on the other. The thesis was therefore characterised by a multi-level analysis – ranging from local to international scales – which proved to be a fruitful methodological framework. It gave context to case studies, yet the study of particular places also revealed the need to adjust general comments on such processes as the evolution of garden design, as seen in Chapter 7.

This thesis largely relied upon GIS as a tool for storing and analysing data, and for visualising, mapping and presenting findings. It enabled the accurate recording and positioning of information extracted from documentary sources and provided a mechanism for plotting spatial patterning at a variety of scales and times. Regional processes in estate building could thus be explored and further analysed through case studies, for example choices for location, availability of land, the land value and the employment of designers. Much data has been retrieved from the cadastral ledgers that have been created since 1832 to register landownership throughout the Netherlands. Considerable effort has been invested in transcribing such sources (e.g. www.dewoonomgeving.nl/), but less attention has been paid to systematically exploring the ways in which they could be used to explore key historical and geographical questions as
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has been done in this thesis. By linking data retrieved from the cadastral ledgers to topographic maps of the late nineteenth century, the GIS facilitated the reconstruction of use made of the land and the exploration of change and continuity in landownership since 1832. As such the thesis has extended and refined links between traditional historical research and modern techniques of computer-aided analysis.

The findings presented in this thesis and summarised above have enhanced the understanding of the development, organisation and regional distribution of Dutch country estates in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, during the course of the research a number of issues have been noticed that might raise possibilities and questions for future research. This research is based on the cross-checking of a large range of various sources, yet it proved time-consuming to obtain the documentary sources dispersed over numerous archives throughout the country. The setting up of an universal system that displayed the contents of individual archives would benefit and stimulate future research on country estates. Furthermore, as spatial elements country estates deserve more attention from historical geographers than they receive at present. Such geographical research could incorporate close cooperation with scholars from other disciplines, particularly garden history and art history, and could be aimed at gaining new insights into the development of landownership and landscape design in the past or at applying such knowledge to making plans for present-day problems such as the creation of twenty-first-century country estates (which forms an important problem in current Dutch spatial planning).

Thirdly, despite several recent contributions to the study of the symbolic and representative landscape, this is still a minor approach in Dutch historical geography. On the other hand, Anglo-American historical geography tends to largely ignore the more traditional approach of studying the material landscape. However, the material landscape and the symbolic landscape cannot be seen as separate entities. They exist together, are part of each other. Both approaches to landscape have so much to offer, in terms of methods, perspectives and use of sources. This thesis aimed to show the value of combining these approaches, and hopes to have stimulated further research, both relating to the geographical study of landownership in particular and a combined historical geographical approach to a landscape of layers in general.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: The New Country Estates of Twente, 1800-1950, with their owners, date of establishment and acquisition, and the garden designers employed.


NB: Of commissions marked with an * it is not certain whether the particular designer worked here, although such has been claimed by estate owners or (contemporary) writers. Commissions marked with ** were not executed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESIGNER (with date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelink, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Blijdenstein family</td>
<td>c. 1800</td>
<td>G.A. Blum (1809); D. Wattez (1881*); Firm H. Copijn (1922); H.A.C. Poortman (1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assink</td>
<td>Haaksbergen</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austie</td>
<td>Denekamp</td>
<td>Erven Dorrens family</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkel</td>
<td>Wierden</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeklust</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
<td>Coster family</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ledeboer family</td>
<td>From 1894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beernink</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Jonge Poerik family</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gelderman family</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekspring</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Blijdenstein family</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belder</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Dikkers family</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanckenborgh</td>
<td>Haaksbergen</td>
<td>Jordaan family</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeck, De</td>
<td>Haaksbergen</td>
<td>Jordaan, J.G.H.</td>
<td>1916-17</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1916-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boekel, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile, H.</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>L. van der Swaefmen (1914-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boerskotten</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Baurichter-Essink family</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonenkamp</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borg, Villa De</td>
<td>Denekamp</td>
<td>Van Wulffen Palthe family</td>
<td>1903-1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boschkamp, De</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Gelderman family</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouwhuism, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek-Blijdenstein, H.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholten-Van Heek, J.M.</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>D.F. Tersteeg (1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christinlust</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damink</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Munsterhuis family</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diemer, Huize</td>
<td>Borne</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>Early 19th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drienermarke</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>Early 20th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duivendal</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Ter Kuile family</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebina</td>
<td>Wierden</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>Early 20th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eekhol, de</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Van Heek, N.</td>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td>D.F. Tersteeg (1931-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egheria</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Ten Cate, H.E.</td>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engels' Tuin</td>
<td>Ootmarsum</td>
<td>Engels family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshorst</td>
<td>Rijssen</td>
<td>Ter Horst, J.H.</td>
<td>1914-15</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groote Schuur, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Blijdenstein-Stroink family</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grote Dorst, De</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundel, De</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Stork, C.F.</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haer, De</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Gelderman-Muller family</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1812); P.H. Wattez (1912); L.A. Springer (1920-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakenberg</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Lohman-Blijdenstein family</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1912); Firm H. Copijn &amp; Son (1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heide, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile family</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Molkenboer, S.</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1918-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmer, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890); Firm H. Copijn &amp; Son (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexel, Het</td>
<td>Wierden</td>
<td>Tilanus, C.B.</td>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>D.F. Tersteeg (1915-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Höltershof</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Jannink-Ter Kuile, N.G.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1913); Th.J. Dinn (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooge Boekel, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek, H.</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1925-26); T.H. Koning (1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulsbeek</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Gelderman, H.P.</td>
<td>1918-22</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1918-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordaanhoeve</td>
<td>Boekelo</td>
<td>Jordaan family</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalheupink</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Gelderman, H.J.H.</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>D. Wattez (undated); L.A. Springer (1913-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kloosteresch</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolk, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ledeboer-Van Heek</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppelboer</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Stork family</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotten, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890); P.H. Wattez (1915); J.T.P. Bijhouwer (1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruisselt, Het</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Van Wulffen Palthe family</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lankheert</td>
<td>Haaksbergen</td>
<td>Van Heek, G.J.</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochemsbleek, Van</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meuleman</td>
<td>Denekamp</td>
<td>Scholten family</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mierennest</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Molkenboer, H.J.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijehuss</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Blijdenstein, J.B.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Firm H. Copijn &amp; Son (1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenzaalse Veen, Het</td>
<td>Oldenzaal</td>
<td>Ledeboer-Van Heek family</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>H.A.C. Poortman (1917); T.H. Koning (1957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oosterhof/</td>
<td>Weerselo</td>
<td>Stork, O.</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnekermeer</td>
<td>Weerselo</td>
<td>Van Heek, L. jr.</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paaschberg</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Stork family</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poort Buiten</td>
<td>De Lutte</td>
<td>Gelderman-Muller, H.J.H.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1912); W.J. Hendriks (1945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Menko family</td>
<td>Early 20th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schutenwalde</td>
<td>Tubbergen</td>
<td>Ledeboer family</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuttersveld, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>De Maere, Ch.</td>
<td>1834-1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smalenbroek</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile, E.</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>D. Wattez &amp; P.H. Wattez (1894); T.H. Koning (1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snippert, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Blijdenstein family</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepelerveld, Het</td>
<td>Boekelo</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokhorst, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Jannink family</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroot, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Roessingh-Van Heek</td>
<td>1820s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroot, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1874); H. Copijn (1920 *); P.H. Wattez (1925); Th.J. Dinn (1925); M. Ruys (1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strootman</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>Early 20th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teessink</td>
<td>Lonneker</td>
<td>Van Heek, H.J.E.</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1905); P.H. Wattez (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol, De</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek, N.G.</td>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1906); T.H. Koning (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vossenbosch</td>
<td>Wierden</td>
<td>Scholten, B.</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1917, 1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wageler, Het (Abraham Ledeboerpark)</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ledeboer family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890); P.H. Wattez (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weele, De</td>
<td>Boekelo</td>
<td>Van Heek-Jannink, H.</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welle, De</td>
<td>Lonneker</td>
<td>Blijdenstein, H.G.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1890); P.H. Wattez (1915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welna, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile, B.W.</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1916 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendelgoor</td>
<td>Almelo</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildernis</td>
<td>Hengelo</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witte Huis, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooldrik, Het</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Ter Kuile-Cromhoff, H.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1885-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izerhaar</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek family</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>D. Wattez (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonnebeek</td>
<td>Enschede</td>
<td>Van Heek, J.B.</td>
<td>1906-1908</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1908); T.H. Koning (1972)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: The New Country Estates of Utrecht, 1800-1950, with their owners, date of establishment and acquisition, and the garden designers employed.


NB: Of commissions marked with an * it is not certain whether the particular designer worked here, although such has been claimed by estate owners or (contemporary) writers. Commissions marked with ** were not executed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESIGNER (with date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aardenburg</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>Eeghen, S.P. van</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>J. Copijn (1860); H. Copijn (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderstein</td>
<td>Maarsbergen</td>
<td>Van Beuningen-Van Heek</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenberg</td>
<td>De Bilt</td>
<td>Strick van Linschoten,</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arensburg</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeklust (Bartimeus)</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Huisthof, B. jr.</td>
<td>1855-1856</td>
<td>S.A. van Lunteren (1855-56 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beerschoten-Willinkshof</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Bouman, A.C.</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>J. Copijn (1850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beukenhorst (Veelzicht)</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Strater family</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1837-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beukenrode (Warandehuis)</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>j’Ablaing family</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beukenstein (Pietersberg)</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Jongh, M. de (widow P.J. van Oosthuyse)</td>
<td>1818-1828</td>
<td>Neervoort van de Poll, J.R.H. 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biesbosch, de</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1910, 1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijdorp</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Mulder, J.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanda</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloemenheuvel</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>Early 19th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloemenheuvel (Hoogerheide)</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Cordes, Ch.H.</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knuttel family</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mervilt family</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boetzelcaerpark, Van</td>
<td>De Bilt</td>
<td>Baron Van Boetzelcaer van Dubbdellam, C.W.Th.</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>L.W. Copijn (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boom, de</td>
<td>Leusden</td>
<td>De Beaufort, W.H. esquire</td>
<td>1879-1882</td>
<td>J.Copijn (1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornia</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Uyterwerp Sterling family</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Du Marchie van Voorthuysen family</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurkow family</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breevecht</td>
<td>Nigtevecht</td>
<td>De Pré-Theunissen family</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breul, de</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Kol, J.</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linsen, R.</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reineke, P.</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May, S.P.D.</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>H. Copijn (1917-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brink, de</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Huydecoper, W.K. esquire</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>S.A. van Lanteren (1856 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartheide (Nieuw Broekhuizen)</td>
<td>Leersum</td>
<td>Nellesteyn, C.J. van</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darthuizen</td>
<td>Leersum</td>
<td>Pauw van Wieldrecht family</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1918 **)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darthuizerberg (Het Zwitserse Huis)</td>
<td>Leersum</td>
<td>Nellesteyn, C.J. van</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennehof</td>
<td>Baarn</td>
<td>Hubers, C.</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijnselburg</td>
<td>Huis ter Heide</td>
<td>Nepveu, J.D.</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pauw van Wieldrecht family</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doornveld (Rustwijk)</td>
<td>Drieburg</td>
<td>Kneppelhout, K.J.F.C.</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drieburg, de (Rusthof)</td>
<td>Drieburg</td>
<td>Blokhuis, G.W.</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blokhuis, A.M.C.</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heerewegen</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Van der Mersch, J.A.</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidestein</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Wetstein Pfister, F.J.H. de</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuvelkamp</td>
<td>Leusden</td>
<td>Rademaker Schorer, H.</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirtler</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoog Beek en Royen</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Voombergh, A.</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooge Vuursche, de</td>
<td>Baarn</td>
<td>Bosch, J.A. van der</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>D.F. Tersteeg (1911-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogstraat, de</td>
<td>Leersum</td>
<td>Nellesteyn, C.J. van</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogt, de</td>
<td>Maarn</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>D.F. Tersteeg (1908 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst, de</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Boer, R.</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crommelin, R.</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scherpenberg family</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Leeuwen family</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De Mol van Otterloo family</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Block van Haersma de With, D. de</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hught, de</td>
<td>Rhenen</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>M. Ruys (1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huis te Maarn</td>
<td>Maarn</td>
<td>Blijdenstein, W.B.</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>P.H. Watteez (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydepark (Heidepark)</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loon, H.M.J. van</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>H. Copijn (1885-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>Smulders, L.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerckebosch</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Lintelo de Geer, E. esquire</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraaijbeek</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Jongh, M. de</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraaijbeek</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Diederichs, P.A.</td>
<td>1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melvill van Cambree family</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leusder End</td>
<td>Leusden</td>
<td>Beaufort, J.K.H. de</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindenhurst</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Metelerkamp, A.H.</td>
<td>1863-1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Beest family</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuhn, E.H.</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meulen, J.H. van der</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arend, P. van den</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oosterwijk Bruijn, W. van</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blankenhagen, O.M.</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Retraite</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Nepveu family</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hengst, C.M. van</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1833 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baron Van Voorst tot Voorst,</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marwijk Kooij, J.H. van</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariënburg</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Munzebroek, H.J.F.</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molenbosch</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Stoop, J.B.</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuw Beerschoten</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Willink, J.A.</td>
<td>1889-1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuw Cronenburgh</td>
<td>Loenen</td>
<td>Boner, G.H.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuweroord (Lenteleven)</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Van der Voort-Beckeringh family (Late 19th C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schroder, F.G.M.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwe Weg</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Owner unknown ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijenheim</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuova, Villa</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Pesters, E. de esquire</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>H. Copijn (1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oirschot</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oorsprong, de</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>c. 1815</td>
<td>H. van Lunteren (1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oude Weg</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paltz, de</td>
<td>Soest</td>
<td>Ram, J.P.A.L. esquire</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers van Rozenburg, L. esquire</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1883-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Pauw van Wielrecht, M.C.H. esquire</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>J. Copijn (1861)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantagehuis</td>
<td>Vreeland</td>
<td>Hooft family</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins Hendriksoord</td>
<td>Den Dolder</td>
<td>Prince W.F.H. of Orange</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>J. Copijn (1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boissevain, A.A.H.</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Firm H. Copijn &amp; Son (1906-10 *); D.F. Tersteeg (1909-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatre-Bras</td>
<td>Woudenberg</td>
<td>De Beaufort family</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reehorst</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Crommelin, J.W.H.</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodichem</td>
<td>Huis ter Heide</td>
<td>Soeters, J.C.</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>H. Copijn (1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiterberg, de</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>Wilmink, J.</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>P.H. Wattez (1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaerweijdje</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Loon family</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1858 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pols, N. esquire</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>H. Copijn (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van der Wyck family</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoonoord</td>
<td>Baarn</td>
<td>Scherenberg, R.</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabortas, P.J.</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faas Elias family</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicker, A.J.</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoonoord</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>D’Aumale van Romondt-</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1920); H. Copijn (1870, 1909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hangest D’Yvoy family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schutterhoef</td>
<td>Leusden</td>
<td>Roëll-De Beaufort family</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminarie</td>
<td>Rijsenburg</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1856-1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silversteyn</td>
<td>Breukelen</td>
<td>Roëll-Huydecoper family</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitio</td>
<td>Doorn</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sluisheof</td>
<td>De Bilt</td>
<td>Heus, H. de</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrenheuvel</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Backer, W.H. esquire</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pauw van Wieldrecht M.C.H. esquire</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stameren</td>
<td>Maarn</td>
<td>Wendelaar family</td>
<td>1904-1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenia</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterrebosch</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Manger Cats</td>
<td>c. 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stort, 't</td>
<td>Maarn</td>
<td>Beaufort, J.W. de</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallyho</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangh, de</td>
<td>Rhenen</td>
<td>Waller, W.</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>H.A.C. Poortman (1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter Wege</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Notten, U.H. van</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>L.A. Springer (1905-09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nova</td>
<td>Loenen</td>
<td>Erdmann, R.H.</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentijn</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>De Haan family</td>
<td>1905-1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegtzicht</td>
<td>Breukelen</td>
<td>Offerman, W.</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veldheim</td>
<td>Zeist</td>
<td>Clotterbooke Patijn van Kloetinge, C.J.</td>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veldzicht</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Boer, R.</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequent owners see De Horst estate</td>
<td>1847-1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welgelegen</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welgelegen</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welgelegen (de Oude Hofstede)</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildbaan</td>
<td>Driebergen</td>
<td>Luden, G.</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>J.D. Zocher jr. (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonheuvel (Maarten Maartenshuis)</td>
<td>Maarn</td>
<td>Bennekom, H.J. van</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canisius, W.H.</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valkenburg, C.W.A. van</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schouwenburg, W.Th.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van der Poorten Schwartz-Van Vollenhove family</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwaanwijck</td>
<td>Nigtevecht</td>
<td>De Pré-Theunissen family</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: The New Country Estates of West Yorkshire, 1800-1950, with their owners, date of establishment and acquisition, and the garden designers employed.


NB: Of commissions marked with an * it is not certain whether the particular designer worked here, although such has been claimed by estate owners or (contemporary) writers. Commissions marked with ** were not executed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESIGNER (with date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adel Willows</td>
<td>Adel</td>
<td>Schunck family</td>
<td>Circa 1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amblethorpe</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Lea</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Thorpe, G.</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage Bridge House</td>
<td>Honley</td>
<td>Brooke, J.</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillegate</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankfield</td>
<td>Cottingley</td>
<td>Murgatroyd, W.</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Mason, H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankfield</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Akroyd, E.</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banney Royd</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Armitage, W.H.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardon Grange</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Brown, W.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleveu</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Crossley, Sir Fr.</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>J. Paxton (1848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermerside House</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Crossley, E.</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Royd</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Horsfall, J.G.</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Park House</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Mitchell, A.</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarcourt</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Sykes, J.</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadfold House</td>
<td>Luddenden</td>
<td>Murgatroyd, J. jr.</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckstone Hall</td>
<td>Rawdon</td>
<td>Dewhirst, W.</td>
<td>1860s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Grange</td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>Tew, Th.</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Carr</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Priestley Edwards, Captain J.</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>J. Hogg (1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffe Castle</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Webster, G.</td>
<td>1830s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Butterfly, H.I.</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosland Lodge</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Crosland, G.</td>
<td>1830-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currerwood</td>
<td>Steeton</td>
<td>Owner unknown</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobroyd Castle</td>
<td>Todmorden</td>
<td>Fielden, J. jr.</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>E. Kemp (1869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durker Roods</td>
<td>Meltham</td>
<td>Brook, Ch.</td>
<td>Circa 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbrook House</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Peckover, E.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood House</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Sugden, W. esq.</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Hill, G.</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field House</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Ward, mrs. S.</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Hill (Tetley Hall)</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Tetley, W.F.</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleddings, the</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Smith, G.H.</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange, the</td>
<td>Burley-in-Wharfedale</td>
<td>Peele Clapham, J.</td>
<td>Early 1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harehills Grove</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Ledgard, W.</td>
<td>1820s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Potternewton Mansion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley Castle</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>England, Th.</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Hemingway, J.T.</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>E. Lutyens &amp; G. Jekyll (1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Mount</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Kell, R.</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helme Hall</td>
<td>Meltham</td>
<td>Carlile, E.H.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DESIGNER (with date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme House</td>
<td>Brighouse</td>
<td>Armitage, G.</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmefield House</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Foljambe family</td>
<td>1830s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hystlands House</td>
<td>Batley</td>
<td>Oldroyd, Sir M.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Roys Hall</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Illingworth, H.</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>Baildon</td>
<td>Wright, W.</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Mount</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Ickringill, I.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlemoor</td>
<td>Queensbury</td>
<td>Foster, H.A.</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longlands</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>Merrall, E.</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood Hall</td>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>Marshall Selwyn, W.</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Wood Hall</td>
<td>Calverley</td>
<td>Gott family</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Heath Mansion</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Crossley, J.</td>
<td>1852-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manygates</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Green, E.</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanwood Towers</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Kennedy, T.S.</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanwoodside</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Oates, E.</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metham Hall</td>
<td>Metham</td>
<td>Brook, W. L.</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbank Hall</td>
<td>Luddenden Foot</td>
<td>Akroyd, J.</td>
<td>1820s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milner Field</td>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>Salt Jr, T.</td>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td>R. Marnock (undated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorville</td>
<td>Burley-in-Wharfedale</td>
<td>Whitehead, J.H.</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfield Hall</td>
<td>Malham</td>
<td>Morkill, J.W.</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate Mound</td>
<td>Honley</td>
<td>Brooke, W. esq.</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Lea</td>
<td>Adel</td>
<td>Croydsdale, W.</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklands</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Tolson, R.H.</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Hall</td>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>Garnett, Th.</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Hall</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Hudson, R.</td>
<td>Early 19th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Oak</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Walley, J.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley Hall (Weetwood Villa)</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Oxley, H.</td>
<td>1861-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect House</td>
<td>Queensbury</td>
<td>Foster, J. snr</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscliffe</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Stott-Stanhope, G.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensknowle</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Beaumont, J.</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinwood</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Bentley, F.W.</td>
<td>Mid 19th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock House</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Harrop, G.</td>
<td>1873-1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royds Wood</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Crosland, Sir J.</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandal Grange</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Hitchon, L.</td>
<td>1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shandon</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf Hall</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Bottomley, S.</td>
<td>1860s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spenfield House</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Oxley, J.W.</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hall</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Holdsworth, Th.</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ann’s Tower</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Harding, T.R.</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Atkinson, J.W.</td>
<td>1878-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneleigh</td>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>Beaumont, E.</td>
<td>Mid 1860s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetwood Croft</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Brown, G.W.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetwood Lodge</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Baines, F.</td>
<td>1870-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Royd</td>
<td>Farsley</td>
<td>Butler, J.</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Lodge</td>
<td>Ilkley</td>
<td>Smith, G.</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfside House</td>
<td>Burley-in-Wharfedale</td>
<td>Forster, W.E.</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatfield House</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Israel, I.</td>
<td>Mid 1860s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholson, J.</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESIGNER (with date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whinburn</td>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>Prince Smith III</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>T.H. Mawson (1912-13 *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteshaw</td>
<td>Denholme</td>
<td>Foster family</td>
<td>1840s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbank</td>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>Heaton, A.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>Batley</td>
<td>Sheard, G.</td>
<td>1873-1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Holden, A.</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>Gildersome</td>
<td>Webster, G.</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodleigh Hall</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Bottomley, M.</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: The Commissions of Professional Designers at *Nouveaux Riches* Estates (i.e. created 1800-1950) in the Province of Utrecht and the Region of Twente, the Netherlands.


NB: Of commissions marked with an * it is not certain whether the particular designer worked here, although such has been claimed by estate owners or (contemporary) writers. Commissions marked with ** were not executed.

**Bijhouwer, J.T.P. (1898-1974)**

1966 Kotten, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.

**Blom, G.A. (1765-1827)**

1809 * Amelink, het (Lonneker, Twente). Owner: W.B. Blijdenstein.

**Copijn, Firm, H. & Son**

1906-10 * Prins Hendriksoord (Den Dolder, Utrecht). Owner: A.A.H. Boissevain
1912-16 Amelink, het (Lonneker, Twente). Owner: H.B. Blijdenstein-Van Heek
1920 Helmer, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ter Kuile family.
c. 1922 Nijehuss (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: J.B. Blijdenstein.
1927 Hakenberg (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: Blijdenstein family.

**Copijn, H. (1842-1923)**

1870 Schoonoord (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: D’Aumale van Romondt-Hangest D’Yvoy family.
1873 Villa Nuova (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: E. de Pesters esquire
1873 * Beukenrode (Nieuw-Sterkenburg) (Doorn, Utrecht). Owner: Knepelhout van Sterkenburg family.
1885-88 Hydepark (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: H.M.J. van Loon.
1900 Schaerweijde (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: N. Pols esquire
1902 Aardenburg (Doorn, Utrecht). Owner: Van Eeghen family.
1917-18 Breul, de (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: S.P.D. May.
1920 * Stroot, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.

**Copijn, J. (1812-1886)**

c. 1850 Beerschoten-Willinkshof (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: Bouman family.
1860 Aardenburg (Doorn, Utrecht). Owner: Van Eeghen family.
1861 Pavia (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: C. Pauw van Wieldrecht esquire.
1873 Prins Hendriksoord (Den Dolder, Utrecht). Owner: Prince Willem Frederik Hendrik van Oranje
1878 Boom, de (Leusden, Utrecht). Owner: De Beaufort family (esquire)

**Copijn, L.W. (1878-1945)**

1930 Van Boetzelaerpark (De Bilt, Utrecht). Owner: C.W.Th. baron van Boetzelaer van Dubbeldam.
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De Bazel, K.P.C. (1869-1923)
1913-17 Stokhorst, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Jannink-Van Heek family.

Dinn, Th.J (1876-1931)
1925 Stroot, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
Undated Hölterhof (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Jannink-Ter Kuile family.

Hendriks, W.J. (20th century)
1945 Poort Bulten (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: Gelderman family.

Koning, T.H. (1916-1992)
1957 Oldenzaalse Veen, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ledeboer family.
1958 Smalenbroek, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ter Kuile family.
1959 Hooge Boekel, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1965 Tol, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1972 Zonnebeek (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.

Poortman, H.A.C. (1858-1953)
1892 Beerschoten-Willinkshof (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: Willink family.
1917 Oldenzaalse Veen, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ledeboer family.
1928 Amelink, het (Lonnker, Twente). Owner: H.B. Blijdenstein-Van Heek.
1928 Tangh, de (Rhenen, Utrecht). Owner: unknown.

Ruys, M. (1904-1999)
1936 Hught, de (Rhenen, Utrecht). Owner: unknown.
1950 Stroot, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.

Smitskamp, C. (20th century)
Undated Valckenbosch (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: G.F. Tets van Goitschalksoord esquire.

Springer, L.A. (1855-1940)
1883-84 Paltz, de (Soest, Utrecht). Owner: L. Rutgers van Rozenburg esquire.
1897 Ma Retraite (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: J.H. van Marwijk Kooij.
1901 Oosterhof, de (Denekamp, Twente). Owner: O. Stork.
1905-09 Wege, ter (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: H.H. van Notten.
c. 1906 * Welna, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: B.W. ter Kuile.
1909 Dennehof (Baarn, Utrecht). Owner: C. Hubers.
1910 Beukenstein (Pietersberg) (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: Neervoort van de Poll family.
1911 Egeria (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: H.E. ten Cate.
1913 Breul, de (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: P. Reineke.
c. 1913 Anderstein (Maarsbergen, Utrecht). Owner: Van Beuningen family.
1916 Scholtenhaer (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: P.J. Scholtenhaer.
1917 Koppelboer, de (Losser, Twente). Owner: Stork family.
1917 Vossebosch (Wierden, Twente). Owner: B. Scholten.
1918 ** Darthuizen (Leersum, Utrecht). Owner: Pauw van Wieldrecht family.
1918-21 Helianthos (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: S. Molkenboer.
1918-22 Hulsbeke (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: H.P. Gelderman.
1920 Vossenbosch (Wierden, Twente). B. Scholten.
1920-25 Haer, de (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: C. Gelderman-Muller.
1921 Schuerweijde (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: Van der Wijck family.
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Springer, L.A. (1855-1940) –continued-
1927 Beukenstein (Pietersberg) (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: Neervoort van de Poll family.
1930 Heuvelkamp (Leusden, Utrecht). Owner: H. Rademaker Schorer.
1932 Boschkamp (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: Gelderman family.
Undated Bornia (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: unknown.

Tersteeg, D.F. (1867-1942)
1908 * Hoogt, de (Maarn, Utrecht). Owner: unknown.
1910-12 Hooge Vuursche, de (Baarn, Utrecht). Owner: Van den Bosch-Van Hardenbroek family.
1913-17 Stokhorst, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Jannink-Van Heek family.
1915-23 Hext, het (Wierden, Twente). Owner: C.B. Tilanus.
1931-32 Eekhof, de (Enschede, Twente). N. van Heek.

Van der Swaelmens, L. junior (1883-1929)
1914-18 Boekel, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H. ter Kuile.

Van Lunteren, H. (1780-1848)
1824 Oorsprong, de (Utrecht, Utrecht). Owner: unknown.

Van Lunteren, S.A. (1813-1877)
1855-56 * Beeklust (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: B. Hulshof jr..
1856 * Brink, de (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: W.K. Huydecoper esquire.

Wattez, D. (1833-1906)
1874 Stroot, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
c. 1881 * Amelink, het (Lonneker, Twente). Owner: W.W. Blijdenstein.
1881 Haer, de (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: Gelderman family.
1885-88 Wooldrik, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H. ter Kuile-Cromhoff.
1889 Stokhorst, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Jannink-Van Heek family.
1890 Bouwhuis, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: J. M. Scholten.
1890 Helmer, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ter Kuile family.
1890 Kotten, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1890 Wageler, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ledeboer family.
1890 Welle, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Blijdenstein family.
c. 1890 Kolk, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: A. Ledeboer-Van Heek.
c. 1890 * Schuttersveld (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H.J. van Heek.
1894 Smalenbroek, het (Enschede, Twente). E. ter Kuile.
1900 Yzerhaar (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1905 Teessink, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H.J.E. van Heek.

Wattez, P.H. (1871-1953)
1894 Smalenbroek, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: E. ter Kuile.
1895 Grundel, de (Hengelo, Twente). Owner: C.F. Stork.
1900 Kalheupink (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: H.J.H. Gelderman.
1905 Belder, de (Hengelo, Twente). Owner: Dikkers family.
1906 Tol, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: N.G. van Heek.
1907 Huis te Maarn (Maarn, Utrecht). Owner: W.B. Blijdenstein & L. van Heek.
1908 Zonnebeek (Enschede, Twente). Owner: J.B. van Heek.
1910 Wildernis, de (Hengelo, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1911 Weele, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H. van Heek-Jannink
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Wattez, P.H. (1871-1953) –continued–

1912  Haer, de (Oldenzaal, Twente). Owner: C. Gelderman-Muller.
1912  Hakenberg (De Lutte, Twente). Owner: Lohman-Blijdenstein family.
1913  Hölterhof (Enschede, Twente). Owner: N.G. Jannink-Ter Kuile.
1915  Kotten, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: L. van Heek.
1915  Welle, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H.G. Blijdenstein.
1916-17  Bleeck, de (Haaksbergen, Twente). Owner: J.G.H. Jordaan.
1916-17  Ruiterberg, de (Maarn, Utrecht). Owner: Wilmink family.
1920  Stroot, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1925-26  Hooge Boekel, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H. van Heek.
1929  Lochemsbleek, van (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Van Heek family.
1935  Oosterveld (Denekamp, Twente). Owner: L. van Heek jr.
Undated  Teessink, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: H.J.E. van Heek.
Undated  Heide, de (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ter Kuile family.
Undated  Wageler, het (Enschede, Twente). Owner: Ledeboer family.

Zocher jr, J.D. (1791-1870)

1820  Schoonoord (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: D’Aumale van Romondt-Hangest D’Yvoy family.
1824  Breul, de (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: J. Kol.
1824  Hoog Beek en Rooyen (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: Voombergh-Van Loon family.
1825  Sparrenheuvel (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: W.H. Backer esquire.
1833 *  Ma Retraite (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: C.M. van Hengst.
1837  Molenbosch (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: J.B. Stoop.
1837-40  Berghuisje (Maarn, Utrecht). Owner: J.B. Stoop.
1848  Heerewegen (Driebergen, Utrecht). Owner: J.A. van der Mersch.
1858 *  Schaerweijde (Zeist, Utrecht). Owner: Van Loon family.

APPENDIX VI: Time Lines of the Major Phases in Industry for the Netherlands (specifically Twente) and England (specifically West Yorkshire)


- Proto-industry
- Transition phase with proto-industry and industry next to each other
- Industry
Bibliography and other sources

I. INTERVIEWS, CONVERSATIONS AND MEETINGS (in alphabetical order)

Dr. Lucia Albers, garden historian Albers Adviezen, Utrecht
Chris de Bont, historical geographer Alterra, Wageningen
D. van Brandwijk, owner of Welna estate near Enschede
Professor Renger de Bruin, social historian University of Utrecht and Centraal Museum Utrecht
Dr. Catharina van Groningen, architectural historian Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg
Adriaan Haartsen, historical geographer Bureau Lantschap, Haften
Alf van Heek, president of Stichting Edwina van Heek, Enschede, and descendant of Van Heek family, owners of Zonnebeek estate.
Ronald Janssen, amateur social historian with special interest in Blijdenstein family of Twente
Hugo de Lanoy Meijer, archivist, Archief Zeist
Gerrit Jan Liet, Overijssels Particulier Grondbezit
Ulbe Mehrtens, architectural historian Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, Zeist
Jim van Notten, grandson of Willem Benjamin Blijdenstein and owner of Huis te Maarn
Ben Olde Meierink, architectural historian SB4, Utrecht/ Wageningen
Lammert Prins, historical geographer Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, Zeist
Dr. Hans Renes, historical geographer University of Utrecht
Henk Smellink, owner of De Hulst estate near Oldenzaal
Dr. Theo Spek, historical geographer Rijksdienst voor Bodemkundig Onderzoek
Family Steinmeijer, owners of De Boekel estate, Enschede
Professor Jelier Vervloet, historical geographer University of Wageningen
John van Zuidam, geography teacher (retired) and PhD historical geographer
II. GENERAL DUTCH ARCHIVAL SOURCES

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF WAGENINGEN (SCL)

Country estates in Utrecht

Anderstein, Maarsbergen.
01.385.01 Reorganisation by L.A. Springer, c. 1913. Scale 1:1000
01.385.02 Reorganisation by L.A. Springer, c. 1913. Scale 1:1000
01.385.03 House and surroundings. L.A. Springer, c. 1913. Scale 1:400

Bornia, Driebergen.
01.203.01 Design for reorganisation by L.A. Springer. Scale 1:500

De Breul, Zeist.
01.555.01 Design for reorganisation by L.A. Springer, 1913. Scale 1:1000

Dennehof, Baarn.
01.086.01 Design by L.A. Springer, 1909. Scale 1:200
01.086.02 Design for C. Hubers by L.A. Springer, 1909. Scale 1:200

De Heuvelkamp, Leusden
01.377B.01 Design by L.A. Springer, 1930. Scale 1:5000

Ma Retraite, Zeist.
01.556.01 Design for reorganisation by L.A. Springer, 1897. Scale 1:500
01.556.02 Design for reorganisation by L.A. Springer, 1897. Relief profile. Scale 1:250
01.556.03 Design for reorganisation by L.A. Springer, 1897. Plan of villa. Scale 1:100
01.556.07 Plan of Ma Retraite before changes in 1897. Scale unknown.

De Paltz, Soesterberg.
01.473.01 Design for labyrinth and park extension by L.A. Springer, 1883-1884. Scale 1:100
01.473.02 Plan of the park around the house, by L.A. Springer, 1876. Scale unknown.

Prins Hendriksoord, Lage Vuursche

Rovèrestein, Maartensdijk.
01.388.01 First sketch drawing by L.A. Springer, 1885. Scale 1:400
01.388.02 Sketch drawing by L.A. Springer, 1885. Scale 1:400
01.388.03 Design for layout by L.A. Springer. Scale unknown.

Ruiterberg, Doorn.
01.2142.01 Aerial photograph.
Ter Wege, Huis ter Heide.
01.358.01 Design by L.A. Springer, 1905-1906. Scale 1:500

Country estates in Twente
Bellinckhof, Almelo
01.029.01 Plan of villa and surroundings by L.A. Springer, 1917. Scale 1:500
01.029.01 Design for flower garden by L.A. Springer, 1917. Scale 1:250
01.030.01 Existing situation with extension plan by L.A. Springer, 1926. Scale 1:1000
01.030.02 Existing situation with extension plan for western area by L.A. Springer, 1926. Scale 1:500
01.030.03 Sketch drawing for extension by L.A. Springer, 1926. Scale 1:500
01.030.04 Sketch drawing for extension by L.A. Springer, 1926. Scale 1:500

De Boschkamp, Oldenzaal
01.423.01 Plan of grounds with design by L.A. Springer, 1932. Scale 1:1000

Egheria, Oldenzaal
01.415.01 Existing situation before new design. Scale 1:500
01.415.02 Design by L.A. Springer, 1911. Scale 1:500
01.415.03 Design by L.A. Springer, 1911. Scale 1:500
01.415.04 Design for gardens around the house by L.A. Springer, 1911. Scale 1:250
01.415.05 Aerial photograph.

De Eshorst, Rijssen
01.453.01 Sketch design by L.A. Springer, 1914. Scale 1:400
01.453.02 Design by L.A. Springer, 1914. Scale 1:400
01.454.01 Sketch design for extension, by L.A. Springer, 1927. Scale 1:500

Helianthos, Oldenzaal
01.425.01 Design by L.A. Springer, 1918-1921. Scale 1:200
01.425.02 Design by L.A. Springer, 1918-1921. Variant. Scale 1:200
01.425.03 Design by L.A. Springer, 1918-1921. Variant. Scale 1:200

Hulsbeeke, Oldenzaal
01.419.01 Plan of estate, by L.A. Springer, 1918-1922. Scale 1:1000
01.419.02 Plan of estate, by L.A. Springer, 1918-1922. Scale 1:500

De Hulst, Oldenzaal
01.421.01 Plan of grounds, with design by L.A. Springer, 1917. Scale 1:500, 1:400, 1:200
01.421.02 Design for flower garden by L.A. Springer, 1919. Scale 1:250
**Bibliography and other sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.421.06</td>
<td>Garden design for J. Gelderman by L.A. Springer, 1918. Scale 1:500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.421.07</td>
<td>Garden design for J. Gelderman by L.A. Springer, 1918. Scale 1:1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.421.08</td>
<td>Flower garden design for J. Gelderman by L.A. Springer, 1919. Scale 1:250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalheupink, Oldenzaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.417.01</td>
<td>Reorganisation design with rosarium by L.A. Springer, 1913. Scale 1:200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.417.02</td>
<td>Design for rosarium by L.A. Springer, 1913. Scale 1:200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mierennest, Oldenzaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.424.01</td>
<td>Design by L.A. Springer, 1925. Scale 1:500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poort Bulten, Oldenzaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.418.01</td>
<td>Forester shed with design for gardens by L.A. Springer, 1912-1917. Scale 1:200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.418.02</td>
<td>Sketch for pergola by L.A. Springer, 1917. Scale 1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholtenhaer, Oldenzaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.422.01</td>
<td>Design, plan and profile by L.A. Springer, 1916. Scale 1:400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.422.02</td>
<td>Design, plan and profile by L.A. Springer, 1916. Scale 1:400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vossenbosch, Wierden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.537.01</td>
<td>Plan of grounds with design by L.A. Springer, 1917. Scale 1:1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. ARCHIVAL SOURCES FOR TWENTE

HISTORISCH CENTRUM OVERIJSSEL (HCO), ZWOLLE

Kadastrale minuutplan 1832 (cadastral map 1832)

Provinciale Overijsselsche en Zwolsche Courant (Provincial Newspaper of Overijssel and Zwolle)
List of highest taxed individuals in the province of Overijssel: 9 August 1850, 17 April 1855, 4 May 1860, 22 May 1865, 6 May 1870, 1 May 1885, 3 May 1895


166. Family Archive Van Heek
3767. Brief van Jan Bernhard van Heek te Burnley aan zijn vader Gerrit Jan van Heek met een verslag van zijn bezoek aan de textielfabrieken bij Manchester, 1884. (Letter of Jan Bernhard van Heek, Burnley, to his father Gerrit Jan with a report on his visit to textile mills in Manchester, 1884)
3776. ‘Lijflied van Grootvader Van Heek’, tekst van een Duits gedicht, voorgedragen door kinderen en kleinkinderen tijdens een diner te op het Zonnebeek te Bad Boekelo, ca. 1909. (Song performed by children and grandchildren of Gerrit Jan van Heek, ca. 1909)
3822. Stukken betreffende de bouw onder leiding van G. Beltman, architect te Enschede, voor Helmich van Heek van een jachthuis op het Hooge Boekel te Lonneker, 1898. (Documents concerning the construction of a hunting lodge at the Hooge Boekel, Lonneker, in 1898)
3826-3831. Stukken betreffende de bouw en het onderhoud van Zonnebeek te Twekkelo door Jan Bernard van Heek en diens vrouw Edwina Burr Ewing, 1894-1925 (Documents concerning the construction and maintenance of Zonnebeek hall, 1894-1925)
3827. Register van aangekochte landerijen van het Zonnebeek, 1904-1912. (Register of purchased land plots for Zonnebeek estate, 1904-1912)
3830. Stukken betreffende de aanleg van de tuin, 1907-1908. (Documents concerning laying out the garden, 1907-08)
3849. ‘Verrekenboekje’, register van afrekening voor de diensten van de jachtopzieners K. van Houten en W. Niekkelink op Zonnebeek, 1917-1920. (Financial register of services by gamekeepers at Zonnebeek estate, 1917-1920)
3851. Instructie voor jachtopziener-bosbaas op Zonnebeek, 1919 (Instructions for gamekeeper-forester at Zonnebeek estate, 1919)

3896. Stukken betreffende het verlenen van vergunningen tot jagen op gronden in eigendom van Ludwig van Heek, 1924 en 1926 (Documents relating the permission to hunt on the landed property of L. van Heek, 1924 and 1926)

3920. Verbouw van een landhuis en wagenhuis op het Hooge Boekel, 1902 (Reconstruction of manor and coachhouse at Hooge Boekel estate, 1902)

3922. Het ommetselen van een vijver op het buitengoed het Hooge Boekel, 1918 (Brickworks for pond at Hooge Boekel estate, 1918)


3929. Bestek en voorwaarden voor de bouw van een garage op het Hooge Boekel in opdracht van Bertiena Jannink, weduwe van Herman van Heek, door J. Schuiling 1931 (Specification and conditions for constructing a garage at Hooge Boekel estate by architect J. Schuiling 1931)

3939. Aantekeningen van Helmich van Heek (1902-1990) over zijn bezoek aan de firma Liebert & Co, Yarn-Agents & Cotton Merchants te Manchester, en andere textielfabrikanten te Manchester en handelsinstellingen te Manchester en Liverpool, 1923. (Helmich van Heek’s notes on his visits to various textile mills in Manchester and other trade corporations in Manchester and Liverpool, 1923)

3949. Stukken betreffende de verwerving door Nicolaas ter Kuile van percelen land in de gemeenten Lonneker en Enschede, 1872, 1893, 1901 en 1907. (Documents concerning the accumulation of land in the municipalities of Lonneker and Enschede by Nicolaas ter Kuile)

3995. Plattegrond van Enschede met ingetekend de ligging van de fabrieken, 1909 (Plan of Enschede with the location of the mills, 1909)

173. Archive Twentsche Bank, 1861-1916

3084. Aankondiging van de vestiging van een handelskantoor te Amsterdam onder de naam ‘De Twentsche Bank Vereeniging’, 1861 (Announcement of the establishment of a trade office in Amsterdam for the Twentsche Bank, 1861)

3087. Testament van Benjamin Blijdenstein jr., 1864 (Last will of Benjamin Blijdenstein jr, 1864)

3118. Genealogische aantekeningen betreffende de familie Blijdenstein van Benjamin Blijdenstein, 1878 (Genealogy of Blijdenstein family)

3146-3155. ‘Copie de Lettres’, brieven -meest van zakelijke aard- van Willem Blijdenstein aan zijn vader Benjamin Blijdenstein, zijn broers, overige familieleden en anderen 1894-1921. (Letters of Willem Blijdenstein to his relatives, 1894-1921)

3162. Stukken betreffende de bouw van een landhuis te Maarn voor Willem Blijdenstein onder architectuur van Jan Stuyt te Amsterdam, 1915-1916. Met een tekening. (Documents concerning the construction of a manor at Maarn for Willem Blijdenstein, designed by Jan Stuyt)
214.9 *Archive House Almelo*

32. Kaart van tuin in Engelse landschapsstijl, 1830, rondom het huis Almelo (schaal 1:50) (Map of garden in English landscape style around House Almelo, 1830)

87. Tekening voor de tuinaanleg in Engelse landschapsstijl voor het gedeelte van de tuin van het Huis Almelo, dat was verkregen door aankoop van de bleken die gelegen waren tussen het Huis Almelo en de Stad Almelo. Schaai in Rijnlandse voeten (ca. 1:35). Tweede helft 19e eeuw. (Drawing for a garden layout in English landscape style between House Almelo and the town of Almelo, second half of the 19th century)

1521. Documenten betreffende beplantingen en aankoop vegetatie voor tuinen Huis Almelo (Documents concerning buying and planting plants and flowers for garden at House Almelo)

233.1 *Family Archive Blijdenstein*

58. Brieven ontvangen door Benjamin Willem Blijdenstein en Maria Christina ten Cate, 1801-1834. (Letters received by B.W. Blijdenstein and M.Ch. ten Cate, 1802-1834)

74. Stukken betreffende de verdeling van de nalatenschap van B.W. Blijdenstein, 1857-1862 (Division of inheritance of B.W. Blijdenstein, 1857-1862)

78. Stukken ontvangen en/ of opgemaakt door Jan Bernard Blijdenstein, als lid c.q. voorzitter der Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken te Enschede. Request van de fabrikan ten te Almelo aan de Koning, ter bevordering van hun belangen, n.a.v. de afscheiding van Belgie en de invloed daarop op de handel, 1830. (Concerning Chamber of Commerce and Factories in Enschede)

79. Stukken ontvangen en/ of opgemaakt door Jan Bernard Blijdenstein, als lid c.q. voorzitter der Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken te Enschede. Verslag over den toestand der fabrieken etc te Enschede 1841 (Concerning Chamber of Commerce and Factories in Enschede)

106. Uitnodiging van Jan ten Cate aan zijn nicht Lida Blijdenstein (Invite of Jan ten Cate to his cousing Lida Blijdenstein)

108. Brieven van Julia Blijdenstein, 1842-1844 (Letters of Julia Blijdenstein, 1842-1844)

109. Brieven ingekomen bij Albert Jan Blijdenstein en zijn vrouw Geertruid van Heek 1843-1911. (Letters received by A.J. Blijdenstein and his wife G. van Heek, 1843-1911)

112. Brief van Rudolf Thorbecke te ’s Gravenhage aan Albert Jan Blijdenstein waarin hij vraagt om geschiedkundige gegevens over Twente, 1854, met concept van antwoord. (Concerning historic information on Twente)

114. Grootboek van Albert Blijdenstein en zijn vrouw Geertruid van Heek, 1872-1898 (Ledger of A. Blijdenstein and his wife G. van Heek, 1872-1898)


149. Jachtboek van Helmich Blijdenstein, 1879-1905 (Hunting diary of H. Blijdenstein, 1879-1905)

245. Pachtboek van het erve Amelink, aangelegd door B. Blijdenstein, 1788-1812. (Tenancy ledger of Amelink estate, by B. Blijdenstein, 1788-1812)

246. Akte, waarbij de weduw van Jan ten Dam en Gerrit ten Dam enige percelen grond, genaamd Snijderskotten gelegen bij het Amelink, verkopen aan Benjamin en Jan Blijdenstein, 1804. (Sale of land plots to Benjamin and Jan Blijdenstein, 1804)

248. Bestek en voorwaarden voor de verbouw van het huis “Amelink” en de bouw van een tuinmансwoning, op last van Albert Blijdenstein, 1879 en 1892. (Specification and conditions for reconstruction of house Amelink and the construction of gardener’s cottage for A. Blijdenstein, 1879 and 1892)

249. Stukken betreffende het bezoek van Prins Hendrik der Nederlanden aan het Amelink, 1903. (Visit of Prince Hendrik of the Netherlands to Amelink estate, 1903)


251. Stukken betreffende de bouw van schuren en een tuinmансwoning op het Amelink en het verbeteren van de oprijweg, 1916-1919 (Documents concerning the construction of sheds and a gardener’s cottage at Amelink estate and the improvement of the main road, 1916-1919)

252. Statuten van de Vennootschap Landbouwmaatschappij Het Amelink opgericht door Margaretha van Heek, weduwe van Helmich Blijdenstein, 1921 (Regulations of Partnership Agricultural Foundation Amelink, founded by M. van Heek, widow of H. Blijdenstein, 1921)

254. Stukken betreffende de bouw van een landhuis op het Amelink, op last van Margaretha van Heek, weduwe van Helmich Blijdenstein, 1922-1923 (Documents concerning the construction of a manor at Amelink estate for M. van Heek, widow of H. Blijdenstein, 1922-1923)


346. Brieven, ingekomen bij diverse leden van de familie Blijdenstein, betreffende de geschiedenis van de familie, 1807-1925 (Letters concerning the history of the Blijdenstein family)

347. Genealogisch overzicht der familie Blijdenstein, opgesteld door Jan Blijdenstein, mid 19e eeuw (Genealogical overview of the Blijdenstein family)

348. Genealogie van de familie Blijdenstein, opgesteld door A.A. Vorsterman van Oyen (eind 19e eeuw) (Genealogical overview of the Blijdenstein family)

349. Genealogische aantekeningen betreffende de familie Blijdenstein, van de hand van diverse personen (19e en 20e eeuw) (Genealogical overview of the Blijdenstein family)

376. “Mijne reis-portefeuille of omzwervingen door Overijs sel in het najaar van 1846, etc” door H. Boom (NB: alleen Twente) (Travels through Overijssel in 1846 by H. Boom)

456. Verslag over de toestand van de bossen van het Amelink in de eerste helft van de 19e eeuw (afschrift begin 20e eeuw) (Report about the condition of the woods at Amelink estate)
**KADASTER OVERIJSSEL, ZWOLLE**


**ESTATE ARCHIVE TWICKEL, DELDEN**

791. Journalen van persoonlijke en huishoudelijke uitgaven van S.W.P. van Heeckeren van Kell, 1814-1820 (Diaries of personal and household expenditures, 1814-1820)

792. Journalen van persoonlijke en huishoudelijke uitgaven van S.W.P. van Heeckeren van Kell, 1821-1830 (Diaries of personal and household expenditures, 1821-1830)

2456. Kaarten van de erven en landerijen behorende bij havezate Twickel, 1726-1733 (Maps of the farms and land plots belonging to Twickel, 1726-1733)

2458. Registers en leggers van aangekochte goederen, 1813, 1821-1875, 1877-1942 (Ledgers of purchased goods)

2460. Overzichten van de onroerende goederen onder het huis Twickel, 1857. (Overview of the landed properties belonging to Twickel estate, 1857)

2469. Overzicht van de toenemende grootte der landerijen onder Adm. Twickel. (Overview of the increasing size of the landed properties under the administration of Twickel)

2655. Register van de ontginning van woeste gronden, 1908-1922 (Ledger of the cultivation of wastelands, 1908-1922)

2657. Begrotingen en rapporten, grotendeels opgemaakt door de Nederlandse Heidemij. voor de ontginning van woeste gronden en de verbetering van enkele cultuurgronden, 1908-1921, 1932 (Reports, mostly by Dutch Heathcompany, for the cultivation and improvement of wastelands, 1908-1921)

2660. Legger van in de jaren 1880-circa 1900 uitgevoerde ontginningen (Ledger of cultivations executed in 1880-1900)

2987. Schetstekeningen van het kasteelpark, de Franse tuin en de kasteelhoederij (mid 19e eeuw, circa 1885) (Sketches of the castle park, the French garden and the castle farm, circa 1885)

2995. Brieven van de tuinarchitect H.A.C. Poortman te Diepenheim aan R.F. van Heeckeren betreffende de beelden in het park, de aanleg van de Franse tuin, de achterplaats en de rotstuin, 1926-1930 (Letters of the garden designer H.A.C. Poortman to R.F. van Heeckeren about the statues in the park, the layout of the French garden, the backyard and the rock garden, 1926-1930)

3016. Stukken betreffende de aanleg van parken op Twickel en op het Hof te Dieren door J.D. Zocher te Haarlem, 1830-1836 (Layout of parks at Twickel estate and Hof te Dieren estate by J.D. Zocher, 1830-1836)
Bibliography and other sources

3036. Ontwerptekeningen van H.A.C. Poortman te Diepenheim voor de beplanting van de bloemenperken in de Franse tuin, 1898, 1907 (Designs of H.A.C. Poortman for the planting of flower borders in the French garden, 1898, 1907)

3066. Brieven van de landschapsarchitect E.C.A. Petzold te Blasewitz aan rentmeester W.J. Bitter betreffende de aanleg van een landschapspark, 1885-1891 (Letters of the landscape architect E.C.A. Petzold at Blasewitz to estate manager W.J. Bitter about the layout of a landscape park, 1885-1891)

3067. Lijst vanuit de kwekerij van E.C.A. Petzold ontvangen tuingewassen, 1885-1886 (List of garden plants derived from Petzold’s nursery, 1885-1886)


3180. Schetskaart van jachtterreinen met de namen van de pachters (circa 1905) (Sketch of hunting grounds with the names of the lessees, circa 1905)

Separate documents:
- Kaart van Rentambt Twickel, schaal 1:20.000 (map of Twickel)
- Plan van de situatie des Huyses Twickel met de geheele Wildbaan, d’Orangerie, Engelsch Bosch en een Gedeelte der Hoven daer in begreepen, toebehorende aen Zijne Excellentie Den Hooggebooren Heere Carel George Grave van Wassenaer, Baender Heere van Wassenaer en Zuijdwijk etc etc etc. Heere van Weldam, Oliedam, Dubling, Kernhem, en der Vrije en Onafhandelijke Heerlijkheid Lage etc etc etc.’, T.A. Hartmeyer en D.G. Dilini, 1794 (Plan of House Twickel with game reserve, orangery, English wood and court yards belonging to C.G. count of Wassenaer, by T.A. Hartmeyer and D.G. Dilini, 1794)

ESTATE ARCHIVE WELDAM, WELDAM ESTATE, DELDEN

90. Perceelsgewijzde kadastrale leggers van goederen van J.D.C. van Heeckeren van Wassenaer in de gemeenten Diepenheim, Goor en Markelo, 1851, 1857, 1876 (Cadastral ledgers of properties belonging to J.D.C. van Heeckeren van Wassenaer in the municipalities of Diepenheim, Goor and Markelo, 1851, 1857, 1876)

229. Registers van de aanbesteding van diverse werkzaamheden onder Weldam, 1862-1873 (Ledger of various activities at Weldam estate, 1862-1873)

236. Aangiften door rentmeester H. Mulder van de ontginning van woeste gronden ter verkrijging van vrijdom van de heffing van de grondbelasting in de gemeente Markelo, 1860, 1863 (Declaration of estate manager about the cultivation of wastelands in order to get tax exemption in the municipality of Markelo, 1860, 1863)
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238. Huurcontracten van Huis Weldam, 1755-1836 (Rental contracts of House Weldam, 1755-1836)
255. Stukken betreffende de bij de Gedeputeerden Staten van Overijssel ingediende verzoeken tot restitutie van de voor het Huis Weldam betaalde grondbelasting wegens leegstand van dit pand, 1841-1870 (Requests for restitution of tax paid for House Weldam because of vacancy of the property, 1841-1870)
265. Instructie voor de jager op het Weldam, 1770 (Instruction for the gamekeeper at Weldam estate, 1770)
322. Stukken betreffende de plannen tot verdeling van de marke, 1853-1854, met een retroacte betreffende het recht van heide en weide in de marke Diepenheim, verbonden aan het erve Zwierink in het Kerspel Goor, 1603 (Concerning plans to divide the marke Diepenheim, 1853-1854)
323. Correspondentie van J.D.C. van Heeckeren van Wassenaer met G. Schimmelpenninck te Diepenheim betreffende de belangen van het Huis Weldam in de marke Diepenheim, 1847-1848 (Concerning the interests of House Weldam in marke Diepenheim, 1847-1848)
338. Stukken betreffende de plannen tot verdeling van de marke Langelo (Haaksbergen), 1862-1863 (Concerning plans to divide marke Langelo, Haaksbergen, 1862-1863)

Separate documents:
- Ontwerp voor parterres door E. André, 19e eeuw (Design for parterres by E. André, 19th century)
- Ontwerp voor rotspark ten noorden van huis door Hugo Poortman, februari 1909. Schaal 1:100. Gedeeltelijk uitgevoerd (Design for a rock garden north of the manor by H. Poortman, 1909)
- Ontwerp door E. André voor geometrisch park Huis Weldam, 1885 (Design by E. André for a geometric park House Weldam, 1885)
- Ontwerp voor doolhof door E. André, 19e eeuw (Design for a labyrinth by E. André, 19th century)
- Overzichtskaart van landgoed, 20e eeuw (Overview map of the estate, 20th century)
- Overzichtskaart van het landgoed Weldam (na kadastrale factuur) (Overview map of the Weldam estate)
- Ontwerp voor verandering parterres door Poortman (Design for alteration of parterres by H. Poortman)
- Overzichtskaart door Poortman, circa 1901. Indeling der weilanden (Overview map by Poortman, circa 1901, with classification of meadows)
- Toestand van huis en tuin van Weldam voor de aanleg van André, 1877 (Map of condition of house and garden of Weldam estate before André’s layout, 1877)
- Luchtfoto/ ansichtskaart, 1930s (Postcard of an aerial photo, 1930s)
- Foto van tuinbaas in de tuin, circa 1910 (Photo of the head gardener in the garden, circa 1910)

ESTATE ARCHIVE DE BOEKEL, ENSCHEDE
- Geschiedenis ‘De Boekel’ door Mini ter Kuile (History of the estate by Mini ter Kuile)
- Tuinboek N.H. ter Kuile ‘Hooge Boekel’, nu ‘de Boekel’ (Garden diary of Ter Kuile)
- Various pictures of house and gardens

VAN DEINSE ARCHIEF
- Inteekenlijst no.1 (1911). Lijst van intekenaren die geld geschenken hebben voor de herdenking van de Enschede brand van 1862. (List of donations for a memorial for the Enschede fire of 1862)
IV. ARCHIVAL SOURCES FOR UTRECHT

HET UTRECHTS ARCHIEF (HUA), UTRECHT

3. Jachtgerecht Utrecht (Hunting in Utrecht: laws and official hunting grounds)


28-3. Kaart van het jachtgebied van de ridderhofstad Lokhorst, 1768 (maker onbekend). Noord = linksboven. Schaal 100 stichtse roeden = 2,3 cm (Map of hunting grounds of the manor Lokhorst, 1768)

28-4. Kaart van het jachtgebied van de ridderhofstad Berkestein aan de Lek, 1768 (maker onbekend). Noord = linksboven. Schaal 100 stichtse roeden = 2,3 cm (Map of hunting grounds of the manor Berkestein aan de Lek, 1768)


29-2. Kaart van het jachtgebied van de ridderhofstad Oud-Amelisweerd. Opgemeten en getekend door L.H. Bonnet, 1778. Noord = linksboven. Schaal 100 stichtse roeden = 5,5 cm (Map of hunting grounds of the manor Oud-Amelisweerd, drawn by L.H. Bonnet, 1778)


68. Aantekeningen betreffende het jachtrecht der ridderhofsteden, 18e eeuw. (Remarks on the hunting rights of manors, 18th century)

29-15. Archive Huis Kersbergen, Zeist

7. Stukken, ingekomen bij de eigenaars van Kersbergen met betrekking tot dit landgoed, 1840-1917 (Documents received by owners of Kersbergen with reference to this estate, 1840-1917)

8. Stukken betreffende de verbouwing van het huis, met plattegrond tekening van de voorgevel en detailschets 1854-1856 (Documents concerning the alteration of the house, 1854-1856)

9. Bestek voor de bouw van een oranjerie, 1865 (Specification for the construction of a hothouse, orangery, 1865)

29-31. Archive Heerlijkheid Oostbroek en De Bilt, c.a., 1681-1882

1. Stukken betreffende verkoop en overdracht van de heerlijkheid, 1714-1833 (Sale of the lordship, 1714-1833)

29. Genealogie der familie Van Ewijck (Genealogy of Van Ewijck family)

32. Catalogus van het landgoed van ouds genaamd de Abtdye van Oostbroek, 1842 (Sale catalogue of Oostbroek estate, 1842)
67. Family Archive Huydecoper

626. Stukken betreffende de ‘grand tour’ van Willem Huydecoper naar Portugal en Italie, 1763-1764 (Documents of W. Huydecoper’s grand tour to Portugal and Italy, 1763-1764)

643. Paspoort voor Joan Huydecoper c.s. voor een reis naar Italie en Frankrijk, 1836 (Passport for J. Huydecoper for a trip to Italy and France, 1836)

646. Gastenboek uit het Huis Groeneveld, 1827-1841 (Guest book of House Groeneveld, 1827-1841)

651. Staat van verdeling van de nalatenschap van Joan Huydecoper, met bijlagen, 1837 (Division of inheritance of J. Huydecoper, 1837)

705. Akte van huwelijks voorwaarden tussen Jan Elias Huydecoper en Marie Taets van Amerongen, met een uittreksel uit het huwelijksregister van de gemeente Utrecht, 1820 (Marriage settlement of J.E. Huydecoper and M. Taets van Amerongen, 1820)


717. Stukken betreffende de afwikkeling van de nalatenschap van Jan Elias Huydecoper, 1865-1866 (Inheritance of J.E. Huydecoper, 1865-1866)

718. Stukken betreffende de afwikkeling van de nalatenschap van Jan Elias Huydecoper, 1865-1866 (Inheritance of J.E. Huydecoper, 1865-1866)

724. Stukken betreffende het beheer van de financiën van Joan Huydecoper en Louisa Ram, 1848-1890 (Financial documents of J. Huydecoper and L. Ram, 1848-1890)

726. Paspoort van Joan Huydecoper voor een reis naar Engeland en Schotland, 1840 (Passport of J. Huydecoper for a trip to England and Scotland, 1840)

741. Stukken betreffende de Vereeniging tot Droogmaking van de Tienhovense-Maarsseveense Plassen, 1855-1865 (Documents of Society for Draining the Tienhovense-Maarsseveense Plassen, 1855-1865)


815. Jachtvergunning van Joan Adolf Huydecoper, 1921 (Hunting permit of J.A. Huydecoper, 1921)

1128. Stukken betreffende de jacht (Documents relating to hunting)

1138. Legger van de percelen land te Maarsseveen en Tienhoven toebehorende aan Jan Elias Huydecoper, 1757, met aantekeningen betreffende de exploitatie van deze goederen, vooral betreffende het houtgewas, 1757-1801, met kaarten (Ledger of plots of land in Maarsseveen and Tienhoven belonging to J.E. Huydecoper, 1757-1801. With notes and maps)

1139. Legger van de percelen land te Maarsseveen en Tienhoven toebehorende aan Jan Elias Huydecoper, 1757, met aantekeningen betreffende de exploitatie van deze goederen, vooral betreffende het houtgewas, 1757-1801, met kaarten (Ledger of plots of land in Maarsseveen and Tienhoven belonging to J.E. Huydecoper, 1757-1801. With notes and maps)
1287. Offerte betreffende de tuinaanleg op Blikkenburg (19e eeuw) met ontwerptekeningen voor een ophaalbrug, een draaibrug, een schraagpomp, een fontein en een orangerie (19e eeuw) (Quotation with design drawings of the garden layout at Blikkenburg estate, 19th century)


1301. Uittreksel van den perceelsgewijzen Kadastrale Legger van de Gemeente Bunnik (Cadastral ledger of the municipality of Bunnik)

1302. Brochure houdende beschrijving van het te koop aangeboden slot Zeist (1867). Gedrukt met tekeningen van het terrein (Brochure with a description of Castle Zeist, put up for sale, 1867)

71-1. Archief van de onderprefecten van Utrecht en Amersfoort (Archive of the underprefects of Utrecht and Amersfoort)

138. Staten van de honderd in 1813 hoogst aangeslagen personen (List of the 100 highest taxed individuals in 1813)


3509. Hoofdelijke omslag, 1856-1896, 1908-1916 (Personal tax)

3567. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1850 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1850)

3570. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1853 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1853)

3572. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1855 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1855)

3574. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1857 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1857)

3576. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1859 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1859)

3578. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1861 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1861)

3582. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1865 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1865)

3588. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1868 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1868)

3590. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1870 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1870)

3595. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1875 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1875)
Bibliography and other sources

3600. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1880 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1880)
3605. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1885 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1885)
3610. Provinciaalblad van Utrecht met jaarlijkse indices, 1890 (Provincial Newspaper of Utrecht, 1890)
7520. Stukken betreffende de onteigening van gronden ten bate van de aanleg van spoorwegen, met tekening, 1839-1875 (Documents relating to the expropriation of lands for the construction of railroads, 1839-1875)
7526. Stukken betreffende de jacht en visserij, 1815-1875 (Documents relating to hunting and fishing, 1815-1875)
7527-7529. Lijsten van afgegeven jacht- en visakten, 1903-1914 (Lists of issued hunting and fishing permits, 1903-1914)

80. Archief van de kaarten en tekeningen van het Provinciaal Bestuur van Utrecht, 1813-1920 (Archive of the maps and drawings of the Provincial Government of Utrecht, 1813-1920)
12. Kaart van percelen heidegrond onder de gemeente De Bilt, vermoedelijk eigendom van het Rijk. Schaal 1:10.000. Anoniem, ca. 1850. Ms., gekleurd; 1 blad, 57x33 cm. Behoort bij brief van H.I.W.U. d.d. 8 oktober z.j., nr. 810 (Map of parcels of heathland in the municipality of De Bilt, probably property of the State, 1850)
13. Kaart der perceelen dominiale heidegrond onder de gemeente De Bildt, opgemeten op last van den Heer Agent van het Domein in de Provincie Utrecht door den ondergetekende landmeter bij het Kadaster: J. Vesters. (Map of parcels of heathland in the municipality of De Bilt)
1041. Kaart van Utrecht; uit de wegenatlas van de A.N.W.B., 1915 Schaal 1:200000. (Map of Utrecht, 1915)
1105-1106. Kaarten van de ontwerpverlegging van wegen in de gemeenten Haarzuilens en Vleuten en nieuwbouw van het dorp Haarzuilens in verband met restauratie kasteel De Haar, 1895 (Design map of the new route of roads in the municipalities of Haarzuilens and Vleuten and a map of the village of Haarzuilens, both relating to the reconstruction of Castle De Haar, 1895)
1107-1108. Kaarten van de verlegging van de Bochtdijk en de Haarlaan onder de gemeenten Haarzuilens en Vleuten in verband met restauratie van kasteel De Haar, 1902, 1905. Schaal 1:2500 (Designmap of altered roads in the municipalities of Haarzuilens and Vleuten relating to the reconstruction of Castle De Haar, 1902, 1905)

703-10. Stadsbestuur van Utrecht, 1808-1813
767-x. Liste définitive des cent contribuables les plus imposés de la ville d’Utrecht’, staat met gegevens over de honderd hoogst aangeslagenen voor de belasting in de stad Utrecht, 1813 (List of the 100 highest taxed individuals in 1813)
1001. House Archive Amerongen
430. Overzicht van de percelen grond van het landgoed, met vermelding van afmetingen van pachters en pachtprijs, ca. 1890 (Overview of plots of land on the estate, 1890)
431. Kadastrale uittreksels i.v.m. de betaling van grondbelasting voor goederen te Amerongen, Leersum en Eck en Wiel, 1878-1912 (Cadastral papers for taxation of properties in Amerongen, Leersum and Eck and Wiel, 1878-1912)
433. Kaart van het landgoed, 1871 (Map of the estate, 1871)
435-436. Kaarten van de landerijen te Amerongen binnen de Kaa, met registers van de landerijen van het huis Amerongen en die van particulieren, 1696 (Maps of the landed properties in Amerongen, 1696)
441. Staten van goederen en rechten behorend aan het huis Amerongen, 1809, 1819 (Goods and rights belonging to House Amerongen, 1809, 1819)
540. Adreslijst van de kennis van Godard van Aldenburg Bentinck, opgesteld door de rentmeester, ca. 1910 (List of addresses of acquaintances of Godard van Aldenburg Bentinck, 1910)
552. Tabellarische overzichten van inkomsten en uitgaven wegens beheer van het landgoed en de huishouding, 1887-1928 (Overview of income and expenses relating to the management of the estate and household, 1887-1928)
1237. Artikiel over landontginning. “Landontginning. Brieven uit een vruchtbaar deel van Twente” door Ericus (Amsterdam). (Article on land cultivation)
1251. Overzicht der opbrengsten aan houtverkopingen van het landgoed, 1880-1931. Met een grafiek van de opbrengst van grove dennenbossen per hectare in kubieke meter, volgens de berekeningen van professor Hunze en Oberförster Weise (20e eeuw) (Overview of the profits made by the sale of wood, 1880-1931)
1400. Veilingbiljetten en advertenties van houtverkopingen op het landgoed Amerongen, met verzendlijst, 1906-1940 (Auction posters and advertisements for the sale of wood at the Amerongen estate, 1906-1940)
1473. Afbeelding van het huis Amerongen, 18e eeuw. Jan de Beyer, uitgave Hendrik Speelman, 1792 (Drawing of House Amerongen, 18th century)
1474-1475. Gezicht op een deel van het huis Amerongen met brug. B.W.F. van Riemsdijk (ca. 1900) (View of part of House Amerongen with bridge. Drawing by Van Riemsdijk, 1900)
1477. Deel van tuin en brug bij de ingang van het huis Amerongen, ca. 1900. (Part of the garden and bridge near the entrance of House Amerongen, circa 1900)
1524. Werkstaatboekjes van werk aan het huis Amerongen en de tuin, 1903, 1909-1910 (Ledger of labour on house and garden, 1903, 1909-1910)
1553-1557. Correspondentie betreffende verbouwingen en tuinaanleg van het huis Weldam, 1881-1905 (Correspondence about the renovations of house and garden at House Weldam, Twente, 1881-1905)
1553. Edouard André te Parijs, 1887-1888. Over plannen en beplantingen van bloemen en heesters (Letters from E. André, Paris, about designs and planting of flowers and trees, 1887-1888)
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1556. Hugo A.C. Poortman te Weldam, 1901. Over extra bewateren van geplante heesters en bomen wegens slecht voorjaar (Letters from H.A.C. Poortman about the need to water the planted trees heavily because of the bad Spring)

1563. Plattegrond van het huis Amerongen met de tuinen, door Bernard de Roy, april 1683 (afmetingen 27x40,5 cm) (Plan of House Amerongen with the gardens, by Bernard de Roy, april 1683)

1565-1571. Plattegronden van het huis Amerongen met de tuinen, 18e eeuw (Plans of House Amerongen with the gardens, 18th century)

1591. Ontwerp voor de aanleg van parterre bezuiden het huis Amerongen, H.A.C. Poortman, nov. 1900 (Design for the parterre south of the house by H.A.C. Poortman, November 1900)


1595-1597. Ontwerpen voor de tuin van het huis Amerongen door E. André, 1887-1888 (Designs for the garden at House Amerongen by E. André, 1887-1888)

2038. Akte van toestemming van de Prins van Oranje aan de Heer van Amerongen om de vrijdom van de jacht te vergroten ten noordoosten van het huis Amerongen, 1768 (Permission certificate of the Prince of Orange to the Lord of Amerongen to enlarge the hunting grounds to the northeast of House Amerongen, 1768)

2047. Registers van geschoten wild, 1881-1893 (Ledgers of shot game, 1881-1893)

2048. Registers van geschoten wild, 1908-1926 (Ledgers of shot game, 1908-1926)

4393. Jachtaktes voor Godard Bentinck en enkele familieleden, met uitnodigingen voor jachtpartijen en een artikel van F. de Bas over de jacht in “Eigen Haard” (1880; pp. 329-332, 337-342), 1880-1912 (Hunting permits of G. Bentinck and relatives, with invitations to hunting parties and an article on hunting)

4915. Foto-album van het gezin van Godard Bentinck, vnl op reis in de Alpen en in Amerongen, ca. 1900 (Picture albums of G. Bentinck’s family, circa 1900)

4916. Foto’s van Godard Bentinck in gezelschap van familie-leden e.a., 1880-1900 (Pictures of G. Bentinck accompanied by relatives, 1880-1900)

4917. Groepsfoto’s (verjaardagen, bruiloften, jubilea), 1899-1929 (Group pictures of birthdays and weddings, 1899-1929)

4931. Maria van Heeckeren van Wassenaer, foto (Picture of Maria van Heeckeren van Wassenaer

4965. Foto van tennisspelers, 20e eeuw (Picture of tennis players, 20th century)

5025. Foto’s van huis en tuin Amerongen, 19e en 20e eeuw (Pictures of house and garden, 19th and 20th centuries)

1101-1. Archive of the meent of the Leusderberg (1550) 1561-1890

21. Schetskaart van de Leusderberg, circa 1850 (Sketch of the Leusderberg, circa 1850)
26. Stukken betreffende de vermelding van de eigendommen van de Leusderberg in de kadastrale leggers, 1833-1859 (Documents concerning the appearance of the properties of the Leusderberg in the cadastral ledgers, 1833-1839)

32. Akte van verkoop door de geërfden aan de gemeente Amersfoort van de meentgrond ten westen van de provinciale weg van Amersfoort naar Doorn met het bijbehorende jachtrecht, 1887 (Sale of a plot of communal land including hunting right to the municipality of Amersfoort, 1887)

35. Akte van verkoop door de geërfden aan Hendrik Johan Herman Baron van Boetzelaar van Oosterhout, burgemeester van Leusden, van een perceel duin- en heidegrond op de Leusderberg, 1888 (Sale of a plot of dune and heathland on the Leusderberg to H.J.H. baron van Boetzelaer van Oosterhout, mayor of Leusden, 1888)

38. Akte van verdeling tussen de geërfden van de meent van de Leusderberg, 1889 (Division of the meent of the Leusderberg, 1889)

65. Stukken betreffende de onderhandelingen tussen meentgraaf en heemraden en Hendrik Daniel Hooft van Woudenberg van Geerestein over de verkoop van een stuk heidegrond behorend tot de meent, 1842, 1856 (Possible sale of a plot of communal heathland to H.D. Hooft van Woudenberg van Geerestein, 1842, 1856)

127. Akten van verhuur door meentgraaf en heemraden van de jacht (per seizoen) op de Leusderberg, 1820-1827 (Lease of hunting rights on the Leusderberg, 1820-1827)

635. Archive Huis Drakestein, De Vuursche

12. Affiche van de verkoop van heerlijkheid De Vuursche, 1805 (Poster of the sale of the lordship De Vuursche, 1805)

STREEKARCHIEF KROMME RIJNGEBIED – UTRECHTSE HEUVELRUG, Wijk bij Duurstede
Kadastrale legger 1832 (cadastral ledger 1832) for the municipalities Amerongen and Doorn.
NB: In 2002 the archive was severely flooded and the documents have been unavailable ever since. Second copies of the ledgers at Kadaster Utrecht have been transferred to Het Utrechts Archieven in the same year, and would be digitised. However, in the time span of this research the ledgers have not yet become available again.

STREEKARCHIEF VECHT EN VENEN, Mijdrecht, Maarssen and Loenen aan de Vecht.

STREEKARCHIEF RIJNSTREEK, Woerden
Kadastrale legger 1832-2002 (cadastral ledger 1832-2002) for the municipalities Harmelen, Kamerik and Laag-Nieuwkoop.
GEMEENTEARCHIEF ZEIST (GZA)
Kadastrale legger 1832-2002 (cadastral ledger 1832-2002) for the municipalities Driebergen, Zeist and Rijssen burg.

STREEKARCHIEF EEMLAND, Amersfoort
Kadastrale legger 1832-2002 (cadastral ledger 1832-2002) for the municipalities Amersfoort, Leusden, Baarn, Eemnes, Soest and Woudenberg.

ESTATE ARCHIVE HUIS TE MAARN
- Various photographs of Blijdenstein family
V. ARCHIVAL SOURCES FOR WEST YORKSHIRE

WEST YORKSHIRE ARCHIVE SERVICE CALDERDALE, Halifax

Akroyd family

MISC 8/116/147. Bank Field estate, Northowram, sale particulars [1886]. Plan of the estate to be sold by auction.

MISC 8/116/148. Bank Field estate, Northowram, sale particulars [1886]. Particulars and plan of valuable MANSION HOUSE called BANKFIELD and freehold and copyhold property in the borough of Halifax in the County of York, to be sold by auction. On Tuesday, the 8th day of June, 1886.


Crossley family

DC 44. Copy out-letters of John and Francis Crossley regarding American interests, donations and subscriptions (Providence Chapel, Ovenden, Orphanages, schools, asylums, etc), New Zealand, property developments in Halifax (Waterhouse St., Crossley St., Square Road, etc), duties as Mayor and Infirmary Governor, opening of the new Town Hall, alterations to Belle Vue, etc. [1859-1868]

DC 45. Copy out-letters of John and Francis Crossley, regarding subscriptions and donations, Aire and Calder Conservancy Bill, American interests, improvements in steamers for steaming printed yarns, alterations at Somerleyton and Belle Vue. Includes letters of John Cordingley, secretary, when Francis Crossley on Continent on account of his health (1869-1870). [1868-1877]

DC 1352. Correspondence, plans, valuation, etc. regarding the Manor Heath estate, with lease to Giulio Marchetti (1913). [1877-1913]

DC 1695. Photography of house party outside Manor Heath, including John Crossley and Edward Crossley, c. 1868

HAL 1-718/ 573. Plan of Belle Vue, Halifax, 1889.


MP 39. Halifax Corporation Education Committee: Bermerside estate plan, 1911. Scale 16 feet to 1 inch.

SH 2/M/21/28. Photograph of a group of people outside Bermerside Mansion, Skircoat, the home of Edward Crossley. E. Greaves, Hall End, Halifax. [1870s]

Fielden family of Todmorden

FPL 3. Detailed plan of the gardens at Waterside House for Miss Fielden, giving names and locations of flowers, trees, vases, etc., December 1859.

FPL 6. Ordnance Survey (25 inch) showing Waterside Mill, Dobroyd Castle and other Fielden properties. Scale 208.33 feet to 1 inch.


Edwards family

CAC 1. Deeds and related papers regarding a moiety of Castle Carr estate, being freehold lands in Midgley. Main parties, John Farrer, Lord of the Manor of Midgley, 1614-1651; William Midgley 1614; Samuel Walton 1615; Walker family 1649-1709; Joshua Stansfield (1709-1742); Tatham family 1747-1830; George Bischoff 1830.


CAC 7. Attested copy deeds, with plan and declaration by James Edward Norris regarding extent and boundary of the Castle Carr estate, including conveyance of the estate by the Trustees of Joseph Priestly Edwards to Lea Priestley Edwards (1872) and copy settlement by Lea Priestley Edwards on his marriage to Emily Gertrude Edwards, Pye Nest (1873). Includes map of estate, 1874.


CAC 10. Miscellaneous plans, including quarry plans 1877-1898, plans of Castle Carr estate 1874-1889, plan of unspecified house and farm buildings at Castle Carr, 1857, and plan of the Wagon and Horses and land at Dyke Nook, Oxenhope, the property of William Brown. Also correspondence etc regarding quarry rights and workings, right of way etc., 1875-1902

SH 2/21/46. Pye Nest, Skircoat, the seat of Henry Edwards esquire, by A. Butler (no date)

YW 698. Copy of the advertisement and conditions of the sale by auction of the Castle Carr Estate, Midgley by Messrs. Walton and Lee, 1889.

**Separate bundle:**
- 14 April 1897, letter from Mr. W.E. Leppington at Oak Hill, Torquay, to John Murgatroyd regarding game shooting.
- 1889: Auction plan of Castle Carr estate by Walton & Lee

**Miscellaneous documents**


SH 2/21/47. Hope Hall, Halifax, by M. Burton (no date)

SH 2/21/42. Field House, Sowerby, by M. Burton (no date)

**WEST YORKSHIRE ARCHIVE SERVICE LEEDS, Leeds**

**Baines family**

WYL383/ 45/34. Letter from Sir Edward Baines in Switzerland to wife about holiday and death of granddaughter, 1878.

WYL383/ 45/35. Letter from Sir Edward Baines at Interlaken to wife about mountaineering (with a ladder), 1880.

WYL383/ 45/36. Letter from Sir Edward Baines to the Yorkshire College on his being Knighted – illustrious reign of Victoria! (sic), 1881

WYL383/ 50/1. Letter from Mrs. Edward Baines senior (Martha) to Edward Baines junior at Leeds (7 May 1829).

WYL383/ 50/2-3. Letters from Mrs. Edward Baines senior (Martha) at Headingley Lodge to her husband in London, no date.

WYL383/ 50/4. Letter from Mrs. Edward Baines senior (Martha) at St. Anne’s Hill, Burley, 9 September 1877.

WYL383/ 53/14. Recounting of gentlemen of Leeds to go in procession at E.B.’s funeral and for a memorial, 1848

WYL383/ 93. Printed work by Edward Baines junior, including ‘On the Social, Educational and Religious State of the Manufacturing Districts’ (1843), ‘An Alarm to the Nation on the Unjust Unconstitutional and Dangerous Measure of State Education Proposed by the Government’
(1847), and ‘On the Woollen Manufacture of England, with Special Reference to the Leeds Clothing District’ (1858).

Blayds family of Oulton

Oates family of Leeds
WYL36 O/A2. A plan of an estate situated in the township of Headingley in the parish of Leeds in county York, belonging to Joseph Oates esquire made in May 1798 by Jonathan Teal.
WYL36 O/A3. A map of an estate at Weetwood in the parish of Leeds county York, the property of Mr. Edwards Oates. Surveyed and drawn by J.Tuke 1796, with lands purchased from the Earl of Cardigan… surveyed by E. Preston and J. Crookes, 1828.
WYL36 O/A12. Plan of an estate at Headingley Moor End the property of Edward Grace, by S.D. Martin, Leeds, 1840. The ‘estate’ is only 3 acres large, without any buildings. No landed estate, therefore.
WYL36 O/A13. Plan of two freehold estates in Headingley and Burley to be sold by auction at the Cardigan Arms, Burley on 4 Nov. 1839

Nicholson family of Leeds
WYL59/ 52. Oakwood Estate, Roundhay, Leeds. The Mansion and grounds known as Oakwood, building land, a small villa, two cottages situated at Roundhay. For trustees of Henry Hudson. With plans. 28 June 1892.

YORKSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, LEEDS
Foster family of Stockeld Park
DD170/ 3-4. Expenditure on estate account books, no 1 (1896-1910), no 3 (1923-1933). Include wages, household expenses, repairs, rates and taxes, garden, keepers, woods, stables, etc.
DD170/ 35. Game book: Stockeld and Spofforth. Includes details of guns and of game killed, 1911-1930
DD170/ 36. Game shot: particulars, costs, etc. Stockeld, 1930-1937
DD170/ 76. House and grounds of Stockeld Park. Plan showing positions of house and buildings, trees, paths, etc. [1891]. Tracing paper coloured. Scale 1 inch to 20 feet.
Accompanied by relevant letters from H.E. Milner of London, 1891-1894, to Robert J. Foster esq., Harrowins, Queensbury, Yorkshire.

**DD170/ 86.** Estate: fields numbered, acreages given, woods and farms named, boundary marked. [1909]. Scale 6 inch to 1 mile.
VI. INTERNET AND CD-ROM SOURCES

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, www.cbs.nl/

DIVA, ‘De woonomgeving’ including cadastral maps and ledgers: www.dewoonomgeving.nl/

Genuki (genealogy for UK and Ireland), www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/index.html

Historisch Centrum Overijssel, http://historischcentrumoverijssel.nl/

Koninklijke Nederlandsche Heidemaatschappij, www.knhm.nl/

Oversticht, Het (1999-2002) Cd-roms Cultuurhistorische atlas Overijssel. For each municipality in the province a cd-rom was published. The following have been consulted: Enschede, Oldenzaal, Losser, Borne, Almelo, Wierden, Rijssen-Holten, Twenterand, Tubbergen, Hengelo and Hof van Twente.

Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, www.monumentenzorg.nl/

UK Database of Parks and Gardens, www.york.ac.uk/depts/arch/landscapes/ukpg/database/

VII. PUBLISHED PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES


Anonymous (1837) Nederlandsche tuinkunst. Handboek voor beoefenaars der plantenkunde, bezitters van tuinen en buitenverblijven, boom- en bloemkweekers, hoveniers en warmoezeniers (Amsterdam, Gebroeders Diederichs)

Anonymous (1884) Fortunes made in business. Series of original sketches, bibliographical and anecdotic. From the recent history of industry and commerce by various writers. Volume I & II (London, Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington)

Anonymous (since 1903) Nederland’s adelsboek (Den Haag, Van Stockum)

Anonymous (since 1910) Nederland’s patriciaat (Den Haag, Van Stockum)


Bateman, J. (1879) The great landowners of Great Britain and Ireland (London, Harrison)


Beresford, M. (1957) History on the ground: six studies in maps and landscapes (London, Lutterworth)


Bergmans, J. (1924) Vaste planten en rotsheesters (Haarlem)


Bijhouwer, J.T.P. (1946) Nederlandsche tuinen en buitenplaatsen (Amsterdam, Allert de Lange)


Borger, G. (1975) *De veenhoop: een historisch-geografisch onderzoek naar het verdwijnen van het veendek in een deel van West-Friesland* (Thesis University of Amsterdam)


*Bouwwereld, de* (various years)


Christemeijer, J.B. (1837) *Het lustoord tusschen Amstel en Grebbe II* (Schoonhoven)


Craandijk, J. (1950) *In dienst van Diana. Een bundle schetsen, beschouwingen en verhalen, de jacht en de honden betreffende* (Enschede, Van der Loef)


Bibliography and other sources


Dingeldein, W.H. (1969; second print) Singraven. Beelden uit het verleden en heden van een Twentse havezate (Enschede, Stichting Edwina van Heek)


Duncan, J. & N. Duncan (1988) ‘(Re)reading the landscape’ In: Environment and planning D: Society and space, 6, pp. 117-126


Elderink, C. (1926) Het geslacht Blijdenstein. Familieberk (Gouda)


Federatie Particulier Grondbezit (1996) Landgoederen in het bestemmingsplan


Fokker, J.P. (1932) Tuinen in Holland (Amsterdam, Kosmos)


Gratama, S. (1905) *Wet tot regeling der jacht en visscherij, van den 13den juni 1857 (Staatsblad no. 87), zooals die gewijzigd is bij latere wetten. Met aanteekeningen, bevattende de Jurisprudentie tot den laatsten tijd* (Schoonhoven, S. & W.N. van Nooten)


Hagens, B. & B. Olde Meierink (1986) *Twente te pronk: drie eeuwen verbeeld in prenten, tekeningen en aquarellen, 1600-1900* (Utrecht, Matrijs)


Bibliography and other sources


Hartogh Heys van Zouteveen, H.F. (1908) Boomen en heesters in parken en tuinen (Zutphen)


Healey, E. (1885) A series of picturesque views of castles and country houses in Yorkshire (Bradford)


Hendrikx, J.A. (no year) Overzicht van de ontwikkeling van de Europese tuinkunst tot ongeveer 1850 (unpublished)

Hendrikx, J.A. (1998) De ontginning van Nederland: het ontstaan van de agrarische cultuurlandschappen in Nederland (Utrecht, Matrijs)


Hendrikx, J.A. (1999b; 2nd edition) De ontginning van Nederland (Utrecht, Matrijs)


Bibliography and other sources

Hoekveld, G.A. (1964) *Baarn: schets van de ontwikkeling van een villadorp* (Utrecht University, thesis)


Huis Oud & Nieuw (various years)


Jansma, K., L. Jansma & M. Schroor (1990) *Tweeduizend jaar geschiedenis van Overijssel* (Leeuwarden, Uitgeverij Inter-Combi van Seijen)

Bibliography and other sources


Kuile, G.J. ter (1911) *Geschiedkundige aanteekeningen op de havezathen van Twente* (Almelo, W. Hilarius)


Kraft, J.Ch. (1809) *Plans of the most beautiful picturesque gardens in France, England and Germany, and of the edifices, monuments, fabrics, etc, which contribute to their embellishment, of every kind of architecture, such as Chinese, Egyptian, English, Arabian, Moorish, etc. Dedicated to architects and lovers of the arts* (Paris, De l’Imprimerie de Levrault)


Loudon, J.C. (1822) An encyclopaedia of gardening: comprising the theory and practice of horticulture, floriculture, arboreiculture, and landscape-gardening including all the latest improvements; a general history of gardening in all countries; and a statistical view of its present state, with suggestions for its future progress, in the British Isles (London, Longmans, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown)

Loudon, J.C. (1833) An encyclopaedia of cottage, farm, and villa architecture and furniture: containing numerous designs for dwellings ... each design accompanied by analytical and critical remarks (London, Longman)
Bibliography and other sources


Lutgers, P.J. (1836) Gezichten aan de rivier de Vecht (Loenen aan de Vecht)

Lutgers, P.J. (1869) Gezichten in de omstreken van Utrecht (Loenen aan de Vecht)


Meindersma, H. & K. de Jong (1985, eds.) Jongere bouwkunst in Overijssel: 1840-1940 (Utrecht, Matrijs)


Mourot, M. (1829-1830) Gezichten van buitenplaatsen en gebouwen gelegen tusschen de stad Utrecht en de Grebbe; geteekend naar het leven (Utrecht)


Neave, D. & D. Turnbull (1992) Landscaped parks and gardens of East Yorkshire, 1700-1830 (Hull, Georgian Society for East Yorkshire)

Nederlandsche Tuinbouwblad, het (1886)


Nitz, H.-J. (1989) ‘Transformation of old and formation of new structures in the rural landscape of northern central Europe during the 16th to 18th centuries under the impact of the early modern commercial economy’ In: Tijdschrift van de Belgische Vereniging voor Aardrijkskundige Studies, 58, pp. 267-290


Maisons d’hier et d’aujourd’hui, pp. 42-68 (Orgaan van de Koninklijke Vereniging der Historische Woonsteden van België en van de Nederlandse Kastelenstichting en met de medewerking van Icomos, Luxemburg)


Olde Meierink, B. (1995, ed.) Kastelen en ridderhofsteden in Utrecht (Utrecht, Matrijs)


Onze Tuinen. Geïllustreerd weekblad voor liefhebbers en vaklieden; gewijd aan tuin- en buitenleven (various years) (Amsterdam)


Pleyte, A.M. (1879) De rechtstoestand der marken in Nederland (Leiden)

Prince, H. (1967) Parks in England (Isle of Wight, Pinhorns)


Renes, J. (1991) Landschapsgeschiedenis in Engeland. Een wegwijzer door de literatuur over de geschiedenis van het Engelse cultuurlandschap (Wageningen, DLO-Staring Centrum)


Schulte, R. & X. von Tippelskirch (2004, eds.) Reading, interpreting, historicizing: letters as historical sources (San Domenico, European University Institute)


Sheeran, G. (1990) Landscape gardens in West Yorkshire 1680-1880 (Wakefield Historical Publications)


rural landscapes: persistence and change in a globalising environment, pp. 227-244 (Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers)


Stichting Edwina van Heek (1996) Verleden met toekomst. 50 Jaar Stichting Edwina van Heek (Enschede, Stichting Edwina van Heek)


Stoopendaal, D. (1719) De Zegenpraalende Vecht. Vertoonende verscheide Gesichten van Lustplaatsen, Heeren Huysen en Dorpen; Beginnende van Utrecht en met Muyden besluytende (Amsterdam, Nicolaus Visscher)


Temple, Sir, W. (1692) Upon the gardens of Epicurus, or... Of Gardening in the Year 1685 (London)


Van der Aa, A.J. (1839-1851) *Aardrijkskundig woordenboek der Nederlanden* (Gorinchem, Noorduyn)


Van Groningen, C.L. (2003) *De wooncultuur op de Stichtse Lustwarande van de zeventiende tot de twintigste eeuw* (PhD University of Utrecht)


Van Laar, G. (1802) Magazijn van tuinsieraaden of verzameling van modellen van aanleg en sieraad, voor groote en kleine lusthoven, voornamelijk van dezulke die met weinige kosten te maken zijn. Getrokken uit de voornaamste buitenlandsche werken naar de gelegenheid en gronden dezer Republiek gewijzigd, en met veele nieuwe plattegronden en sieraaden vermeerderd (Amsterdam, Johannes Allart)

Van Laren, A.J. (1913) Decoratieve tuinbeplanting, tuinboek voor vaklieden en liefhebbers (Koog-Zaandijk, S. Bakker)

Van Luttervelt, R. (1943) De buitenplaatsen aan de Vecht (De Bilt, Drukkerij Fa. B. Cuperus AZ.)

Van Luttervelt, R. (1944) Schoonheid aan de Vecht (Amsterdam, Allert de Lange)

Van Luttervelt, R. (1949) De Stichtse Lustwarande (Amsterdam, Allert de Lange)


Van Tent, W.J. (1972) De buitenplaatsen van de Amsterdamse kooplieden in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw – hun onstaan en situering. Met een catalogus van de buitens aan de Vecht (Theses Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Van Voerst van Lynden, M.G.A. Baroness (n.d.) De tuinen van Twickel (Delden, Stichting Twickel)


Whatley, Th. (1770) *Observations on modern gardening. Illustrated by descriptions* (London)


Williamson, T. (2000a) ‘The rural landscape 1500-1900, the neglected centuries’ In: D. Hooke (ed.) *Landscape, the richest historical record*, pp. (The Society for Landscape Studies)


Witte, H. (1866) *Handboek voor den bloementuin* (Groningen)

Witte, H. (1876) *Tuinen, villa’s en buitenplaatsen* (Groningen)

Wittert van Hoogland, E.B.F.F. (1900-1912) *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Utrechtse ridderhofsteden en heerlikheden* (’s Gravenhage, Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie en Heraldiek)


