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ABSTRACT

Research Question: The purpose of this study is to understand how users of Camp Santanoni perceive and interpret the visual harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment and if these meanings are congruent with the design recommendations from Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks. The main goal is to understand the congruent relationships between how a designer wished to achieve visual harmony between buildings and landscapes, and how people actually perceive this interaction. The meaningful relationships between users (the people) of Camp Santanoni’s buildings and the surrounding landscape (the place) were documented.

Results: The results revealed that the users agree with the historical designers intent to achieve a harmonious relationship between the building and the landscape. This thesis established an understanding of what people perceive and interpret a harmonious relationship to be between rustic architectural design and the natural environment.

Practical Implications: This thesis collected idiosyncrasies-intangible meanings, which can be used for successful and meaningful site interpretation. This new body of knowledge has the potential to impact the reasons and justifications for a range of preservation actions performed by historic preservationists and cultural landscape preservation experts. The researcher believes there are many things
that will be brought to light, things that have been overlooked or never even considered before about the site and how it is used and interpreted just by including the users in a direct conversation regarding the sites management. Not only is this an opportunity to learn from the users, but this is also an opportunity to teach them about the site and why certain decisions have been made. The researcher recommends selecting sites around the country in both state park and national park sites to conduct this study at.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Park design, in other words, is how parks work. Design is what has made it possible for people to have meaningful experiences of nature and history without destroying or impairing the landscapes they experienced. In other cases, park design made daily patterns of urban life more healthful, beautiful and meaningful. Above all park design has been a means of landscape preservation: of stabilizing and interpreting places of perceived natural or cultural significance for a visiting public, whatever the interpretive program and whoever the visiting public might be.
Ethan Carr (2013), p. 8

1.1 Introduction

Professionals within the field of cultural landscape preservation have identified a problem in which sites of natural and cultural value are at risk of losing the idiosyncrasies that define place, because of the “routine practice of survey and registration” (Melnick, 2008 et al.; Richard Longstreth, 2008). A site is typically surveyed for physical characteristics and then registered with the National Register of Historic Places: while this is not always the case, this tends to be the direction, but it is not absolute. The field of cultural landscape preservation will benefit from the identification of this broader problem by Arnold Alanen and Robert Melnick, because landscape preservation doctrine calls for the understanding of meaningful relationships between people and place. Landscape preservation doctrine that addresses the meaningful relationships between people and place are the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO, 2003), and Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage, Sites and Areas (ICOMOS, 2005). Many professionals are suggesting that it is time to reevaluate and return to understanding the idiosyncrasies and intangibles that help define sense of place,
which is imperative to successful and meaningful site interpretation.

Building on the author’s strong background in architectural design and interest in human behavior, this study focuses on the balance between rustic architecture, visual harmony and the complex ways people understand and interact with architecture and the landscape. The researcher defines visual harmony as, the visual relationship between rustic architectural design and the surrounding natural environment that is aesthetically pleasing to the human eye and where the built environment respects the site's natural features. Guided by design principles established by designers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, users of Camp Santanoni today give merit to these design principles, which are worthy of recognition and implementation in new design and construction within natural and wilderness environments. Camp Santanoni, an Adirondack Great Camp completed in 1893, was designed by Robert H. Robertson utilizing the principles of visual harmony. In recognition of its excellent rustic design and history, it was named a National Historic Landmark in 2000. Based on an examination of principles of Downing, Olmstead and Wicks, the researcher concluded that Camp Santanoni was designed with their concept of reverence for the natural environment in mind. Informant responses indicate the design of Camp Santanoni continues to reflect a harmonious relationship with the natural environment even 120 years after its completion. Collecting data from users of rustic buildings in natural environments can help influence rustic building preservation by understanding how user experience might be affected by
management decisions. Cultural landscape preservation decisions will ultimately impact and have implications on user experience with or without their input. However, it is best practice and the responsibility of true site stewardship that user perception is accommodated in management decisions, especially since most buildings within park and natural settings were designed for the user. Pearl and Walker (2011) comment on public perception pertaining to public cemeteries:

Once the preservation treatment is finalized, cemetery managers need to consider the impact of any changes to the public’s perception or use of the landscape. In Massachusetts cemeteries and burying grounds have been a part of the public landscape for centuries, and many people have come to appreciate the current character of those places. Mature trees, overgrown vegetation, and memorial plantings may define people’s visual experiences and memories. Prior to making any change in landscape character, it is important to educate constituents about the reasons for and benefits of change. Removing trees in 17th century burial grounds may be an appropriate preservation treatment, but visitors and neighbors should understand the reason for such radical change. (p. 9)

These authors clearly acknowledge how changes to a historic landscape can impact the public’s perception and experience, and further emphasize, why understanding the public’s perception from the beginning is imperative.

Furthering this discussion are comments from Laurie Matthews, Cultural Landscape Planner and Director of Preservation Planning and Design at MIG, Inc., and Karl Dietzler, Recreation Planner, Architectural Historian for the Middle Fork Ranger District, Willamette National Forest. The researcher interviewed these cultural landscape professionals to ascertain their impressions of how public perception is valued or incorporated by design professionals during the planning process. The general question is: during the planning process for
landscape preservation, how much is user (public) perception incorporated into this process by design professionals? The conversation between Dietzler and the researcher took place over the phone, while the conversation below took place between Dietzler and Matthews over email in October 2012.

Karl Dietzler:

My sense is that historical landscape architects and historical architects tend to focus more on the physical resources themselves during the planning process, and to a practical extent, the project is what the public will see and how they will interact with the space upon project completion.

Laurie Matthews:

I would say that we think about public perception when we are developing treatment plans/designs for historic landscapes, but it is not a separate or discrete task. Oftentimes we are focused on how the new features that we are adding to the historic landscape will be compatible with and blend with the historic site, but be clearly distinguishable. In that case you’re right that we are focused on the physical features.

However, we also do think about public perception when it comes to interpretation and education. How will the public perceive a historic landscape and learn from it? I know personally I am committed to creating an authentic historic landscape that may at times be messier and not as manicured as people might expect. Figuring out ways to educate people so that they understand why a landscape is not clipped and manicured is part of the perception issue that we think about.

For example, we are working with a client in Hawaii right now. The landscape was particularly tropical and lush and some might say overgrown during the main historic period that they want to interpret. The challenge we are facing is how do we restore that historic character when they have grown used to a more polished and manicured site? The other challenge we face is that even if we can get by on that approach, how do we work with maintenance staff to change their methods a bit? We encountered a similar issue at Hearst Castle, where some plants were more shaped in recent years than they were during Hearst’s time. He preferred a more flowing form to some plants and we worked with the staff to reinstitute methods that would bring that back.
Creating and portraying authentic historic landscapes is imperative for proper historical landscape interpretation purposes, and will also ultimately impact the public’s perception. Educating the public about the appearance of the landscape should be a priority. The value of historical photographic documentation cannot be underestimated.

The literature review, included in chapter two of this study, provides the reader with critical information necessary to understanding visual harmony and its important role in the construction and preservation of buildings within natural environments. By understanding and identifying the idiosyncrasies that define landscape, we can better understand the needs for meanings and associations in the filed of cultural landscape preservation. This study of rustic architectural design within natural environments helps illustrate these ideas by collecting the meaningful relationships between people and place.

This research demonstrates how important people’s relationships are to landscape, but more importantly how thoughtful design with regard to human experience in natural environment can foster those relationships. The researcher successfully collected meanings and associations necessary to understanding the important relationships between people and landscape. Through this study, many idiosyncrasies have been uncovered that add significant meaning to and help clarify what is important about the intangible human element in cultural landscape preservation pertinent to Camp Santanoni.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

This thesis examines Camp Santanoni, as the case study to answer this question: How do users of Camp Santanoni perceive and interpret the harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment and are these meanings congruent with the design recommendations from Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks?

While Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks documented how visual harmony could be achieved between rustic architecture and the natural environment, it is not known if current users of these kinds of places understand and perceive this harmony in the way that these designers intended. This thesis will unveil Camp Santanoni’s current users’ understanding of visual harmony and will assert whether they agree or disagree with the historical designers’ intent. There are no answers, information or studies, to the author’s knowledge, about whether the historic designer’s goal of achieving harmony between the built and natural environment for rustic buildings within natural environments was successful from the perspective of contemporary users. While there is documentation on the design history of the concept of visual harmony, none of the material addresses how design intent is perceived from the users of the site.
1.3 Purpose of Study

The ideas and concepts that are presented in this thesis originated from the author’s interest in rustic architecture. The author has intuitively sensed for many years that rustic architecture enhances users’ overall experience in park and natural environments. One hypothesis was that people might perceive the same visual quality and harmony of the buildings in context with the natural environment that the designers intended, but that the user is not necessarily consciously aware of this. To understand this phenomenon, documentation that directly addressed how to build in harmony with nature was identified; essentially these can be considered early design guidelines. To assess these ideas, the author created a qualitative test to research how people actually perceive and interpret the harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment, and therefore agree or disagree with the designer’s intent.

The purpose of this study is to understand how users of Camp Santanoni perceive and interpret the visual harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment and if these meanings are congruent with the design recommendations of Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks. Based on the precedents cited in Chapter 2, the main goal of this study is to understand the congruent relationships between how a designer wished to achieve visual harmony between buildings and landscapes, and how people actually perceive this interaction.
1.4 Research questions

This study explores the following three questions, which originated from the problem statement:

1. How do users of rustic architecture perceive and describe visual harmony between the built and natural environments?

2. Do users agree or disagree with the design recommendations of Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks?

3. How does rustic architecture enhance people’s attachment to the natural environment?

The author is studying how the users of Camp Santanoni perceive the intended harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment, and if their interpretation is congruent with the design recommendations of Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks. Through this case study, the author hopes to enhance the knowledge of public perception of historic rustic architecture in natural environments on a wider scale.
1.5 Significance to the Field

This thesis establishes an understanding of what people perceive and interpret a harmonious relationship to be between rustic architectural design and the natural environment. The meanings revealed in this study identify some of the idiosyncrasies that are imperative to cultural landscape preservation. The information collected contributes knowledge to the neglected research area of people and their interactions between natural and built environments.

Historically, academics have studied people in natural environments and people in built environments separately, but it was not until recently that the two have been considered together, particularly in the field of cultural landscape preservation. This research has helped the researcher explain the complex human element (human thought and emotion as it pertains to sense of place, i.e. the user’s perception) in landscape, while providing feedback on what is important and meaningful about visually harmonious relationships. By taking into account users’ perspectives, this new body of knowledge has the potential to influence the reasons and justifications for a range of preservation actions performed by historic preservationists and cultural landscape preservation experts by taking into account users’ perspectives.

This research is also expected to raise awareness about the historic use of the term “harmony” and the concept of visual harmony—a design history of which many are unaware and a history important to the influence and development of structures in our state and national parks.
1.6 Definitions

**Visual Quality**: The measure or standard of a visitor’s visual experience in both natural and developed areas containing visitor amenities in state and national parks established for natural resources protection and recreation.

**Visual Harmony**: Zube (1993), describes visual harmony as “relative to the perceived meaning of the structure or development and the landscape context in which it exists.” p. 9

**Harmonious Relationships**: Good (1993) defined harmonious relationships as, “the subordination of a structure to environment and having buildings blend in with the landscape.” p. 6

**Cultural Landscape**: The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Cultural Landscape Preservation define cultural landscapes as:

A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.

**Rustic Architecture**: Design that is compatible with the surrounding natural environment, defined by its use of native building materials of timber and stone
1.7 Limitations

The limitations of this study include the small \((n=16)\), non-probability sample, the framing and quality of the photos, the impermanence of vegetation, and the inability to conduct this study at other, similar rustic architecture sites around the country. It is important to note that the results of this thesis cannot be generalized or predicted with certainty, as one could with a quantitative study. However, similar meanings and associations revealed by this study may be transferrable to other sites similar to Santanoni. This thesis attempts to understand a particular phenomenon by collecting meanings. Theoretically, at a site similar to Santanoni one would expect to collect similar meanings shared by the informants, which could be used to further understand the phenomenon on a greater level.

The characteristics of Camp Santanoni are unique and have not been researched previously, and are characteristics that lend themselves to an exploratory, qualitative case study. Qualitative case studies also work best with a purposive sample, as has been used in this study. Stake (2005) discusses a type of qualitative case study that he refers to as an “intrinsic” case study, which emphasizes the value in understanding what is important about a specific site and the role of purposive sampling in providing the “opportunity to learn.” Purposive sampling is the selection of a sample for a specific purpose.

The bulk of case study work, however, is done by people who have intrinsic interest in the case. Their intrinsic case study designs draw these researchers toward understandings of what is important about that case within its own world…Intrinsic designs aim to develop what is perceived to
be the case's own issues, contexts, and interpretations, its "thick description." (p. 450)

Quantitative research study designs are appropriate for prediction, causality, and correlation, but they do not allow the researcher to understand a phenomenon in depth. Qualitative designs offer “thick descriptions” that are filled with meanings. This study focuses on understanding the thick description of a “wink”—or a snapshot of a phenomenon that is taking place a particular site.

In Chapter 1, titled *Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture of the Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geerts*, Geerts (1973) discusses what “wink” is—a deliberate and voluntary action, which is embedded with meaning.

The winker is communicating, and indeed communication in a quite precise and special way: (1) deliberately, (2) to someone in particular, (3) to impart a particular message, (4) according to a socially established code, and (5) without cognizance of the rest of company. (p. 6) The thick description is in the meat or meaning of what the winker is communicating. Winks are perceived and then interpreted.

Stake (2005) recommends choosing cases that we can learn the most from (p. 451). Similarly, Singleton and Straits (2005) believe that the selection of cases is best left to the expert’s judgment (p. 132). The selection of a small sample of users of Camp Santanoni was necessary for this qualitative study and
relevant to the meanings and associations the research is trying to understand about the site.

The researchers sample is not “random” (i.e., not a probability sample) and does not represent any known population, and any conclusions in terms of “x” percent of the informants indicating “y” results is not statistically significant. This study’s use of a nonprobability sample relies on the purposeful selection of a sample rather than a random selection of samples. Singleton and Straits (2005) note two limitations of nonprobability samples:

1. They do not control for investigator bias in the selection of units, and
2. Their pattern of variability cannot be predicted from probability sampling theory, thereby making it impossible to calculate sampling error or to estimate sample precision. (p. 132)

The limitations of a nonprobability sample are, however, counterbalanced with the types of meanings that can only be obtained from a qualitative case study, such as this one. This study’s design offers a better way of understanding meanings than any quantitative design based on a probability sample. The results are saturated with information that only a qualitative design like this could have revealed—meanings and associations pertinent to Camp Santanoni are made more meaningful by a selected sample that is familiar and knowledgeable about the site. These people were not first-time users of the site. They had experienced the site over time and through multiple seasons. The strength of the study lies in explaining a particular phenomenon through the meanings (or idiosyncrasies) the informants shared with the researcher. An informant’s
understanding of place and the meanings and associations they ascribe to it cannot be quantified.

In design, a theory or concept is an artistic expression (e.g., visual harmony) of an idea that is to be actualized. The designers of the nineteenth century literally constructed buildings based on human thought, which is defined by Guba and Lincoln (1994) as “inventions of the human mind” (p.108). The researcher set out to understand the design from the perspective of the user—to see if their understanding was the same. Furthermore, the researcher wanted to know if there is a congruency between designer’s artistic expression and users personal mental construct of the final design.

Entangled in the data was the “thick description” of how users of Camp Santanoni perceive and interpret the visual harmony of Camp Santanoni in relation to the natural environment. Descriptions filled with meaning were organized into identifiable themes for the first time. Consistencies emerged across all the categories. Understanding how its users interpret a site allows for a sensitive and thoughtful site management approach.
1.8 Ethical Considerations

This study involves human subject research, in which Roger Williams University (RWU) requires proper protocol. The research was approved by RWU’s Human Subject Review Board (Appendix A). Informants were never at risk of being exposed to the possibility of physical, mental or social discomfort, harm or danger and were not subject to more than minimal harm. All informants will remain anonymous, as no personal identifiers were collected. Only demographic information was collected, such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, occupation, level of education, and location. The demographic information of the participants and the research data collected will be kept in a password-protected file. The interviewees were also told, “If you are bothered or upset about any aspect of this study, you may refuse to answer a question or stop at anytime.” Every measure was taken to respect the privacy of the informants.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

There is a need to understand the complex relationships between people and cultural landscapes (Alanen & Melnick, 2000). This need derives from the philosophical discussion about the reasons and justifications for a range of preservation actions, as well as practical application of those reasons and justifications to cultural landscape preservation. Professionals and practitioners in the field of historic preservation and cultural landscape preservation are having a discussion about the “routine practice of survey and registration” (Alanen & Melnick, 2000). The traditional, methodical way of preserving a cultural landscape by surveying a site and then registering it with the National Register of Historic Places, is a result of a process described by Robert Melnick (2008) as the “bureaucratic process that allows us to think about and act on landscape protection.”

This bureaucratic process has simplified values inherent in cultural landscape preservation. It has been described by Alanen and Melnick (2000) as codification, the systematic way of generalizing complex meanings and association or the act or process of contracting multifaceted values. They assert that in codifying the intangible memories of landscape experience, results in the loss of the very idiosyncrasies that define landscape. Idiosyncrasies ways of thought peculiar to an individual, add significant meaning to and help clarify what is important about the intangible human element in cultural landscape
preservation, which is why a greater understanding of landscapes can improve our knowledge of places and also our treatment of them (Longstreth, 2008).

Melnick (2008) stresses that we need to ask more questions about what is meaningful, so that we add to our understanding of place and go beyond the orthodoxy of our own work to better understand human-nature relationships from a contemporary perspective. In addition, as Melnick (2008) states, “when we ask the same questions about people and place, we run the risk of arriving at the same conclusions, and in so doing, we fail to understand the complex relationship of people and landscape. There are no right questions, but by asking more questions we add to our multifaceted understanding of any place” (p. 205). We must do a better job at engaging the community by asking what is important, and what is meaningful. “It means listening to others in order to learn about the landscape, why it is important, what is meaningful, and how it can continue to play a vital role in the community’s future” (Melnick, 2008 et al Richard Longstreth). Therefore, such a need to better understand these complex questions and relationships has inspired this thesis.

The author has identified a neglected area of research specific to the preservation of cultural landscapes that seeks to understand the complex relationships between people and natural (park, wild, and wilderness) environments. The author identified a documented time in the history of architectural design when the goal of rustic design was to integrate the building with its surrounding natural environment. The final relationship was described as
being visually harmonious and was the result of following well-established design principles and philosophies. The design and integration of a building with its natural setting was paramount at the onset of the early conservation movement, coinciding with the transcendentalist movement. The author has developed a research niche that begins to understand the complex relationships between people and landscape. The author seeks to understand if the visually harmonious design is recognized and perceived as harmonious from the perspective of Camp Santanoni’s contemporary users.

Cultural landscape preservation and interpretation allows one to understand the many aspects of a cultural landscape, including the history of the site’s design, the original inhabitants’ interaction with the site, and what contemporary users of the site today experience. The preservation and maintenance of a cultural landscape is just as important as the design of a landscape, because it respects the site’s development and communicates its story to future generations.

Designers (architects and landscape architects) of the nineteenth and twentieth century, designed “rustic architecture” to be in harmony with the surrounding landscape. Therefore, the design intent is known, but we do not know what “visual harmony” is in the relationship between natural and cultural elements in a landscape from the perspective of the users of these sites today. The available literature on how buildings were designed to be in harmony with nature ranges from design guidelines to experts’ descriptive writing on
harmonious relationships. The subject of landscape and health can contribute valuable information that may provide insight on people’s connection to the landscape. More specifically, an understanding of landscape and the “healthful” aspects of wilderness can help answer the third research question: How does rustic architecture enhance people’s attachment to the natural environment? It is through the subjects of landscape and health that we begin to understand the benefits of exposure to landscape.

2.2 Harmony and Visual Quality History

2.2.1 A Brief History of Early Landscape Developments with Regard to Andrew Jackson Downing and Frederick Law Olmsted

During the mid-nineteenth century, coinciding with their work developing urban parks, two landscape architects, Andrew Jackson Downing and Frederick Law Olmsted, began identifying how structures and other improvements built in parks should harmonize with the natural scenery.

Andrew Jackson Downing (1815-1852), considered to be the father of American landscape architecture, developed principles that reflected the landscape-based interests of the transcendentalist philosophical movement (McClelland, 1993). Downing’s idea of harmonization was to focus on the natural features and to blend the structures into their natural surroundings (Major, 1997; McClelland, 1993). Andrew Jackson Downing’s books, Cottage Residences (1842) and The Architecture of Country Houses (1850), “had a strong influence
on architects’ appreciation for building in harmony with the landscape” (Kaiser, 1997). Downing stressed the importance of site in *The Architecture of Country Houses*:

As a villa is a house surrounded by more or less land, it is impossible rightly to understand how to design such a dwelling for a given site, without knowing something of the locality where it is to be placed. The scenery, amid which it is to stand, if it is of a strongly marked character, will often help to suggest or modify the character of the architecture. A building which would appear awkwardly and out of place on a smooth plain, may be strikingly harmonious and picturesque in the midst of a wild landscape. (p. 271)

According to Downing (1850), “The first point that both the proprietor and the architect will examine, in choosing the site, will be to select the best locality with regard to these three points—view, shelter, and position for kitchen offices and outbuildings” (p. 271). Downing believed in the primary importance of proper site selection and that designed improvements should be subordinate to natural beauty (McClelland, 1993). Downing linked between a structure’s material and its setting, and set the precedent for the use of native materials in naturalistic forms as a technique for harmonizing manmade structures with a natural setting (McClelland, 1993).

Downing’s principles influenced landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted (1822—1903) (McClelland, 1993; Twombly, 2010). In his 1865 report on how the nascent Yosemite National Park should be managed, Olmsted discusses the subordination of architecture:

The first point to be kept in mind then is the preservation and maintenance as is exactly possible of the natural scenery; the restriction, that is to say, within the narrowest limits consistent with the necessary accommodations
of visitors, of all constructions and the prevention of all constructions
markedly inharmonious with the scenery or which would unnecessarily
obscure, distort, or detract from the dignity of the scenery. (Frederick Law
Olmsted, 1865)

The Yosemite report was the first preliminary plan for how to manage a national
park, Olmsted thought it was essential to discuss how you build—or where not to
build. Olmstead developed his own design principles and wrote about park
design. Olmsted also believed that sites of natural beauty and grandeur should
be chosen, and that all improvements upon the land must be managed in a way
that strengthens rather than weakens the prevailing character of the park; natural
features such as rocks should be skillfully merged into the buildings face; views
are to be commanded, and if water is present, the building must be built in such a
way that it can be viewed from several vantage points (Twombly, 2010).

2.2.2 Defining Geographical Boundaries in the Adirondacks

Following the Civil War the Adirondacks became a tourist destination and
place for recreation and for the treatment of tuberculosis. Haynes and Jacos
(2000) discuss the introduction of tourists into the Adirondack Park: “William
Murray’s Adventures in the Wilderness, or Camp Life in the Adirondacks (1869)
attracted thousands of tourists to travel to Saratoga Springs by train and continue
by coach over rough road to primitive hotels, often built of logs on the model of
the logger’s camp” (p. 10). As tourist traffic increased, there was a demand for a
rail line from Saratoga Springs. Thomas C. Durant incorporated the Adirondack
Railroad, and in 1871 he extended the Adirondack Railroad from Saratoga to
North Creek, allowing the public access to America’s largest park (PBS, 2008).
With public access and interest came real estate development. William West Durant, son of Thomas C. Durant began building Great Camps for America’s wealthiest: the robber barons and captains of industry (PBS, 2008).

Haynes and Jacos (2000) and McClelland (1998) agree that the design ethic for rustic architectural design was influenced by Andrew Jackson Downing’s principles. In addition to drawing heavily upon Downing’s principles, influence also came from local and regional building traditions: “The great camps of New York’s Adirondack region provided one of the earliest and strongest expressions of Downing’s ideas for a picturesque rustic style appropriate for a natural area or wilderness” (McClelland, 1998, p. 94).

In Log Cabins: How to Build and Furnish Them (1889), architect Williams S. Wicks (1854—1919), discusses how buildings should appear to look as if they are growing out of the ground and harmonize with the site:

Having selected your site, the next thing is to study it. Mark well its commanding and beautiful views, its background, the foreground. Study it as you would a painting, for out of your site and its environment you must grow your building plan. Indeed the structure should be outgrowth of, and harmonize with the site, so that when your work is completed the structure shall be outgrowth of and harmonize with the site, a new object added by the hand of man to perfect and beautify its surroundings; and the whole when viewed shall produce an agreeable effect, like harmony in music and rhythm in poetry. (p. 9)

Regarding Wicks’s above statement, McClelland (1998) notes further that, “Wicks told his readers to select a site based on scenic views, accessibility, frontage of water, and protection by trees. He was one of the first to promote the idea that structures should be an outgrowth of the site and harmonize with it” (p. 96). As
the following discussion will illustrate, Wicks’s principles were implemented in Adirondack camp design.

2.2.3 Visual Harmony in Relation to Santanoni

This thesis focuses on Camp Santanoni, a historic site located in Newcomb, N.Y., that epitomizes the designers’ concepts of visual harmony, as the case study to determine how people perceive and interpret the visual quality and harmony of historical, rustic architectural design in context with natural environments. Understanding users’ perceptions of historical rustic architecture in natural environments is critical to describing how users perceive and interpret the visual harmony.

Paul Malo, architect, author, historic preservationists and advocate of all things historic, is co-author of Santanoni: From Japanese Temple to Life at Adirondack Great Camp (2000) and writes a foreword for Craig Gilborn’s Adirondack Camps: Homes Away from Home, 1850—1950 (2000). In Adirondack Camps, Gilborn discusses Santanoni’s relationship to its surroundings with comments on how difficult the Camp is to photograph in its entirety. This suggests and supports how harmonious the building is with its natural surroundings.

The camp, which cannot be seen or comprehended at a glance, was experienced as an extension of nature, an organic whole that was part of the continuum of space and foliage around it. Thus the symmetrical disposition of the six cabins, shown by Paul Malo in his reconstruction of the camp, comes as a surprise. Photographing the lodge as a whole has never been done, despite pictures taken by amateurs and professional photographers between 1892 and the early 1930s, because of trees and an elevated position. (p. 229)
2.2.4 A Brief History of Later Developments

Designers of the nineteenth and twentieth century designed rustic architecture to be in harmony with the surrounding landscape. The following sections will discuss Shepard, an architect of Adirondack great camps and publications on National Park Service architecture.

2.2.4.1 Augustus D. Shepard’s Influence

Augustus D. Shepard continued the theme of the integration of the buildings and sites through the Adirondack camp period (Haynes & Jacos, 2000; McClelland, 1998). In 1931, Shepard’s *Camps in the Woods* was published, almost a half century after Wicks’s *Log Cabins: How to Build and Furnish Them*. Kaiser (1982) points out the similarity of design philosophy between Wicks and Shepard: “Desirability of a site was based on the available views, access, and a tree-protected waterfront, and as Wicks said, ‘The structure should be the outgrowth of, and harmonize with the site.’ Shepard echoes this: ‘The buildings must be designed so that they appear to grow out of the ground. It should be hardly discernible to the eye where the building commences” (p. 65). Shepard, who designed Adirondack camps, described his work and philosophy in *Camps in the Woods*:

In designing a camp in the woods one should avoid the use of materials that do not possess qualities that are appropriate to the setting. In the woods a building should be so constructed that it becomes actually a part of the woods and even a part of the scenery. The camp must possess certain inherent qualities of the forest… Visible construction may be said to stand as an architectural symbol of nature’s growth, and these camps make their strongest appeal in the fact that their designs are so definitely based on structure… Simplicity is the keynote of the design as it is of
Although Augustus D. Shepard did not publish material until after Santanoni was completed, he did begin designing camps in the Adirondacks three years before Santanoni was complete. One of his most famous contributions to camp architecture was the lodges at the Adirondack League Club (ALC). The ALC, organized in 1890, is located in Old Forge, New York, and is one of the oldest and largest private preserves in the eastern United States. From the *Adirondack League Club Centennial* book in Chapter 5 titled “So Close to Nature”: Rustic Architecture at the Club, Craig Gilborn remarks “…August Shepard as having the greatest influence on the architecture of camps and lodges at the Club. Shepard could be considered the more sophisticated of the two men: he designed camps that contemplated both occupants and the surrounding landscape” (Chapter 5, pp.1—2).

### 2.2.4.2 National Park Service Developments

With the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, and railroads linking the East and the West, there was a need for accommodations as tourists began flocking to Yellowstone to view one of the nation’s most beautiful natural environments. Railroad companies and their designers were responsible for the first park accommodations, which drew on exposure to rustic architecture in the Adirondacks Mountains, building the first park accommodations in Yellowstone, Yosemite, Glacier and the Grand Canyon (Kaiser, 1997; Zube, 1993; Campagna, 2002). The National Park Service Preservation Brief 26, *The
Preservation and Repair of Historic Log Buildings makes reference to the reflection of Adirondack rustic architecture in NPS buildings: “The Adirondack or Rustic style was balanced in the West with construction of the Old Faithful Inn at Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, designed by Robert C. Reamer, and begun in 1903. This popular resort was tremendously influential in its use of locally-available natural materials, especially log and gave impetus to Rustic as a true national style.” This source also mentions the use of native materials.

When the Organic Act officially authorized the creation of the National Park Service (NPS) in 1916, a design model was needed concerning the relationship of developments with park resources (Kaiser, 1997; Zube, 1993). The NPS followed the railroaders’ lead in designing park buildings that were perceived to be in harmony with park resources, and set guidelines for future developments concerning harmonious relationships. A NPS document titled Rustic Architecture: 1916—1942 further discusses the architecture style that influenced the railroads:

The railroads’ search for architectural styles suitable for park settings occurred at a time when landscape architecture was beginning to exert major influence on architectural design and theory. In 1842, landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing had publicized his ideas on “picturesque” landscape and the importance of nature in architectural design in his widely distrusted book Cottage Residences. Several decades later, Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., a friend and pupil of Downing, working in conjunction with architects such as H.H. Richardson, strengthened the connections between architecture and landscape architecture. Their buildings were constructed of “natural” materials, including native stone, timbers, and shingles. The building forms responded to their sites, and landscaping became an integral part of the design. (p.1)
In *Landmarks in Landscape* (1997), Kaiser discusses how the NPS implemented the concept of harmony as the underlying design ethic, which served as the design model. However, he was careful to skirt the issue of its potential derivation from Adirondack sources:

The NPS followed this concept of harmony by producing “some of the most well-known elements of Americans’ shared architectural heritage, sometimes defining a national park as much as the canyon or geyser.” The underlying ethic of design, use of materials, and selection of site embraced “a spectrum of attitudes about ‘harmony.’ Some structures are created in nature’s image, reflecting or vying with awesome imagery. Others seek a dynamic fusion with the setting, others obscurity.” (Kaiser 1997, p. 9)

In 1935, *Parks and Recreation Structures* by Albert Good was published. Good’s publication was the NPS’s first pattern book, which references many of Shepard’s principles. The principles set forth in this book created guidelines for execution that would aid future projects involved with planning designing, and managing of structures within parks. Careful planning and design in consideration of the visual quality of the built environment allows for a harmonious relationship to landscape. Good discusses several ways that this may be achieved, including a recommendation that some buildings should be screened.

…by locating it behind existing plant material or in some secluded spot in the terrain partly screened by some other natural feature. In the absence of such screening at a site otherwise well-suited for the function of the building, an adequate screen can be planted by repeating the same plant materials that exist nearby. Preferably, structures will be so located with reference to the natural features of the landscape that it is unnecessary to plant them out. (p. 9)

Good suggested other design attributes that would contribute to harmonizing buildings with park resources and that would help blend in with the landscape
Stephen Mather, the first director of the NPS, described desirable relationships between buildings and landscapes with phrases such as “a result which will be harmonious” and “one harmonious whole” (Zube, 1997). With those words reflected in practice, Mather would hire designers charged with ensuring the harmony of all developments in the parks, and the quest for visual quality in the parks would begin.

*Visual Quality of Built Environments in National Parks* (Zube, 1993) is a report intended for an internal audience (within the NPS) who can influence visual quality and is meant to raise awareness of and sensitivity to the importance of the visual quality of the built environments in parks. It provides a review and discussion of visual quality strategies and tools for planning, designing, and managing parks. The report was developed out of concern voiced by the academic, professional and philosophical descendants of the original designers charged with ensuring the harmony between the built and natural environments.

Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there was a consensus of how rustic architecture should complement the surrounding natural environment. Initially described as harmony, and more recently described as visual quality, the NPS is now the main proponent for these design philosophies and principles.
2.2.5 Historical Themes/Concepts Related to Landscape Harmony

The researcher established a timeline for the history of developments concerning the integration of rustic architecture with its sites to achieve harmony. This was necessary to establish a chart identifying specific building element concepts that designers of the past that designers historically believed resulted in buildings that harmonized with natural landscapes. For the purposes of this study, only material predating the completion of Camp Santanoni in 1893 was used to identify the building element concepts (see Table 2.1 below).

Table 2.1 Building Element Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Building Element Concepts That Harmonize Building and Site</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Selection: A site should be chosen for views, naturally beauty and grandeur</td>
<td>Downing, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structural Materials: Native materials; wood, bark, rocks</td>
<td>Downing, 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downing, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merging Building and Natural Material: buildings should be an outgrowth of, and complement the site</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Views: Buildings should be oriented in a way allows for the maximum amount of views looking out</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Water: If water is present the building will be built in such a way that the water can be viewed from multiple vantage points</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Screening: Position buildings behind existing vegetation</td>
<td>Downing, 1844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Landscape Preservation Best Practices

The author previously stated that this research will contribute to cultural landscape preservation decisions, more specifically to the understanding of complex relationships between people and landscapes. In order to understand how professionals make preservation decisions based on human perception, a review of the literature on landscape doctrine is necessary to understand the material that guides cultural landscape preservation throughout the world and United States, and more importantly to demonstrate how this research can contribute to the existing doctrine on landscape preservation. Existing conservation doctrine does not really cover the intersection of the built and natural environments; there is an assumption that the “natural” environment is also a designed landscape (e.g., a garden).

This section will acknowledge international and national best practices, including the Florence Charter (1981), the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), the ICOMOS Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas (2005). The National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 17, *Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Building as an Aid to Preserving Character*, and Preservation Brief 36, *Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* as well as the listing criteria for World Heritage Sites. These documents, out of all possible choices, were chosen because they are germane to the author’s study.
of cultural and/or natural landscapes and/or the intersection of the natural and cultural. The author is only discussing doctrines that specifically focus on landscape issues.

2.3.1 The Florence Charter (1981)

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) charter on historic gardens, called The Florence Charter (1981), after the name of the town it was created in, guides the preservation of historic gardens throughout the world. According to the Charter, the term ‘historic garden’ is equally applicable to small gardens and to large parks, whether formal or ‘landscape’ (The Florence Charter, Article 6). One of the most important aspects of landscape preservation in this charter is its emphasis on the maintenance of vegetal growth: “Continuous maintenance of historic gardens is of paramount importance” (Article 11). The preservation of a historic garden or landscape must be done in accordance with its contextual surroundings and based on historical precedent, in which it can be fully understood (i.e. how the land was used), such as its relational infrastructure (e.g., buildings, caretaking facilities, visitors’ amenities, fences, roads, etc.). Prior research is, of course, necessary to understanding the historic use of the site. By outlining the need for maintaining vegetal growth based on historical precedent, the charter provides useful guidelines for preservation professionals who make decisions about the maintenance, conservation, restoration and reconstruction of historic gardens.
2.3.2 UNESCO—Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) identifies intangible cultural heritage, provides guidance on best practices, and makes recommendations on measures for the safeguarding or the protection of intangible cultural heritage (Article 7). The convention defines intangible cultural heritage as:

the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. (Article 2)

Intangible cultural heritage, in short, are the meanings and associations that people associate with place. Intangibles are more difficult to understand and protect than tangibles, because tangibles are physical, clear and definite. The convention defines safeguarding as “measures that must be taken to protect intangible cultural heritage, such as, the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly though formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage” (Article 2). Intangible meanings are harder to identify because experiences that educate, raise awareness, and evoke thought and emotion are embedded in cultural and cultural practices (i.e. the transmittal
of oral stories), and the human mind. Although difficult, it is worth identifying the intangible meanings because it enhances our understanding of place and makes historic preservation and cultural landscape preservation worthwhile.

2.3.3 ICOMOS--Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structure, Sites and Areas (2005)

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) charter on The Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Area, is called the Xi’an Declaration. The Xi’an Declaration focuses on the conservation of setting. The setting of a heritage structure, site or area is in need of “protection through the establishment of buffer zones… to recognize, protect, and sustain adequately the meaningful presence of heritage structures, sites and areas in their setting as a way to reduce the threat these transformative processes constitute against the cultural heritage in the full richness of its authenticity, meaning, values, integrity and diversity” (p. 1). In order to protect the setting of heritage structures in landscapes the declaration outlines five important principles and recommendations for the conservation of intangible cultural heritage aspects, including “the interaction with the natural environment; past or present social or spiritual practices, customs, traditional knowledge, use or activities and other forms of intangible cultural heritage aspects that created and from the space as well as the current and dynamic cultural, social and economic context” (p. 2). The five principles and recommendations are as follows:

1. Acknowledge the contribution of setting to the significance of heritage monuments, sites and areas;
2. Understand, document and interpret the setting in diverse contexts;
3. Develop planning tools and practices to conserve and manage settings;
4. Monitor and manage change affecting settings;
5. Work with local, interdisciplinary and international communities for co-operation and awareness in conserving and managing settings.

Buffer zones or boundary lines that extend beyond a place help to protect the context that may help define any historic place (i.e. building, garden, park, trail, etc.) The five principles and recommendations should be used when creating buffer zones, and identifying and protecting the setting of heritage structures in landscapes.

2.3.4 World Heritage List

The World Heritage List is made up of international sites that contribute to the history of the world. These sites have outstanding universal value, represent human history, and are for the benefit of future generations. Sites included on the World Heritage List must be of “outstanding universal value and meet at least one out of ten selection criteria” (UNESCO, 2013). World heritage sites are currently selected on the basis of six cultural and four natural criteria: this recognition of both natural and cultural criteria is unique. Santanoni, although not a World Heritage site, does appear to meet several natural and cultural criteria. The criteria that Santanoni meets include:

4. to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
5. to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change

10. to contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

It is important to include the World Heritage List because it highlights places of natural and cultural significance, while simultaneously suggesting the importance of relationships between people and place. Significant interactions between people and the natural environment are recognized as cultural landscapes (UNESCO, 2013).

2.3.4 NPS Preservation Briefs

The National Park Services’ Preservation Brief 17, Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Building as an Aid to Preserving their Character is intended to help a building’s owner or architect identify those feature or elements that give the building its visual character. Character refers to all those visual aspects and physical features that comprise the appearance of every historic building. Character-defining elements include the overall shape of the building, its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details, interior spaces and features, as well as the various aspects of its site and environment. Preservation Brief 17 teaches owners and architects how to identify visual aspects through a step-by-step process. It offers a contextual approach teaches the viewer the elements that make up a composition by asking a series
of questions that allow one to visualize context. For example, under step one, number seven “Setting,” the brief asks:

What are the aspects of the setting that are important to the visual character? For example, is the alignment of buildings along a city street and their relationship to the sidewalk the essential aspect of its setting? Or, conversely, is the essential character dependent upon the tree plantings and out buildings which surround the farmhouse? Is the front yard important to the setting of the modest house? Is the specific site important to the setting such as being on a hilltop, along a river, or, is the building placed on the site in such a way to enhance its setting? Is there a special relationship to the adjoining streets and other buildings? Is there a view? Is there fencing, planting, terracing, walkways or any other landscape aspects that contribute to the setting?

It is important to note that this brief only addresses the tangible qualities of a building and site.

Preservation Brief 36, Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes, teaches the reader the process of documenting, treating, and managing a cultural landscape site. It emphasizes planning, which involves research, inventory and documentation of existing conditions and the preparation of plans. Brief 36 teaches readers one how to begin to read the landscape and analyze the site, while providing the resources and tools for developing a treatment plan. This brief is documentation-oriented, meaning that it relies heavily on existing material and documentation to understand what is important about a site.

Preservation literature, in its focus on how to preserve and manage physical features, is limited in its ability to provide guidance for how users of historic sites perceive and value historical design features, which links directly to
visitor experience. Knowing more about visitor experience allows site stewards to manage sites in away that best serves users needs while adding meaning to overall experience. This also aids stewards in their effort to help the user get what he/she wants out of his/her visit, because each individual's experience is unique. The preservation literature outlined in this section should be considered and used when identifying intangibles in cultural landscape preservation. The charters, documents and briefs offer invaluable information and guidance.

2.4 Environmental Psychology

Environmental psychology is the study of human-environment relationships (Williams and Patterson, 1999; Williams, 2004). A review of the literature on environmental psychology can help us to begin to understand how people perceive the visual quality and harmony of historic, rustic architectural design in context with the natural environment, by first understanding and “clarifying how individuals perceive, experience and create meaning in the environment” (Williams, 2004).

2.4.1 Place Attachment

The study of place attachment focuses on better understanding the emotional and physical attachments that people form with places (Williams and Vaske, 2003). Walker and Ryan (2008) define place attachment as the emotional and psychological connections between people and place (p.141). Williams,
Patterson, and Roggenbuck (1992) describe two concepts that dominate the literature on environmental psychology: place-dependence and place-identity.

Place-dependence (a physical attachment to place) has been defined and described by many. Stokols and Shumaker (1981) defined the concept of place-dependence as one’s dependence on place, the place’s ability to satisfy the needs and goals of an individual. Place-dependence (a physical attachment) reflects the importance of a place in providing features and conditions that support specific goals or desired activities (Stokols and Shumaker 1981, Williams and Roggenbuck 1989, Williams and Vaske 2002).

Place-identity (an emotional attachment) is the concept that seeks to understand people’s emotional attachment to place. Place-identity refers to “those dimensions of the self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment (Proshansky, 1978, p. 155). Williams and Vaske (2002) provide a similar definition supported by other authors:

Place identity (an emotional attachment) refers to the symbolic importance of a place as a repository for emotions and relationships that give meaning and purpose to life (Williams and Roggenbuck 1989, Shamai 1991, Giuliani and Feldman 1993). As such, place identity has been described as a component of self-identity (Proshansky et al. 1983) that enhances self-esteem (Korpela 1989), increases feelings of belonging to one’s community (Relph 1976, Tuan 1980), and is an important component of communications about environmental values and policies (Cantrill 1998). Some investigators have suggested that a history of repeat visitation due to place dependence may lead to place identity (Moore and Graefee 1994). However, place identity is not necessarily a direct result of any particular experience with the place (Proshansky et al. 1983), though it generally involves a psychological investment with the place that tends to develop over time (Giuliani and Feldman 199, p. 831).
2.4.2 Symbolic Interaction Theory

Symbolic interaction is used by architectural sociologists to explain how people interact with and describe the built environment. Smith and Bugni (2006) use symbolic interaction theory to help explain the fundamental connections between architecture and human thought, emotions, and conduct. When discussing architectural sociology, it is important to distinguish it from the related field of environmental sociology. Architectural sociology focuses on humans and their designed environments, as opposed to humans and their natural environments (Smith and Bugni, 2006).

Smith and Bugni (2006) propose that symbolic interaction theory contributes to three fundamental ways to our understanding of architecture:

1. It emphasizes that designed physical environments and the self potentially influence and find expression in the other.

2. It informs us about how these designed physical environments contain and communicate our shared symbols and meanings (Bourdieu 1990; Giddens 1990; Gieryn 2000; Mead 1934).

3. It reveals that this designed physical environment is not merely a backdrop for our behavior. Quite the contrary, because some designed physical buildings, places, and objects act as agents to shape our thoughts and actions; they invite self-reflection.

People assign meaning to objects that impact them directly, especially in an architectural context (Blumer 1969). Place attachment is based on nostalgic memories of past experiences in a physical setting and anticipations that such positive encounters might continue in the future (Milligan 1998, 2003). This is similar to what the NPS has done with its consistent visual quality. The NPS assumes that this nostalgic memory of park buildings is what people will base
their experiences on, and they use that the precedent for designs of new park buildings (Zube, 1997). Knowing that nostalgic memories will guide future association with place, social design architects seek to understand how and why people attach meaning to designed physical forms and how these forms can impact lives in positive ways by incorporating the forms into design (Smith & Bugni, 2006, p. 134).

Smith and Bugni (2006) address how people interact with architecture, especially in terms of the visual quality of the built environment in context with the natural environment. Environmental psychology and architectural sociology overlap in their study of meanings and how people ascribe meaning to place. Though these two fields are distinct, environmental psychology and architectural sociology do overlap in their study of meanings and how people ascribe meaning to place.

2.5 Landscape and Health

Scientific research and writing is numerous on the health benefits of nature. As Ulrich (1986) states:

Views of nature appear to have more positive influence on emotional and physiological states. The benefits of visual encounters with vegetation may be greatest for individuals experiencing stress or anxiety. Recent research demonstrates that responses to trees and other vegetation can be linked directly to health, and in turn related to economic benefits of visual quality. (p. 29)

Exposure to the landscape and vegetation can reduce stress (Kaplan, 1995).

Ulrich (1986) also comments on the topic of stress reduction. He suggests that
people may benefit most from visual encounters with nature when they are uncomfortable, stressed or anxious.

Ulrich’s *Responses to Vegetation and Landscape* (1986) has similar findings to Kaplan’s *With People in Mind: Design and Management of Everyday Nature* (1998). Both study what people prefer in their landscape and what contributes to liking versus not liking a specific environment. The consensus is that people prefer spaced trees and smooth ground, with no dead or overgrown vegetation.

### 2.6 Conclusion

The lack of information regarding how users perceive the visual quality and harmony of historical, rustic architectural design in context with the natural environment leads to the need for additional research on this topic. The history of design that takes harmony and visual quality into account is well documented. This very deliberate design of buildings with concern for the environments is referred to as visual quality. How people perceive and interact with the natural environment has also been researched and documented within the field of environmental psychology. The field of architectural sociology has provided us with knowledge about how people ascribe meaning to the built environment. Lastly, there is scientific evidence and research linking landscape and health, which could potentially help to answer the secondary research question of this thesis. Landscape and health are a critical part of understanding human-environment relationships.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

3.1 Introduction

This thesis uses Camp Santanoni, a historic site designed by Robert H. Robertson and completed in 1893 that epitomizes the historical concepts of visual harmony, as the case study to answer this question: “How do users of Camp Santanoni perceive and interpret the harmony between historic rustic architectural design and the natural environment and are these meanings congruent with the design recommendations from Downing, Olmsted, and Wicks? A qualitative design that used a purposive sample, as discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.7, was used to understand user perceptions of historic, rustic architecture in a natural environment. It was also used to analyze an understanding of their interpretations or “thick description” of visual harmony. The next step was to relay that information by organizing the informant’s responses into themes and categories that related to the historic building element concepts that make a building harmonious with the natural environment.

The researcher used a qualitative interview methodology to answer the research question, supplemented by a photo-sort task. The interviews and photo-sorts took place at the Newcomb Town Hall, where climate conditions were comfortable for participants to sit and talk for an extended period of time. The purpose of using a photo-sort was for each informant to be able to visually see the concepts being discussed, and to express his/her interpretation of the relationship between the built and natural environments. For the photo-sort task,
a focus group was used to select the top five photographs for each category, which best represented the building element concepts. The top five photographs selected by the focus group were used to understand what users perceive to be a harmonious relationship between the building and the natural environment. The researcher asked the informants to sort the photos with the top photo most representing the building element concept, and the bottom photo least representing the concept. The researcher then recorded the photo-sort orders for each informant. An open-ended interview was conducted after the photo-sort to allow the informant to express why he/she chose the top two images to best represent the building element concept identified by the researcher. In addition, the researcher asked the informant if he/she agreed or disagreed with the designer’s intent.

3.2 Setting

3.2.1 The Adirondacks

The Adirondacks became an outdoor playground for America’s wealthy in the late 1800s. Men, women and children would spend their days hiking, fishing, and boating. The pristine lakes and sweeping mountain views of the Adirondacks offered a welcome escape from the bustle of cramped city life. Camp Santanoni was the summer home and retreat for the Pruyn family. The Pruyns spent their time at camp with the company of close family and friends and reconnected with nature. While at camp the Pruyns and their guests spent time fishing, boating,
hiking, picnicking, swimming, singing, dancing, and storytelling. Historic photographs and sources indicated that Pruyn: “… guests did not spend their time indolence, served by staff. The “strenuous life” advocated by the Pruyns’ friend, Theodore Roosevelt, was the rule. Both men and women, if not otherwise inclined to plunge into the outdoors, would be motivated by the example of their host and hostess” (Engel, Kirshenbaum, Malo, 2009, p. 118).

3.2.2 Research Site: Camp Santanoni

Camp Santanoni and Santanoni Preserve were established by Robert Clarence Pruyn (1847—1934). Construction of the main camp began in summer 1892 and was completed by the spring of 1893. Pruyn employed architect Robert Robertson (1849—1919), a friend and colleague he met at Rutgers University. Pruyn was President of National Commercial Bank in Albany, New York; the institution was a forerunner of what is currently known as “Key Bank.” (Engel, Kirshenbaum, Malo, 2009, p. 16)

Camp Santanoni is a National Historic Landmark located in the Town of Newcomb, New York—the heart of the Adirondacks. Camp Santanoni was chosen for this study because of the researcher’s familiarity with the site and knowledge of the site’s history. More importantly, Camp Santanoni is a well-preserved site that maintains much of its historical integrity. The historic camp is built of natural materials and represents thoughts about rustic building design of all the building element concepts that the historical designers wrote about. Users of Camp Santanoni were chosen for their ability to answer the research
questions.

Santanoni Preserve is located within the Adirondack Forest Preserve, which was created in law in 1885 to protect the region from uncontrolled forest clearing. In 1894, Article XIV of New York Constitutional Protection—known as the “Forever Wild” provision—was created to protect the Adirondack Forest Preserve. This level of protection has protected Camp Santanoni’s natural landscape. The 12,900-acre Santanoni Preserve was acquired by the state of New York in 1972, and became a part of the New York State Forest Preserve, which is managed by state’s Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC).

Access to Santanoni Preserve is located just off New York Route 28N, in the Town of Newcomb. Camp Santanoni is located on Newcomb Lake, five miles from Route 28N, and is accessed by a gentle sloping carriage road. Under current site management practices, access to the site is limited. Users must walk, bike or horseback ride down the carriage road to the site in the summer or snowshoe or cross-country ski during the winter.

Santanoni is specifically oriented on its site to take advantage of its natural surroundings (see Figure 3.1). The front of the camp faces west and five thousand square feet of porches extend north—south, and run the length of the camp. This was done to take full advantage of the lake and mountain views as well as the western prevailing breeze, which sweeps across Newcomb Lake.
3.3 Visual Harmony Theory and the Identification of Building Element Concepts

Visual harmony is an intended, final design outcome that resulted from the thoughtful design of buildings in concert with and consideration of their surroundings. The final relationship has aesthetic qualities purposefully designed to be pleasing to the human eye and respectful of the natural environment. This may raise some questions about what people actually think constitutes a harmonious relationship. This thesis has identified the design elements, referred to as building element concepts, and uses them as a research tool. To test the theory of what visual harmony actually is, or if it was achieved in practice, the author identified Camp Santanoni as a site that appeared to successfully incorporate visually harmonious design elements. The historical designers’ intentions were compared with the site users’ shared meanings and associations with the site.

The identification of the building element concepts took place over a six-month period of research (Table 3.1). As the researcher was identifying potential sources, she kept track of when and where any form of the word *harmony* appeared. After looking at many sources that predated the completion of Camp Santanoni in 1893, a pattern began to emerge. These concepts recurred in the writings of different designers, including Augustus D. Shepard, William S. Wicks, Andrew Jackson Downing and Frederick Law Olmstead. As they were writing contemporaneously, it appears that these designers were aware of each others’ work and influenced each other. There are likely to be many other possible
concepts, but these will not be tested, as the researcher did not find specific references to them in the literature in the era of the designers’ work.

Although the literature on how to make a building harmonious with the natural environment continued to exist after Santanoni was built, it is not examined for this thesis as they were unavailable at the time Camp Santanoni was designed. However, given that the designers recommendations are used today in the National Park Service that may provide insight to the effectiveness of these concepts at making a building harmonious with the natural landscape.

Table 3.1 Building Element Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Building Element Concepts That Harmonize Building and Site</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site Selection: A site should be chosen for views, naturally beauty and grandeur</td>
<td>Downing, 1850 Olmsted, 1875 Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structural Materials: Native materials; wood, bark, rocks</td>
<td>Downing, 1844 Downing, 1850 Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merging Building and Natural Material: buildings should be an outgrowth of, and complement the site</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875 Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Views: Buildings should be oriented in a way allows for the maximum amount of views looking out</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875 Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Water: If water is present the building will be built in such a way that the water can be viewed from multiple vantage points</td>
<td>Olmsted, 1875 Wicks, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Screening: Position buildings behind existing vegetation</td>
<td>Downing, 1844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Specific Areas Where Data Was Collected

3.4.1 Collection of Photographs around the Main Camp

Once the building element concepts were identified, the author visited Santanoni to photograph the site. The building elements concepts guided how the researcher took the photographs that were used in the photo-sort task. Photographs were taken according to the six identified building element concepts. Prior to the site visit, an official map with a boundary line was identified; all necessary permissions were granted for its use. This boundary map was used to identify where the photographs were taken (Figure 1). All photographs were taken within the identified boundary line.
Figure 3.1: Camp Santanoni Historic Area Boundary Map. Courtesy of the Department of Environmental Conservation
3.4.2 Photo-sorts and Interviews Data Collection

A qualitative research methodology, which emphasizes narrative rather than numerical data, was used as it seemed most appropriate for this study. Qualitative studies focuses on meanings revealed from social research. Bui (2009) discuses the steps a researcher takes when creating a qualitative study: “A qualitative researcher starts with a specific situations, finds patterns or themes in the data, establishes a tentative hypothesis, and then develops theories or conclusions.” The photo-sorts and interviews were conducted at the Newcomb Town Hall, with the permission of Town Hall Supervisor George Canon. The Newcomb Town Hall is located 0.3 miles east of the Santanoni Preserve entrance, and is climate-controlled, and offered an empty office that was suitable for conducting interviews. Through an open-ended interview process, informants were able to freely express thoughts, opinions, emotions and feelings about the photographs they were seeing. This was all done in order to record and deduce meanings from the collected data, which was crucial to developing an understanding of each informant’s perception of the harmonious relationships between the buildings and natural landscapes examined in this study.
3.5 Sample/Participants

The sampling procedure used by the researcher was purposive sampling. According to Bui (2009), “In a purposive sample, the researcher selects the individuals who are considered representative because they meet certain criteria for the study” (p. 143). The participants were restricted to recreational users of the site who were willing to partake in the study. Participants also had to be age eighteen and older. Table 3.2 lists demographic information about the study participants. The participants were also selected because of their familiarity with the site and for their potential to contribute to the understanding of the research problem.

Prior to the scheduled data collection sessions, the researcher made a demographic table to enable consistent recordation of demographic information (see Table 3.2). The participants in the study were not from diverse ethnic backgrounds. It is possible that this could have affected the outcome, however, it is unknown. The majority of informants were Newcomb residents and based on 2010 U.S. Census data, the Town of Newcomb is not demographically diverse.\(^1\) The median age of the informants is 56.5, and the mean is 53.125.

\(^1\) http://esd.ny.gov/NYSDataCenter/Data/Census2010/PL2010Tab3NY.pdf
Table 3.2 Demographics Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Informant #1</th>
<th>Informant #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Trail Crew</td>
<td>Town Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>B.A. History</td>
<td>B.S. Community Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #3</th>
<th>Informant #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #5</th>
<th>Informant #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #7</th>
<th>Informant #8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Restaurant Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>B.S. Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant #9</td>
<td>Informant #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Highway Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #11</th>
<th>Informant #12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Town Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #13</th>
<th>Informant #14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Retired Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Newcomb, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #15</th>
<th>Informant #16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (state)</td>
<td>Phoenix, MD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Measurement Instruments

3.6.1 Instrument # 1—Photo -sort

The photo-sort provided informants with a visual representation of each concept and enabled them to interpret specific harmonious relationships. As this research is primarily visual, the photo-sort method is well-suited to the study of specific, historic building element concepts. David Wang (2002) describes how this research method is implemented: “In a directed sort, the researcher specifies a set of categories into which the cards must be sorted, such as a 5- or 7-point rating scale from highly preferred to least preferred” (p. 232). This researcher did not use a numeric scale; instead an order of preference was used. The informants placed the photos in an order that represented the photos they thought represented visual harmony from most to least. In addition, the open-ended interviews, which followed the photo-sort operation, helped the researcher to understand why the informant believed that certain images best represented the building element concepts. The building element concepts were explained in the same way that the historical designers of rustic architecture did in their treatises, and definitions were orally transmitted to the informants to ensure comprehension.
3.6.2 Instrument #2—Interview

Following the photo sorts, open-ended interviews were conducted to allow the informant to express why he/she chose specific images to represent the building element concepts. More importantly, interviews were conducted to understand if the informant agreed or disagreed with the designer’s intent, as determined by the researcher. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews, which is defined by asking pre-established questions to elicit open-ended responses (Fontana & Frey, 2007; Punch, 2005). Two open-ended questions were asked: “Why did you choose the top two images to represent the building element concepts?” and “Do you agree or disagree with the designer’s intent?” An audio recording device was used to record the open-ended interviews.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

Qualitative methodologies are designed to gather meanings from individuals in an open, unobstructed way. The instruments chosen by the researcher were best suited for the informants to be able to express their interpretations of a harmonious relationship between the building and surrounding natural environment called visual harmony. The researcher was able to analyze the results in a meaningful way because of this carefully chosen research design. By conducting this exploratory research, it was possible to understand this unknown phenomenon without personal biases and prejudices.
interfering with data collection. To understand a phenomenon that has never been documented before one must begin by exploring. Through exploration, analysis of a subject or theme becomes possible. The researcher explained the process of the photo-sort and interviews in exactly the same way to every informant, and followed the same procedure to ensure consistency and unadulterated results.

The researcher was able to assure that the meanings being shared by the informants were valid by executing the photo-sorts and interviews in the same manner for every informant. If the informants began sorting the photos in the same order and revealing the same meanings through the interviews, the researcher would infer that the results were significant. If the results were inconsistent, the researcher would then infer that the results reflect different interpretations. Design is open to multiple interpretations despite what is intended.

The meanings collected through this study are transferrable to architecture and landscape design more generally. Design professionals often develop recommendations, guidelines, or instructions to achieve specific outcomes or relationships, but often lack the data to support the effectiveness of their objectives. Objects, buildings, and places are often defined by their tangible qualities, but what about the intangibles, such as association and meaning? Professional expertise typically offers and assigns meanings to objects, buildings, and places—often with documentation; what do those ascribed
meanings mean to users, and do they resonate with our own perceptions and interpretations? The research that is set forth in this thesis, for the first time, collected the perceptions of users of Camp Santanoni and the meanings and associations they ascribe to place.

3.8 Data Collection/Procedures

Onsite photographs were taken inside the boundary line indicated by the map provided by the Department of Environmental Conservation (Figure 1). A Roger Williams University focus group made up of fellow professional colleagues was used to pick photographs that best represented the historic building element concepts. Five photographs were targeted for each identified concept.

The photographic samples used in the final photo-sort were selected by the focus group made up of five colleagues. A focus group was used to ensure that the photographs were consistent with the identified building element concepts. The focus group was provided the table of building element concepts and ten photographs that the researcher believed were most representative of each building element concept. The researcher then described the building element concepts to the focus group consistent with historic designers; the focus group then chose the top five photographs that best represented each building element concept. These five photographs selected by the focus group were used to measure what the user perceives to be a harmonious relationship between the building and the natural environment.
In the final interview process, the researcher recorded the photo-sort orders for each informant. The researcher explained the building element concepts using language consistent with the historic designers (see Table 3.1 for terminology). The researcher asked the informants to sort the photographs with the top photograph most representing the building element concept, and the bottom photograph least representing the concept. Following the photo-sort, the researcher conducted open-ended interviews, and asked the informant why he/she chose the top two or three images best representing the building element concepts. Interviews took place over seven days.

3.9 Procedures

1. Photography for the photo-sort: Photographs were taken of design elements that the historical designers included in this study purported to make a building harmonious with the site.

2. Focus group: A focus group was used to select photographs that seemed to best represent the building element concepts of historical designers. Five photographs were targeted for each concept.

3. Solicitation and interviewing of informants: The researcher identified users of the site that would be interested in participating in and contributing research, and set up times to meet with the informants at the Newcomb Town Hall. Informants were told that this was their opportunity to express
what they believe is important and meaningful about Camp Santanoni’s design and setting.

4. Each informant was shown five photographs that represented each identified building concept. The researcher then described the concept to the informant using language consistent with what historic designers wrote. The informant was then asked to sort the photos into order, with the top photographs with the top photograph most representing the concept, and the bottom photograph least representing the concept.

5. When the informant was done sorting the photographs, the sort order was recorded using the standardized data collection sheet (see Table 4.1).

6. After the photo-sort was complete, an open-ended interview was conducted asking the informant why he/she chose the top two images to represent each building element concept.

7. The informant was then asked to move on to the next set of photographs representing a particular building element concept and repeat steps 4—6.

8. Steps 3—7 were repeated until the informant shared no new meanings or until a preset time limit of one hour was exceeded.
3.10 Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis of the data took place once all of the interviews had been completed. According to Babbie (2011), qualitative analysis is “the nonnumeric examination and interpretation of observations, for the purpose of discovering underlying meaning and patterns of relationships. This approach is most typical of field research and historical research” (p. 439). The researcher identified patterns while examining the data and broke the data down into themes that related to the original research questions.

This study used a case-oriented analysis described by Babbie (2011) as an approach that aims to understand a particular case by looking closely at the details in an attempt to discover patterns. The collected interview data was transcribed and categorized into themes relating to the research questions. In order to do this, the researcher used the general qualitative data analysis methods including topic coding, analytical coding, and theming. The process that was followed was the Miles and Huberman (1994) framework for qualitative data analysis. Coding is simply a general term that allows researchers to simplify and focus on some specific characteristics of the data.

Topic coding allows the researcher to identify patterns and gather information based on specified topics. According to Richard and Morse (2007) topic coding allows the researcher to “reflect on all the different ways people discuss particular topics, to seek patterns in their responses, or to develop dimensions of that experience” (p. 134). Following topic coding, analytical coding
is used to further “develop categories theoretically” (p. 141). Analytical coding allows for more meanings and themes to be revealed through the data and developed. Punch (2009) uses the term *analytics induction* to describe “concepts developed inductively from the data and raised to a higher level of abstraction, [after which] their interrelationships are then traced out” (p. 197). Finally, as a result of analytical analysis major themes that exist in the data are revealed. These are cases where “a theme runs through data and it is not necessarily confined to a specific segment of text” (p. 143).

Miles and Huberman’s data analysis model contain three linked subprocesses (Miles & Huberman, 1984, 1994): data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The data were reduced to specified topics designed and guided by research parameters that included photo-sorts and interviews. Data display is “defined as an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and/or action taking, [and] is a second, inevitable, part of analysis” (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Lastly, during the conclusion drawing and verification step the researcher drew meaning from the displayed data.
3.11 Conclusion

This chapter described the qualitative research methodology used to answer the research question. Photo sorts and interviews were used to measure what user perception and interpretation of visual harmony. Qualitative data analysis methodologies allowed the researcher to identify meanings and themes in the data. This information was then further analyzed in order for the researcher to understand how users perceive and interpret the visual harmony between the built and natural environment and to draw conclusions and answer the research questions.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The interviews provided a wealth of knowledge to the researcher regarding the user group perceived and interpreted the visual harmony of the historic rustic architectural design in context with natural environments at Camp Santanoni, as guided by the building element concepts described in Chapter 3. Though this conclusion is based on a small sample at a single site, it provides promising results, which could be applicable on a larger scale. During each interview, the researcher asked the informant to sort the five presented photographs, with the top two photographs most representing the building element concept and the bottom photograph least representing the concept. This activity was followed by the questions: “Why did you choose the top two images to most represent the building element concept?” and “Do you agree or disagree with the historical designers’ intent?” The researcher only asked the two questions and then purposely left the discussion unstructured to allow the informants to speak freely and openly. Four significant themes emerged from the interviews that crossed all six categories: framing of the photograph, blending-in (building with site), building placement or siting, and personal experiences. The user group’s connection to this specific place is so strong that throughout the interviews, the interviewees shared their personal stories and memories about Camp Santanoni with the researcher.
4.2 Photo-sort Results

The researcher recorded the sort order for each building element concept during the interview with each informant. Table 4.1 lists the sort order record. The numbers in the table below correspond to particular photographs, which can be found in Appendix C of this document. During the photo-sort task the researcher used an Olympus Digital Voice Recorder VN-7200 to record each informant’s answer to the question, “Why did you choose the top two images to most represent the building element concept?” for each of the six building elements. The data collected during the interviews was analyzed to create themes and categories pertaining to individual and group perceptions and interpretations of visual harmony. More specifically, the informants were guided by researcher-identified concepts that make a building harmonious with the natural environment; the users responded to a design concept that had a specific intent and a final design outcome that reflecting visual harmony.
Table 4.1 Sort Order Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Element Concept</th>
<th>Informant #1</th>
<th>Informant #2</th>
<th>Informant #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sort Order Record, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Element Concept</th>
<th>Informant #4</th>
<th>Informant #5</th>
<th>Informant #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sort Order, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Element Concept</th>
<th>Informant #7</th>
<th>Informant #8</th>
<th>Informant #9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Element Concept</td>
<td>Informant #10</td>
<td>Informant #11</td>
<td>Informant #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Site Selection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Element Concept</td>
<td>Informant #13</td>
<td>Informant #14</td>
<td>Informant #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Element Concept</td>
<td>Informant #16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Site Selection</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Structural Materials</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Merging Building and Natural Material</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Views</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Water</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Screening</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1 The Two Most Frequently Selected Photographs for Each Category

The results for the two images most frequently selected for the six building element concept categories are as follows:

- Site Selection: photographs 1 & 2
- Structural Materials: photographs 3 & 1
- Merging Building and Natural Material: photographs 2 & 2
- Views: photographs 5 & 1
- Water: photographs 1 & 2
- Screening: photographs 2, 1 & 5

These results, along with an explanation of consistent and inconsistent results, are interpreted with this section. Only the top two rows of the sort order record were examined.

4.2.1.1 Site Selection

The top two photographs selected for site selection were Photograph 1 (Figure 4.1) and Photograph 2 (Figure 4.2). The informants explained to the researcher that Photograph 1 demonstrates the thoughtful placement of the structure onto the landscape; several mentioned that the photographs perspective underlined the design choice. Photograph 1 shows a change in the elevation of the landscape, which leads to the beginning of the porch at the height of land. Photograph 2 illustrates the language used within the site selection definition and shows the views of natural beauty and grandeur from the boathouse.
4.2.1.2 Structural Materials

The top two photographs selected for structural materials were Photograph 3 (Figure 4.3) and Photograph 1 (Figure 4.4). Most informants chose Photograph 3 because of the way the photograph was framed. They expressed that the framing of the photograph impacted their decision: in particular, Photograph 3 was preferred as its wider shot includes a more comprehensive image of the building and its materials. It also illustrates all of the materials listed under the description of the structural materials category. Photograph 1 demonstrates the creative use of natural and native material on a cabin door.
Figure 4.1: Site Selection Photograph 1. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.

Figure 4.2: Site Selection Photograph 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
Figure 4.3: Structural Materials Photograph 1. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
Figure 4.4: Structural Materials Photograph 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
4.2.1.3 Merging Building and Natural Material

The top two photographs selected for merging building and natural material were Photograph 2 (Figure 4.5) and Photograph 2. Merging Building and Natural Material was the most consistent building element concept category with informants choosing Photograph 2 the most, to represent the first and second spots in the sort order. The consensus for Photograph 2 was the unquestionable harmonious relationship between the glacial erratic and the chimney. It was common for informants to express that the chimney appeared to grow from the rock chimney appeared to grow from the rock.

4.2.1.4 Views

The top two photos selected for views were Photograph 5 (Figure 4.6) and Photograph 1 (Figure 4.7). Photograph 5 was chosen as the top image because it sparked nostalgic memories of experiencing the view in the image. The informants shared with the researcher that they had the same photograph from the same spot, and they recognized it as the best view away from the camp towards the water and mountains. Photograph 1, which was chosen to represent the second spot most frequently, is an image of a sunset from the boathouse. Many of the informants were drawn to this image because of its beauty; however, the image represents much more than a beautiful sunset. Photograph 1 demonstrates the strategic positioning of the camp on the eastern side of Newcomb Lake so that sunsets could be viewed every over the lake.
Figure 4.5: Merging Building and Natural Material Photograph 1 & 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
4.6: Views Photograph 1. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
Figure 4.7 Views Photograph 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
4.2.1.5 Water

The top two photographs selected for the Water building element concept were Photograph 1 (Figure 4.8) and Photograph 2 (Figure 4.9). These were the only two images provided to the informants that had a part of the verandah in the composition of the photograph. This perspective made a difference in the ordering of the photo, perhaps because of the description of the Water category, which said that the water would be viewed from a number of vantage points. The informants understood that the verandah wraps around the building and that the water can be viewed from a number of vantage points, regardless of where one stands on the verandahs.

4.2.1.6 Screening

The top two photographs selected for screening were Photograph 2 (Figure 4.10) and Photograph 4 (Figure 4.11). Screening was the most inconsistent category for the informants to sort, and there are some possible explanations for this. The description for screening states: “Position building behind existing vegetation.” Each of the five photographs show an aspect of the building and surrounding trees and vegetation, but Photograph 2 shows a clear delineation between the camp and the water. This particular photograph reads both ways: views are screened looking away from the camp and toward the camp. Photograph 4 demonstrates screening all the way around the camp. From the way the photograph is framed, one can tell that there is vegetation on both
sides of the camp: the other photographs were regarded as being too manicured and non-representative of the building element concept.

Figure 4.8: Water Photograph 1. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
Figure 4.9: Water Photograph 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.

Figure 4.10: Screening Photograph 1. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
Figure 4.11: Screening Photograph 2. Photograph taken by Nina Caruso.
4.3 Consistent Themes Across Categories

There were four themes that emerged from the interviews and were consistent through discussions of all six building element concepts: framing of the photograph, blending-in, building placement or siting, and personal experiences.

4.3.1 Framing of the Photographs

Eight of the sixteen informants noted in the interviews that the way the photograph was framed affected their sort order decisions. Framing was not the only word used to describe the composition of a photograph; many of the informants referred to it as framing with the camera. Informants 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 17 (see Table 3.2) all agreed that the framing with the camera made a difference. Informant 7 explained the rationale for not selecting certain photographs by expressing that the way the photograph was framed did not allow for a full glimpse of what the designer was trying to accomplish as described by the building element concept. Photographs with a wider view allowed the informant to more comprehensively see the design. Informant 7 noted, “The way the picture is framed makes a difference.” Furthermore, Informant 7 made an excellent point about human nature and taste. Informant 7 made a referenced the many ways in which people view art—we all view art differently. Informant 7 pointed out that this was similar to the way she felt about the photographs and their framing; the photographs could be framed and viewed in many different ways.
4.3.2 Blending in With the Site/Fits in with the Site or Landscape

Though it may be a reflection of successful site design with the goal of visual harmony, the informants’ language choice was remarkable. Even when not specifically discussing the building element concept that “buildings should be an outgrowth of and harmonize with this site,” many began using the phrases “blend in with the site” and “fits within the site or landscape.” These descriptions were consistent throughout all six building element concepts.

Informants 5, 6, and 14 used the phrase “blends in” to describe how the building is integral with its natural surroundings, “like it is supposed to be there.” Informant 12 consistently used the phrase “fits with the landscape” throughout all six categories to describe how well the building was sited within its natural surroundings. Informant 4 also used the phrase “fits in” to describe how the building was hidden: “It fits in, you wouldn’t know it was there.”

4.3.3 Building Placement or Siting

Perhaps one of the most interesting themes that emerged across all six building element concepts was the informants’ recognition of the building placement or siting on the landscape. The majority of informants agreed that the building was well-sited on a natural promontory. They all agreed that they could not imagine a better spot for the location of the camp. Informant 5 eloquently said, “When you are in the right spots, it is breathtaking. If the building was positioned or oriented in any other way, it would be a different experience.” Other stated: “They wouldn’t have centered the camp at any other spot” and
“They knew what they were doing.” Informant 6 believed that, “they thought of the placement of the building.” Informant 9 and 11 had very similar statements: Informant 9 noted, “I couldn’t picture a better location for the building on the lake” while Informant 11 stated, “I couldn’t think of a better place to have located the camp.” Informant 12 believed that the camp was “perfectly sited on the landscape.” Lastly, Informant 13 furthered asserted that the building was perfectly place with this statement, “It was obvious that is was built on the point. Yes, it was situated on the land to the maximum amount of views.”

4.3.4 Personal Experience

The point of using long-term users of Camp Santanoni in this research study was because of their familiarity with the site; as a result, it was no surprise when all informants shared their personal experiences with the researcher. All were able to look at the photographs and place themselves within context of the image, and then to reflect and describe their experiences and associations with the place. The informants were able to imagine themselves at the site and describe the buildings’ relationship with the natural environment—not merely as a physical relationship, but through experiences unique to each informant.

Informant 6 associated the front porch step’s alignment with the natural promontory in the landscape as “the coolest part about the experience, when you bike ride in, eat lunch and look out.” Informant 6 felt that this feature of the building integrated with the landscape created a view that was designed to be experienced. Elaborating on the statement: “They picked out points where you
can capture moments. You feel that they really lined the camp to match the terrain, and it’s the best view looking out from this point. This is my favorite view of the whole place.” Informant 7 associates the porch’s location on the west façade facing the lake and mountains as a specific design intent: “Enjoying the porch is part of the experience.” Informants 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16 collectively used the phrases “I like” and “I envision” to talk about how they pictured themselves in the photographs and what visually appealed to their eyes. This allowed them to formulate meanings and associations particular to their own unique experiences, which ultimately factored into their sort order.

4.4 Site Selection

4.4.1 Aesthetics

4.4.1.1 Landscape Aesthetics

The aesthetics of Santanoni Preserve—with its pure, pristine waters, unhindered views of the mountains, and surrounding wilderness—are something to be appreciated. The informants recognized the natural beauty of the site and interpreted the site, as a natural setting that is pleasing in appearance to the eye. The geography and terrain where Santanoni is located offer panoramic views of all the natural features of the landscape. Informant 1 described the compositional make up of the landscape by stating “you have the water, mountains, islands out in the distance, and to me that is very aesthetically pleasing.” Informants lauded
the natural beauty of the site by noting the “picturesque views” (Informant 7) and “the grandeur, spacious grandeur” (Informant 15), of the lake and mountain vistas.

**4.4.1.2 Building Aesthetics**

Not only did the informants use the word *aesthetics* to describe the landscape, but they also used it to describe the features of the building. The designed features of the building are just as important, if not more so, as the selection of the location in which the building is to be sited. Wicks, Shepard, Downing, and Olmsted were careful to articulate how to merge the building with the site, selecting native building materials in order to achieve the desired harmonious effect between building and site. Informant 1 talks about the wood pattern doors of Santanoni: “I have always been fascinated by these doors, the framing with the cedar bark, which is in great condition…it is aesthetically pleasing as it is outlined with sawn lumber and painted red” (see Figure. 4.4). Informant 8 was keenly aware of the vertical elements and their relationship to the surrounding trees: “Vertical lines reflect vertical lines of the tree trunk. Natural materials reflect the landscape around. An aesthetic decision.”

**4.4.2 Composition**

The compositional makeup of the photographs was important to each informant when selecting the top two photographs for site selection. It was important that the photograph contain water, mountains, shoreline and trees in order for the informant to agree that a thoughtful selection of site could make a
building harmonious with the site. These aforementioned elements are important to the informant when considering the selection of a site. The informants also recognized that the camp had been placed to have these varied, compositional views. For instance, Informant 1 expressed that one photograph “brings in all the elements that I like to see in a site selection. You have the water, mountains, shore line, and island close by.”

4.4.3 Topography

The recognition of the role that topography plays in site selection and merging building with site was most deeply understood by the informants. The informants were able to read the landscape and to recall and draw upon their own experience to describe the important role topography played in site selection and the positioning of the building on the landscape. Camp Santanoni’s main building is elevated on a hill above the water and follows the natural contours of the hill. The designers and local craftsmen and woodsmen did not simply clear-cut the land, but rather designed the building in a way that responded to the natural changes in elevation. More importantly, the design consideration is still evident to contemporary users of the site. Thoughtful responses to elevation changes demonstrated working with the landscape in a harmonious way, which was expressed by Informant 12, who said, “The building conforms to the contours of the land, and fits with the way the land slopes down to the lake. The structure fits with the setting.”
4.4.4 Trees

Informant 4 referenced to the importance of trees in site selection. A site that has existing trees, and retains the majority of the existing trees after new buildings have been added to the landscape, is more likely to have a greater harmonious relationship between the building and the site. Informant 4 understood the important role trees play in making a building harmonious with the site both for aesthetic reasons and also for practical reasons: “They did use the trees that were there, but they didn’t take down all the trees. They used what they needed and left the natural forest.”

4.4.5 Water

Eight of the informants ranked water as an important consideration when Camp Santanoni’s site was selected. It was obvious to the informants that the presence of water has an overall effect on the visual harmony of the site. The ability to walk down to the water is an important part of the visitor experience. Informant 7 describes her own experience: “I remember walking down and seeing the beauty, it was the first time you could go into the boat house. It was easy to get down to, and you could just be right on the water.” The building’s location on the lake, and the user’s ability to look at and enjoy the lake was described as meaningful. Informant 11 describes the water as the predominant consideration in selecting a site.
4.5 Materials

4.5.1 Craftsmanship

The informants described skilled craftsmanship as a key component to making a building harmonious with the site. This is an important idea to follow up on, as historical designers indicated/argued that a building should be built of native materials to best harmonize with the site. To the researcher’s knowledge, however, the designers did not comment on the skilled labor necessary to work with the native materials to achieve a harmonious relationship. Is it the material itself that achieves this, or is it the craftsman? The informants are suggest that the skill of the craftsman who use native materials is what produces visual harmony. The quality of the work is directly associated with skilled craftsmen (Informant 9); “The guy knew what he was doing; it’s about craftsmanship” (Informant 3). Informant 5 references the cabin doors, commenting that: “The wood door shows the craftsmanship and shows wilderness design.” Many of the informants were drawn to the door because of the creative use of natural materials to add detail to a stock panel door unit: “I have always been impressed by the doors, because they are commercial doors and the craftsman added natural materials and made them fit with the building and the site” (Informant 12). Informant 7 expressed her personal taste: “The door, I think, is so interesting—the way the architecture used the wood to make a special design.”
4.5.2 Color

The use of native materials to make a building harmonious with the site makes sense when one thinks of the natural color of the material; it will match the surroundings from which it came. Color was an important visual aspect when the informants considered what resulted in visual harmony between the building and the site. Materials that were similar or exact matches in color were visually compatible with the natural environment. Informant 6 discusses color matching: “Matches the color of the ground, the house matches the trees, the rocks fit perfectly with the surroundings. They really thought about the colors and using natural materials.” Informant 14 also noticed the importance of color: “The natural fieldstone in that area and the wood that was from the area blends into nature, the colors are the same.”

4.5.3 Horizontal/Vertical Elements

*Vertical elements* and *horizontal elements* were a common phrase used by the informants to describe the use of timbers in the structure. *Vertical* logs were used for the log palisade skirt along the verandas to cover the stone footings of various sizes and uneven terrain beneath the camp, and to create a uniform line. *Horizontal* logs were used in the construction of the camp buildings and porches. Informant 15 eloquently describes the relationship of *vertical* and *horizontal* elements with the surrounding natural environment as “great dialogue.” The *vertical* and *horizontal* elements of the building communicate and respond with the natural environment. “Narrow and *vertical* reflects nature of the trees.”
Vertical poles help integrate and soften the horizontal nature. This nature characterizes the harmonious relationship between material and natural environment" (Informant 9). Informants 4 and 7 also used the terms vertical and horizontal to describe design elements.

4.5.4 Natural Materials

Twelve informants out of the sixteen used the phrases natural materials or native materials to tell the researcher how the use of these materials makes a building harmonious with the site.

4.6 Merging Building with Site

4.6.1 “Growing out”

Growing out was a phrase commonly used by the informants to describe how the building appeared visually in the natural setting. The informants ascribed natural characteristics to the building in an associative way as natural growth. To describe the building’s relationship to the natural environment in the photographs for merging building and natural materials, a third of the informants expressed: “It looked like it grew there” or “it is growing out of the ground” (Informants 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13).

4.6.2 Incorporation of Natural Materials

Camp Santanoni incorporates existing glacial erratics into the building’s footprint: an example of this is shown in Figure 4.5. The informants used the word
incorporation to describe the thought that went into use of existing natural features into the design and construction of the camp. The informants understood the creativity and thought that went into using the glacial erratic at the base of the chimney. For instance, Informant 4 indicated that: “They actually depended on the rock as part of the fireplace to hold it in place. They didn’t have to put the fireplace there.” Informant 8 said that “It is clear, the absolute thoughtfulness of how they created the fireplace, and they could have moved the building over. This was not an accident; it was a thoughtful incorporation on an aesthetic level, and structural context.”

4.7 Views

4.7.1 Obstructed/Filtered Views

The informants, imagining themselves on the verandahs described their viewing experience as being obstructed or filtered by existing vegetation when looking out and away from the camp. “Filtered views through the screen are what I think they intended”, said Informant 12. Informant 15 spoke about the enticing nature of the filtered views and the invitation to peruse around and beyond the perimeter. There are filtered views through the trees and unobstructed views beyond the tree line.
4.7.2 Positioning

Although many of the views are obstructed or filtered from the verandahs the informants spoke about the opportunity for the positioning of oneself in front of the Main Hall on the lakeside steps. Informant 5 described this as “one of the best views in the whole Adirondacks,” Half of the informants understood that if they positioned themselves in this particular spot, they would have a framed view of the mountains beyond the lake. Other informants understood the building element concept to mean the maximum number of spots for viewing opportunities. The photographs that ranked high were the ones that contained portions of the verandahs, because this indicated a diversity of spots for viewing (Informants 8, 13, and 16).

4.8 Water

4.8.1 Porch Design and Elevated Perspective

The building element concept description of water is as follows: If water is present, the building should be built in such a way that it can be viewed from a number of vantage points. Through the interviews, the researcher concluded that all informants thought that it was important that the design of the porch was for viewing the water; and that no matter where a person is on the porch, he or she has nearly one-hundred and eighty degree view of the water. Furthermore, the informants described the porch as extending out over the water, this perception is due to the change in grade between the water and the porch, which creates an
optical illusion: this effect is compared to an infinity pool by Informants 6 and 7. Additionally, because of the porch’s ability to enhance the users’ experience and connect the users with the water, it was crucial for some aspect of the porch to be in the photograph that was chosen in the top two: “Once again, in terms of the description of the concept, any number of vantage points along multiple axes. You can tell there is a corner behind there and the porch continues. I want to see the building in the photograph” (Informant 8). Informant 10 agrees with Informant 8: “Based on the criteria, being able to see from different perspectives, I know if you are standing there you have a view, and if you stand here you have another view. You are able to see the water from different directions.” The view of the water from an elevated perspective created visual harmony from the perspective of the user.

4.9 Screening

4.9.1 Experience

The researcher had not anticipated that screening would have a significant impact on user experience. However, Informant 12 made a point to describe how screening enhances experience: “The screen becomes something to look at, part of the experience. This is another one where it is not so much where the building is or where you see the building from. The different textures like foliage are important too. The proximity of the trees is important—as part of creating the experience.”
4.9.2 Importance of Nature

Historic designers recommended positioning buildings behind existing vegetation to harmonize them with the site. However, some of the informants understood this as the subordination of the structure to nature, or “putting nature in front of man’s designs” as a recognition of the importance of nature. Informant 1 believed that the goal of screening was to put nature first. Additionally, Informants 1 and 6 agreed that “living in harmony with nature” is the result of this design choice. By positioning a building behind existing vegetation, the designer creates a natural screen that gives the users a feel of wilderness that translates to the feeling of being in harmony with the outdoors.

4.9.3 Protection

Several of the informants revealed to the researcher that one functional role screening provides is to serve as a natural barrier protecting the Camp against the elements. Informants 5 and 7 stated that the screen protects the building from wind.

4.9.4 Viewed from Approaches

Historic designers indicated that to make a building harmonious with a site, it should be positioned behind existing vegetation. This raises the question of whether this is meant to be understood as looking in from the water towards the camp, a point which Informant 8 highlighted: “Two elements: structure and lake. You have a corridor between the two—you have filtered views towards the
lake and from the lake. The photograph communicates screening back and forth. Different stories about screening, but both very powerful stories about screening.”

4.10 Conclusion

The overall responses of the informants were filled with enthusiasm, excitement, and a willingness to share thoughts and experiences. The majority of the informants expressed a sincere appreciation for being included in the research—they felt as though their opinion mattered. Furthermore, the responses were thoughtful and directed towards the entire context of the site: the relationship between the building and site. Many of the responses taught the researcher something new about the site—things about the site that she had not picked up on. These long-term users of the site had a special way or ability of understanding the site that reflects a deep, spiritual relationship.

The very nature of the interpretive process requires the informants to perceive the concepts first before they can interpret. The informants were allowed to read the written building element concepts as many times as they requested and were allowed as much time as they needed to process the descriptions. Furthermore, they were provided with three different definitions of visual harmony and from which to create their own interpretation of visual harmony or what constitutes harmonious relationships between the built and natural environments. After each building element concept was explained to the informants, they spent a significant amount of time processing before they began
to sort the photographs. After they completed sorting the photographs, they were able to explain in great detail what it was about the makeup of the photograph that represented visual harmony for them in each category. In order to complete the process, and to know if they agreed or disagreed with the designer's intent, they needed to perceive (become aware and process) before they could interpret, or explain the meaning of, visual harmony or a harmonious relationship as it applied to each building element concept.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Designers (architects and landscape architects) of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries designed rustic architecture to be in harmony with the surrounding landscape. Their design intent is known through historical documentation, but the resulting visual harmony of natural and cultural elements in the landscape from the perspective of contemporary users had not been explored—until now. The researcher studied user perceptions of Camp Santanoni to find out how present-day users perceive and interpret the visual harmony of camp in its surroundings. The goal of conducting the research was to understand if people perceive the same visual harmony between buildings and landscape that the camp’s designer envisioned.

The extensive review of the literature (see Chapter 2) includes a significant amount of information that allows for a comprehensive understanding of the design history of visual harmony. *Visual harmony* is an expression used to describe an experience that is sensually pleasing to humans, specifically a visual experience that evokes emotion and creates attachment to place: this term has for too long been left in the hands of design professionals to understand. There is much to be learned from the users of sites and now is the time to learn from them. The National Park Service has conducted surveys on the importance of visual quality of the built environment in natural park settings within its own department and published its findings in a report titled *Visual Quality of Built Environments in National Parks*. However, this study does not include an
examination of the concepts and ideas that achieve visual harmony from the user’s perspective, and more importantly, what can actually be learned from the users of the site—for whom the buildings were designed and built. These two important discussions coupled with the need to understand the complex relationships between people and cultural landscapes addressed by Arnold Alanen and Robert Melnick, will give more meaning to the work preservationists do. As preservation professionals we can apply our training to expand and improve the public’s perception of cultural landscape preservation by engaging the community by asking what is important and meaningful. Furthermore, landscape preservation literature calls for the collection and analysis of information specific to the special, intangible connections between people and place such as associations and meanings. Preservation literature provides principles and recommendations for identifying these intangibles, but fails to provide guidance on how to collect the meanings and associations people ascribe to place. Preservation literature also puts emphasis on planning, which involves research and documentation of existing conditions for the maintenance and management of landscape intangibles.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to begin understand the complex relationships between people and landscape. The results of this study will enlighten preservation and cultural landscape professionals about the value in communicating with contemporary users and the importance of taking user perception into account when making cultural landscape preservation decisions.
A long-term site user holds valuable information and much can be learned from them. By taking into account user perspectives, a contribution can be made to this neglected area of research. Laying the foundation for this study in a way that begins an important dialogue has not been easy, and it is hoped that this study can be further developed and improved upon by preservation professionals, researchers, designers who are interested in this topic of study in collaboration with the author. The author is willing to share her knowledge with others, as well as to learn from others; opportunities for growth are welcomed.

5.1 Discussion: Results

5.1.1 Result 1: How People Perceive and Interpret the Visual Harmony of Historical Rustic Architectural Design in Context with Natural Environments

The users of Camp Santanoni consulted for this study perceived and interpreted the visual harmony of historical rustic architectural design in context with natural environments with far more thought and detail than the researcher could have predicted. Additionally, the users were highly sensitive to building and site design than the researcher expected. The purpose and added benefit of interviewing users of the site was to allow their intimate knowledge of and relationship with the site to guide them to point out and share significant aspects of the site that foster harmonious relationships. The interviewees had various educational backgrounds, yet they used the same language and phrases to explain what it was about a particular design element that allowed for a
harmonious relationship between the building and natural environment and thus created visual harmony for the user. The users responded strongly to the design of the building and its relationship to the natural environment, which speaks directly to good planning and design.

The informants relied heavily on their personal relationships with and experiences at Santanoni to place themselves in the context of the photograph: many informants verbally expressed the need to pause and recall memories and sensory experiences associated with those memories.

After they completed these mental processes, they would begin to sort the photographs based on two things: personal taste and adherence to the particular building element concept. Many of the informants described in their interviews that they sorted the photographs they way they did based on the composition of the photograph and their ability to understand the relationship in the photograph based on personal experience at the site. For example, an informant would choose an image based on his or her ability to place himself or herself in the photograph, and know what types of views could be experiences from a specific spot. When sorting the photographs based on the building element concepts, the informants would usually have the researcher read the concept several times and would repeat it to themselves while sorting the photographs. They explained in the interview that they sorted the photographs based on the concept description and the top two were most representative of
the concept. Informants selected the images based on personal experience with
the site and adherence to building element concepts.

5.1.2 Result 2: Do The Users Agree or Disagree With The Designer’s Intent?

All of the sixteen informants, with the exception of two informants
answered, “I agree” when asked, “Do you agree or disagree with the designer’s intent?” It is worth noting that the informants answered, “I agree” for each of the six building element concepts. The two informants who expressed exceptions disagreed with one concept each (separate categories) out of the six. Informant 6 was particularly drawn to the Photograph 4 for structural materials and disagreed with the way the vertical posts clashed with the stone footings. Informant 16 was indifferent about the building element concept of screening, due to the fact that the landscape changes over time. The researcher concluded that Informant 16 had a difficult time envisioning the original screen of trees that was historically between the camp and the lake. Based on the data collected and analyzed from the informants, a great deal of congruity between the way designers expressed visual harmony and the way in which the informants expressed it.
5.1.3 Result 3: How Does Rustic Architecture Enhance People’s Attachment to the Natural Environment?

From the onset of this research study, the researcher hypothesized that
rustic architecture enhances people’s attachment to natural environments.
Analysis of the data revealed that this was indeed the case for very specific
reasons. The researcher previously stated that the informants shared their
collected memories about Camp Santanoni. During the sharing of memories, the
informants indirectly revealed to the researcher that the design of the building
enhanced their experience and interpretations of site selection. They understood
that the building was positioned in the best spot for maximum viewing
opportunities of nature that included the water, mountains and sunsets.
Thoughtful design and the goal to achieve visual harmony enhanced the users’
overall experience with the natural environment. The informants enjoyed the
designed aspects of the building that make it harmonious with the site and
explained why this was the case:

Informant 5, “I picked the main view that you notice when you first walk in.
When you hit the center it is one of the best views in the whole
Adirondacks. They wouldn’t have centered the camp at any other spot.”
Informant 6: “I picked this view because I know where it is, and the steps
lead you to the lake. They centered the building and steps with the
clearing, which is the coolest part about the experience, when you bike
ride in, eat lunch and look out.”
Informant 7: “If I am sitting back away from the porch, not only do I get the outdoors, I can see the arch. It frames a view, enjoying the porch is part of the experience.”

The researcher is motivated to learn more by these responses because good experience enhances people’s attachment to place; it is clearly a good experience that keeps bringing people back to sites.

5.2 Limitations

The limitations of this study include the small ($n=16$) non-probability sample, the framing and quality of the photographs, the impermanence of vegetation and the inability to conduct this study at other, similar rustic architecture sites around the country. It is important to note that the results of this thesis cannot be generalized or predicted with certainty, as one could with a quantitative study. However, similar meanings and associations revealed may be transferrable to other sites with a building and site similar to that of Santanoni.

This thesis attempts to understand a particular phenomenon by collecting meanings. Theoretically, at a site similar to Santanoni one would expect to collect similar meanings shared by the informants, which could be used to further understand the phenomenon on a greater level.

Due to the time constraints of this study, the majority of the participants that took part in the study were from the Town of Newcomb, because of the geographic location of Camp Santanoni. Ideally, the interviews should have taken
place over the summer months, when roughly 2,000 users come through the site. Interviewing additional users would have also made the demographics more diverse and representative of a larger population.

Many of the informants pointed out to the researcher that the way the photographs were framed impacted the way they interpreted the photograph and sorted the photographs. The way the photographs were framed was not considered by the researcher until after the photographs had been selected. Furthermore, when the photographs were printed out they came out darker than they appeared on the researcher’s computer. Although the informants never mentioned anything about the quality of the photograph, the researcher felt that this variation in quality could have changed or influenced some of the informant’s decisions when sorting the photographs.

The selection of the five photographs for each building element concept was done by a focus group made up of both historic preservation and architecture graduate students. Even though the photographs were selected based on a consensus. The researcher believes that the selection of photographs to represent a design concept—especially concepts that deal with aesthetics—is a very subjective thing to do.

The major goal of this study was to understand design intent from the users’ perspective, through the collection of meanings. This study sought out “thick descriptions” or meaningful phenomena, which is the goal of qualitative research.
5.3 Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher anticipates that the Town of Newcomb, Adirondack Architectural Heritage, and the New York State Department of Conservation will be interested in collecting more data from users for future site management decisions. This initial study provides is a wonderful opportunity to conduct more user studies. If photographs were used again as part of the methodology, more thought shall be given to the framing of the photographs, specifically what building element concepts require zooming in or zooming out to effectively communicate the designer’s intent. Although Santanoni is an excellent case study site, the researcher suggests selecting similar sites around the country in both state parks, and National Park Service sites at which this study could be effectively conducted. It is also suggested that studies use different user types, such as those who have visited several years versus first time users. The researcher advocates for the need to listen to users talk about what is important and meaningful about a site.

The researcher believes there are many things that will be brought to light that have been overlooked or never even considered before about the site and how it is used and interpreted by including the users in a direct conversation regarding the sites management. Not only is this an opportunity to learn from the users, but this is also an opportunity to teach them about the site and why certain decisions have been made. To share information in an open feedback loop is truly for the benefit of all who are involved and care
5.4 Implications for Practice

This research is expected to raise awareness about the historic use of the term *harmony* and the history of visual harmony. Many are unaware of this design history, which is important to the design and development of structures in the United States National Parks. This new body of knowledge has the potential to impact the reasons and justifications for a range of preservation actions performed by historic preservationists and cultural landscape preservation experts by taking into account users’ perspectives. Studies of this nature should be conducted at similar cultural landscape sites containing significant works of rustic architecture. A study of this nature has the potential to create more meaningful site interpretations.

The research in this study agrees with the conclusions of Arnold Alanen, Robert Melnick and Richard Longstreth, which were used to frame this study. Alanen and Melnick (2000) described that in codifying a landscape, too often an understanding of the idiosyncrasies, intangible memories and experiences of landscape are lost. Longstreth (2008) emphasizes that idiosyncrasies (a way of thought peculiar to an individual) add significant meaning to and help clarify what is important about the intangible human element in cultural landscape preservation; this is why a greater understanding of landscapes can improve our knowledge of places and also our treatment of them. Furthermore, Melnick (2008) stresses that we need to ask more questions about what is meaningful, so that we add to our understanding of place and go beyond the orthodoxy of our
own work to better understand human—nature relationships from current perspectives. In addition, as Melnick (2008) states, “When we ask the same questions about people and place, we run the risk of arriving at the same conclusions, and in so doing, we fail to understand the complex relationship of people and landscape. There are no right questions, but by asking more questions we add to our multifaceted understanding of any place” (p.9). We must do a better job at engaging the community. “It means listening to others in order to learn about the landscape, why it is important, what is meaningful, and how it can continue to play a vital role in the community’s future” (Melnick, 2008 et al Richard Longstreth).

Based on the results of this study, the author recognizes the vital importance of Alanen, Melnick, and Longstreth’s statements and concurs with their assertions. The researcher concludes the process of asking more questions about what is important and meaningful and listening to the responses is key to a greater understanding of landscape; this will improve our knowledge of place and can help guide our treatment of cultural landscapes.

The community from which the informants were selected for interviews expressed to the researcher their appreciation for being included in the research, and they were confident that their opinions would seriously be taken into account. The author cannot stress enough how important it is to engage and listen to the community that surrounds a historic site and cultural landscape like Santanoni. Users of the site know and understand the site in a way that is valuable to its
preservation. The informants had noticed designed features of which the researcher was not even aware of; their responses should help guide the preservation of those features.

Informants contributed to the understanding of the research problem, but also revealed new meanings to the researcher. Without any prior knowledge of site history or design, users of Santanoni recognized building element concepts, principles, and the recommendations made by historic designers to create a visually harmonious aesthetic that resulted in effective relationships between the build and natural environments. This result, coupled with a well-documented design history, confirms the author’s suspicion that there was an intent very specific core theory behind rustic architectural design with respect to the natural environment that enhances the user’s overall experience in park, natural and wilderness environments.

Informant 5 believed that preservation professionals have knowledge of the site’s history and an understanding about the original design and will take that information into account to manage the site properly. Measures taken to enhance, preserve, and restore the buildings and historic landscape are made in a way that does not detract from user experience.

When experts take the user’s perspective into account—along with interpretations of a site that are critical to each individual’s personal experience—these professionals are ensuring a sensitive approach to the preservation of the cultural landscape. By listening to the users, we learn and become aware of
designed features, built or landscaped, that warrant further investigation about how those features influence user experience.

In this study, Informant 5 supposed that site interpretation is conducted respectfully with historic documentation. Furthermore, informants 5, 6, 7, and 14 expressed the belief that site stewards work in a manner that is sensitive to user experience. By collecting information from users to aid the development of maintenance and treatment plans, rather than developing guidelines strictly within and for a state or federal government agency. Professionals move beyond the bureaucratic process described by Alanen and Melnick (2000). Only then can they begin to identify the intangibles and clarify what is important about the intangible human element in cultural landscape preservation. Clarifying what is important about intangibles helps to improve our understanding and treatment of landscape in a more meaningful way. Site stewards that are successful will be able to recognize the intangible associations that arise within a designed landscape, which the user was not consciously aware of, but which enhance experience through good design and design intent. When this is the case, professionals can conclude that the final design outcome was achieved.

Design intent should be taken into serious consideration when documenting and managing historic places. Similar studies should be conducted at other sites around the country with great care following historical research and photographic documentation of each site’s present-day appearance. The designers of rustic architecture had a specific outcome in mind and built and
designed with great respect for the landscape. Researchers may be disappointed in the lack of expression by designers about their intent. For example, Robert Reamer, the designer of Old Faithful Inn, located in Yellowstone National park, never recorded any thoughts on his design intent for this extraordinary structure; this is also the case with Santanoni. Despite substantial research on Robert Robertson and Santanoni, no sources have been found that yield any information on his design intent for Santanoni.

Visual harmony is an attribute that connects design with emotion, a combination that ideally results in users’ attachment to site. It is up historic preservation and cultural landscape preservation professionals to understand user experience and to ensure that designed visually harmonious relationships are preserved for future generations to experience. Professional due diligence is required to avoid the loss of this design history.

The author asserts that what Melnick, Alanen and others are calling for is a re-connection with Andrew Jackson Downing’s principles and recognition of the power of aesthetics on the human senses. McClelland (2008) expounds on Downing’s principles of construction and buildings within natural environments and brings forth the importance of the aesthetic on the human senses:

Downing’s writings provided a philosophical basis for preserving America’s natural areas and translated the idea of “wilderness,” as evocative, sublime and picturesque, into design terms….Downing cultivated in the American mind an aesthetic appreciation of wild places and stimulated images of the picturesque qualities of such places. He was intensely aware of the tremendous power of primeval nature, with its dramatically changing landform, variations of light and shadow, sounds of moving water, and enveloping vegetation, could exert on the human
senses…Downing’s description of Montgomery Place illustrated the meaning of scenery, vista, enframement, and sequence stressed the role that rustic features placed in enhancing the individuals enjoyment and experience. (pp. 190—21)

The above paragraph explains why it is imperative to understand the idiosyncrasies that define landscape and the user experience within cultural landscapes—even if the questions that are asked are complex. The implication of this research on the semiotics of rustic architecture is that a more comprehensive understanding of the design for greater and more meaningful interpretation.

Many of the informants expressed the need to educate people about these design principles and their applicability to new construction in the Adirondacks. Residents of the Adirondack Park, who are familiar with new construction projects within the park, recognize that not all new construction is respectful to the landscape and perhaps even detracts from the natural landscape. Collectively, the informants expressed that all new construction within the park should follow the historic ideas, principles and recommendations outlined in this thesis.

The researchers next goal is to create a set of design guidelines that will be based on the design principles in this research, along with the major themes identified by the participants in this research study in order to help inform future rustic architectural design in natural environments and to influence new camp construction within the park. Much thought and effort went into developing the theory of harmonization between building and landscape and actual design and
construction. The development of visual harmony in relation to rustic architectural
design occurred during a significant period of time in architectural design history.
Visual harmony as a design philosophy should not be left to the past; rather, it
should still be referenced and implemented into practice. McClelland (1993)
discusses the importance of natural landscape design after construction and how
that step is integral to creating harmony: “Concern for the harmonization of
construction and nature left park designers to adapt principles of natural
landscape design for restoring building sites to natural condition after
construction” (p. 5).

5.4.1 Landscape Preservation Best Practices

The review of literature on landscape preservation doctrine has led the
researcher to stress the importance of collecting and analyzing varied sources of
information before making preservation decisions. The researcher places
importance and priority on the investigation and implementation of associations
(the special connections between people and place) and meanings (what a place
signifies, indicated, evokes or expresses) into management guidelines. The ideas
in these doctrines will be compared against the researcher’s results. The results
of the research will be related to the discussion on preservation doctrine in
Chapter 2.

5.4.1.1 The Florence Charter (1981): Discussion

Maintenance of vegetal growth is one of the most important aspects of
landscape preservation that this charter puts emphasis on: “maintenance of
historic gardens is of paramount importance” (Article 11). The preservation of a historic garden or landscape must be done in accordance with its contextual surroundings and based on historical precedent, in which it can be fully understood (i.e. how the land was used). In this study, the informants expressed that their experiences were directly related to vegetal growth (see Section 4.9.1). The informants also understand that their experience is dependent upon the maintenance of vegetal growth by site managers: they described views as “obstructed” or “filtered” (see Section 4.7.1). The informants were sensitive to vegetal growth, especially when it affected their views toward and away from the camp. Many of the informants wanted to know if the site’s landscape had been maintained according to historical precedent. The Florence Charter serves as an ideal guide for preservation professionals making decisions about the maintenance, conservation, restoration and reconstruction of historic landscapes. The language in the charter should be incorporated in the planning process and drafted in plans where it is likely to be implemented.

5.4.1.2 UNESCO—Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003): Discussion

Intangibles are more difficult to understand and protect than tangibles, because tangibles are physical, clear and definite while intangibles are not. Extra measures must be taken to protect or safeguard intangible cultural heritage.

Prior to this study, the Identification of the intangible cultural heritage at Santanoni, particularly with regard to the visitor experiences, has not been a priority. Dealing with and understanding intangible cultural heritage as it applies
to the visitor’s experience with both the building and natural landscape is not easy. Specifically, understanding visitor response to an intentionally designed environment (one where the desired outcome was a harmonious effect) and how they interact with the intersection of the built and natural environment has been a challenge. However, beginning to document and understand the intangible cultural heritage and meanings associated with the site has been truly rewarding and the result will be beneficial to both the visitor and the site. Further identification of intangible cultural heritage at Santanoni must be prioritized so measures can be developed for its safeguarding. Recordation and documentation is the first step toward long-term safeguarding.

5.4.1.3 ICOMOS—Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structure, Sites and Areas (2005): Discussion

In order to protect the setting of heritage structures, sites, and areas, the Xi’an Declaration outlines five important principles and recommendations for the conservation of intangible cultural heritage aspects, including “the interaction with the natural environment; past or present social or spiritual practices, customs, traditional knowledge, use or activities and other forms of intangible cultural heritage aspects that created and from the space as well as the current and dynamic cultural, social and economic context” (p. 2).

This charter outlines principles and recommendations but offers no reference on where or how to begin. This thesis offers a tool for the collection of intangible cultural heritage aspects such as the interaction with the natural
environments. This is only one tool in addition to other tools listed above, and it may apply to each of the five principles. This research offers one way in which setting can be interpreted in diverse contexts. In Chapter 4, the informants addressed emphasized the importance of setting and contexts. The overall setting was important to their experiences.

5.4.1.4 Preservation Briefs Discussion

Preservation Brief 17 *Architectural Character—Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic building as an Aid to Preserving their Character* only addresses the tangible qualities of a building and site. This is a succinct and useful piece of guidance that should considered alongside the Florence Charter, UNESCO- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), and the Xi’an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structure, Sites and Areas (2005) when formulating preservation plans for the treatment of cultural landscapes like Santanoni. Preservation Brief 17 helps individuals identify the tangibles of the site, so that the intangibles of site may be later identified. The limitations of Brief 17 are in identifying intangibles, which this research can help address.

Preservation Brief 36 *Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* is limited in its ability to provide guidance for how users of historic sites perceive and value historical design features, which links directly to visitor experience. However, it succeeds at providing guidance on understanding and documenting the tangible aspects of
site and calls for the protection of the intangibles. Knowing more about visitor experience allows site stewards to manage sites in a way that best serves users’ needs while adding meaning to overall experience. This helps the users get what they want out of their visits with the recognition that each experience is unique.

5.5 Conclusions

Professionals and practitioners in the field of historic preservation and cultural landscape preservation recognize that the field of cultural landscape preservation is at risk of losing the idiosyncrasies that define landscape in an effort to standardize preservation practice by categorizing elements worth preserving (Alanen and Melnick, 2000). Alanen and Melnick called for a greater understanding of landscape by putting forth the need to ask more questions, and to listen to the community talk about what is important and meaningful. Researchers and preservation professionals can learn much about a historic site from the site’s users.

As documented in the literature review (see Chapter 2), the intended goal of historical rustic architecture to achieve harmony between the buildings and natural environment is well known. However, contemporary user perception, or lack thereof, of the intended visual harmony at these sites has not been studied. This study establishes that there is a congruency between the designers’ intent and users’ perceptions. The users who participated in this study were cognizant of good building design, and were able to impressively identify key building
design components that create successful relationships with the natural environment. Furthermore, the informants, despite their differing educational backgrounds, used similar terminology and phrases to describe their choices of imagery that most represented the building element concepts. After one hundred and twenty years, Robert Robertson’s goal is still well-received and recognized by the users of Camp Santanoni. This study's informants agreed that Downing, Olmstead, and Wicks’ strategies to make a building harmonious with the site were successful. A bonus to this researcher was when the informants began to explain how rustic architecture enhances people’s attachment to the natural environment. This is a very strong statement corroborating the researchers hypothesis and warrants further exploration and investigation.

Furthermore, this study has initiated a conversation about the effect that rustic architectural design principles (visual harmony) have on a site’s users and the design’s ability to connect users to the natural environment (i.e. landscaped, park, or wilderness environments)—all from the users’ perspective. After all, thoughtful architectural design is for people to experience, and understanding the relationship between the built and natural environment from the users’ perspective is of paramount importance.
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