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**Abstract**

From the 1880s, new types of designed green space appeared in the industrial landscape in Britain and America as progressive industrialists began to enhance factory buildings with planting, provided pleasure gardens for employees, and opened allotment gardens for local children. Gardens and gardening in the workplace were thought to contribute to the recruitment and retention of staff, to employee health and well-being, to corporate identity, public relations and civic improvement. By the early twentieth century, corporate landscapes represented ideals that underpinned a successful, modern industrial and social outlook, much like today’s elite corporate landscapes are constructed in response to the demands and opportunities of the digital age.

In the ‘Boys’ Garden’ at the National Cash Register Company (NCR) in Dayton, Ohio, which opened in 1897 as the firm’s flagship project in social engineering through gardening, local boys received horticultural training. This didactic landscape, designed by the Olmsted Brothers, was widely promoted as effective in moral, intellectual and physical improvement, and responsible citizenship. Corporate gardens today, such as those at Google in Mountain View, California and in London, are provided for similar homiletic purposes, but they can also offer valuable recreational opportunities, link employees to local communities and improve biodiversity.

How can a comparative study of past and present corporate landscapes contribute to theories and practices of design for corporate clients today?
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**Presentation**

***[Slide :Photograph of book]*** In my book *‘The Factory in a Garden’. A History of Corporate Landscapes from the Industrial to the Digital Age*, published next week, I argue that from the 1880s, new types of designed green space appeared in the industrial landscape in Britain and America. Progressive industrialists building new factories began to enhance buildings with planting, to provide recreation grounds and sometimes pleasure gardens for employees, and open allotment gardens for local children. ***[Slide: International Harvester ‘Playground’ Milwaukee, 1920s and NCR Boys’ Gardens c.1900]*** Industrialists building model villages since the mid 18th century had commonly provided vegetable allotments for employees and sports grounds at factories were not unusual by the late 19th century. However, in the early twentieth century, designed recreational and cosmetic landscaping at factories presented a new paradigm for industrial space that underpinned a modern industrial and social outlook, providing better conditions in workplaces, more opportunities for leisure and recreation, and more access to green space. By the industrialists’ own admission, their attractive factories with recreation grounds were a means to greater productivity through a healthier, more motivated and local workforce. ***[Slide: Memorial Garden at Newbury, Oxon, UK, 2015]*** These landscapes, constructed in response to the industrial age, were the precedents for those elite corporate landscapes, such as Google or Vodafone, which respond to the demands and opportunities of the digital age.

**[*Slide: Google, London, Roof Gardens, 2014]***The landscaping that we see now at the new campuses or roof gardens of tech and other industries has a long history and the links between these and their counterparts in the early 20th century will form the focus of this talk. Some of the more innovative of the corporate landscapes today are found in the internet-related and banking industries, because they tend to have the funds, space and incentives to supply them. In the early 20th century their equivalent were constructed at new technology companies such as telecoms and in the consumer goods sector, including food and clothing.

I will begin by giving you a quick tour of some of the precedents for these corporate landscapes which were the factory towns and villages of the early Industrial Revolution. I will then look at two case studies from around 1900 to the 1930s, the Cadbury factory at Bournville, UK and the National Cash Register Company (NCR) in Dayton, Ohio, USA. I will highlight the importance of their landscaping strategies to their promotion of industrial welfare. I will discuss why our responses to the landscapes should be circumspect, and argue that corporate gardens and recreation parks were part of a social engineering project to shape the model employee and responsible citizen and they became instruments of power. I borrow from Foucault’s concept of heterotopias[[1]](#footnote-1) and from Lefebvre’s articulation of complex and contradictory spaces and how power operates in space[[2]](#footnote-2) to understand the paradoxical nature of these spaces, both of opportunity and control. I will examine one landscape in detail, the Boys’ Garden of the NCR, discussing its design, and how it was used and represented in the company promotional literature to show how the landscape’s didactic function was reinforced through photography. Finally, I will reflect on some lessons we can learn from the past when planning and designing corporate landscapes today.

**Evolution of factory gardens**

***[Slide 7 Coalbrookdale by Wlliam Williams, 1777****]* The idea of landscaping a corporate site to give employees access to green space has its origins in the early Industrial Revolution, when outdoor exercise was regarded as an antidote to grueling factory work and to improving employee morality and health. Promotional paintings and prints from this period like this one of Coalbrookdale, present idealized views of the industrial landscape and labour. From 1782, Richard Reynolds laid out the Sabbath Walks around Coalbrookdale, facilitating country walks on the one day in the week when the miners and ironworkers could take their leisure. At one viewpoint, a revolving rotunda made of iron offered a wide perspective**. *[Slide: Robert Owen’s Mills at New Lanark, Scotland]*** Robert Owen, at his mills at New Lanark just south of Glasgow, Scotland, constructed walks along the river Clyde to encourage recreation and he promoted dancing out of doors. [***Slide: Salt’s Mill at Saltaire Today,, overlooking the village allotments***] At Saltaire, an industrial village built by Titus Salt from the 1850s, the village allotments symbolically presented the factory as a site for social and familial responsibility and by the 1870s, the new Saltaire Park provided a variety of sporting and leisure opportunities to the local workforce and their families. ***[Slide: Saltaire Park]*** Titus Salts’ method was one of strict control and the park was part of his strategy to impose his own moral values, particularly temperance, by encouraging healthy and respectable activities.[[3]](#footnote-3) (Temperance was a driving force in the emergence of public parks in the 19th century.[[4]](#footnote-4)) It is likely that the American industrialist George Pullman visited Saltaire on his tour of Europe, for his industrial village to which he gave his name, built near Chicago from the 1880s, is similar in concept and design to Saltaire.[[5]](#footnote-5) The town of Pullman is said to be the first in America laid out collaboratively by an architect and a landscape architect, Solon S. Berman and Nathan Barratt.[[6]](#footnote-6) The press hailed Pullman as ‘The World’s Most Beautiful Town’,[[7]](#footnote-7) but following a disastrous strike in 1894, when thirteen workers were killed and fifty-three seriously injured, the town gained a reputation as a failed experiment in industrial organization, and the landscaping a metaphor for controlling industrial systems.

***[Slide: Shredded Wheat factory Niagara Falls, c.1901 and Shredded Wheat factory Welwyn Garden City, 1925]*** At the Shredded Wheat factory, Niagara Falls, the landscape framed and defined ‘The Palace of Light’[[8]](#footnote-8) – a manipulative slogan for a factory being erected in an area of outstanding natural beauty! You can see a theme developing here of consumer goods companies, particularly food manufacturers such as Shredded Wheat, Heinz, Ovaltine, Rowntree, Cadbury and Horlicks, promoting their product and shaping the brand with romanticised illustrations. ***[Slide: Roof Gardens at Heinz, c. 1900]***Promotional photographs of the landscapes and employees using them were widely published, as you can here at Heinz, where employee morality was renewed in segregated and gendered spaces.

By the 1920s and 1930s, it was not unusual for companies to commission nurserymen or landscape or garden architects to improve the aesthetic beauty of their sites, provide space for sporting and other outdoor activities such as gardening and offer retreats for rest away from the spaces of production. Corporate leaders and representatives bodies such as the Industrial Welfare Society (UK) and the National Industrial Conference Board (USA) believed that workplace gardens and recreation grounds contributed to the recruitment and retention of staff, to employee health and wellbeing, to corporate identity, public relations and civic improvement.[[9]](#footnote-9) The green landscape diverted attention from the utilitarian, restrictive, often unhealthy and authoritarian nature of factory or office work and culture due to the association of gardens and parks with utopias and with healthy living, much like the advocates of the Garden Cities and public health movements recommended generous green space, with fresh air and sunlight as the prerequisite for health and wellbeing.[[10]](#footnote-10) **[Slide: Advertisement for Welwyn Garden City]** Factories with significant green spaces were celebrated as ‘the most beautiful factory in the world’, ‘the perfect factory’ or ‘the ideal workplace’ and photographs and films of the workers at rest or play in the factory grounds reinforced the message. **[Slide: Spirella Corset Factory at Letchworth Garden City]**. Suburbanisation was also a factor in the beautification of factories. The new suburban factories, such as Hoover and Firestone, built west of London, had more space for outdoor recreation. An attractive landscaped factory, which diverted attention from pollution and noise, was likely to be more acceptable to the suburbanites.

**Case studies: Cadbury and the NCR**

One of the most active supporters of the Garden City Movement, George Cadbury, created what probably became the most celebrated ‘Factory in a Garden’ of them all. The maxim originated at Cadbury, and many companies copied it.

***[Slide: Cadbury factory, Bournville, showing Men’s Recreation Ground and Girls’ Gardens, 1930]*** In their work as industrialists, developers and philanthropists, the Cadbury brothers, George and Richard, were expert place-makers. They communicated positive messages through their landscaping practices including at Bournville, creating a strong sense of place not only through using English vernacular architecture and landscape in the design of Bournville Village, but also at the factory itself. As Edward Relf has suggested: ‘An authentic sense of place is above all that of being inside and belonging to (your) place both as an individual and as a member of the community and to know this without reflecting upon it.’[[11]](#footnote-11) The Cadburys created authenticity using land with an existing history and then constructed it in the image of an authentic almost feudal, family community.[[12]](#footnote-12)

**[Slide: map of Bournville – detail showing Girls’ Grounds]** In 1878, the Cadburys purchased an 18th century estate, updated in the 19th century, which lay just across the road from the factory, to present their gardens and recreation grounds as a palimpsest, or space layered with memories of place, to create a continuity of time and place as if the family firm had always been there. They updated the original landscaped grounds to provide gardens and sports grounds for their female employees.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Cadburys photographed their ‘girls’ (so named because at Cadbury, when a girl married, she had to leave the company, but also signifying paternalistic and patriarchal values), as safe in their ‘hortus conclusus’, or enclosed garden. The Cadbury ‘girls’ became known as the Cadbury’s Angels, pure and virginal, their virtue protected from the male gaze, their bodies made ethereal in pictorial photographs that suggested a painterly, idealised distance from their positions as factory workers. **[Slide: the ‘nook in the Rowntree Women’s garden, c.1900]** Rowntree, another Quaker firm, was one of many companies providing segregated and gendered spaces, reinforced with design and planting. The Girls’ Gardens at Rowntree, an idea quite likely copied from Cadbury, as these Quaker firms had a close relationship, were furnished with benches and trellis and planted with climbing roses. However, the women’s privacy appears to have had less importance at Rowntree, as the company railway line, bounded one side of their ‘nook’ as the girl’s garden was known, from where voyeurs could intrude on this semi-private space. Even on company roofs, men and women were segregated for their recreation, such as at Frank Lloyd Wright’s Larkin Building in Buffalo New York (1904-6) or the roof of the Heinz factory at Pittsburgh seen earlier.

The literature suggests that companies played down or denied any suggestions that they coerced employees to participate in company activities, although at some firms, employees had their dues for company clubs automatically deducted from their wage packets.[[14]](#footnote-14) Some companies found some alternative strategies to encouraging or even imposing healthy outdoor activities on their employees and their families.

***[Slide: Boys’ Gardens at the National Cash Register Co. Dayton, Ohio, c.1900]*** From the 1890s, the National Cash Register Company (NCR) in Dayton Ohio, (arguably the Microsoft of its day) set themselves up as the model to the whole neighborhood for the benefits of landscape beauty and gardening. John Patterson, the founder of the company, might be described as a zealot in his many projects of redemption through gardening schemes to improve the local environment and to teach local boys how to grow vegetables. Patterson’s ‘Boys’ Garden’ became the NCR’s flagship project in social engineering through gardening, to teach good citizenship and social responsibility.

Patterson claimed that something had to be done to control the local youth, who had been running wild and breaking windows in the neighborhood, and that gardening and horticulture, practices he had learned as a boy on the family farm, would teach them discipline, self-respect and a sense of responsibility in supplementing the family budget. ***[Slide: ‘The Boy Gardeners]*** He founded a boys’ gardening company, gave the boys responsibility for managing the company, and staged an annual dinner and with prizes for the best gardens.[[15]](#footnote-15) ***[Slide: NCR Before Boys’ gardens – local youth at Slidertown]*** According to company propaganda, the lessons learned in the gardens changed a local delinquent youth into ‘Good Men for the Factory’. ***[Slides: ‘After training in the gardens’ and ‘Good Men’]*** (I have no evidence but I am sure that the first photograph in the sequence is not genuine but was set up retrospectively for promotional purposes. The signifiers of scallywag youth, facial expressions, body language, scruffy clothing and borrowed hats suggest some creative art direction.) ***[Slide: the Bean Crop]*** Sources do not offer any impartial opinion on life in the boys’ gardens although photographs suggest they were closely supervised under a strict disciplinary regime.

***[Slide: NCR Vista]*** The importance attached to his gardening schemes is suggested by Patterson’s decision to employ the leading landscape architecture firm of the day, the Olmsted Brothers, to landscape the factory and the neighborhood, design the Boys’ Gardens, and to advise local people on how they might improve their front and back yards and the urban environment. Patterson had seen the work of their patriarch, Frederick Law Olmsted, when he visited the Chicago World’s Fair in 1893 and would have known of his reputation as the designer of New York’s renowned Central Park. By the time Patterson began making improvements to the factory in the mid 1890s, Olmsted was an old man (he died in 1903) and his sons, stepbrothers Frederick 11 and John Charles, ran the firm. The policy of redemption through gardening would have met with the Olmsteds’ approval since their father was well known for his views on the environmental and social benefits of urban green space.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Formerly named Slidertown, Patterson renamed the factory neighborhood South Park with its connotations of respectability, and began to name and shame local residents who did not conform to his wishes. ***[Slide: NCR Landscape Gardening School]*** He set up a landscape gardening school in the factory to encourage compliance and shape ‘good taste’, therefore imposing his ‘legitimate’ middle-class taste in on his employees.[[17]](#footnote-17) ***[Slide: back yard of Dayton house near NCR showing the owner discussing his garden with Patterson, John Charles Olmsted, and others]*** This photograph of Patterson with his famous landscape architect John Charles Olmsted in a local back yard discussing the garden with the householder suggests the paternalist patriarch bestowing a great favour on his minions. Patterson also used the before and after photograph, ***[Slide: before and after shot of local garden with factory in background]*** a technique perfected more than 100 years earlier by that master of self-promotion, landscape architect and architect Humphrey Repton with his Red Books in which he used before and after views of his landscaping projects as tools of persuasion. Multiple, highly illustrated NCR publications and talks, including a booklet, ‘The Boys Gardens’, the company landscape gardening lecture and reports in the company magazine *The NCR*, made very clear the value of the gardening projects to the business and its employees.

**Discussion**

How can we understand the strange juxtaposition of a factory and a garden? A factory is a space of power and surveillance, therefore Foucault’s model of Bentham’s Panopticon in his book *Discipline and Punish* would be an obvious way to conceive the imposition of power in a factory.[[18]](#footnote-18) A Foucauldian interpretation of these spaces might suggest that the employees were in a Panopticon environment, subject to surveillance, their behaviour regulated and monitored. I have anecdotal evidence to suggest that a choice of non-participation in company social activities disadvantaged employees in terms of promotion or preferment,[[19]](#footnote-19) and histories of industrial relations and company cultures have suggested that some employees resented welfare facilities that they found patronizing or too ‘middle class’.[[20]](#footnote-20) And companies, through their promotional literature must have exaggerated the amount of time their employees spent in the company grounds. [***Slide Cadbury dancing in Girls; Grounds at Cadbury***]. It is also likely that the factory gardens were used only in warm weather, although historian Ross McKibbin has suggested that the canteen and workrooms were more favoured for lunch and break periods than going outside – although he does not measure this preference against the quality of outside space available to employees.[[21]](#footnote-21)

**[Slide NCR Dayton ‘It Pays!’]** How does power operate in a factory garden, a utopianist project, designed to improve employees’ lives, giving them agency, but also a contested and coercive space, provided to increase productivity? The factory and the garden would appear to clash, to produce strange juxtapositions which makes the factory garden a heterotopia, a space that according to Peter Johnson’s understanding of Foucault’s meaning of the word, will ‘unstitch, undermine and transform utopias.’[[22]](#footnote-22) In other words, the imposition of power implicit in a factory garden undermines the utopianist project, giving it strong heterotopianist characteristics. However, as Johnson asserts, the theory of heterotopia does not help to explain how the company imposes its power through the gardens, nor how employees accept, or resist that power.

Through exploring other theories of how power operates in social space, such as those of Henri Lefebvre and Stephen Lukes, it could be argued that within these power structures, employees achieved agency and empowerment and the landscapes were more enabling in these respects than the indoor space, since they allowed more bodily freedom, opportunities to improve physical and mental health, and at best, gave them space for privacy. Stephen Lukes has argued that even in spaces of power, individuals and groups can find agency, and opportunity within the wider power structures.[[23]](#footnote-23) My research suggests that many employees, if the conditions were right - fair wages, respectful treatment by employers, lack of coercion to participate - welcomed the opportunities offered by the gardens and recreation grounds, therefore workplace gardens and recreation grounds potentially could contribute to productivity, improve retention, and create more stable industrial relations. The employers certainly thought so, but there is so far little substantive evidence to support these claims (and I am looking for collaborators in a research project to do this).

It could be argued that women particularly benefited from green recreation space, since they had fewer opportunities for sporting activities than men.[[24]](#footnote-24) At firms that employed a high proportion of women, such as Cadbury, Rowntree and the Spirella Corset Company, private gardens for women and sporting opportunities such as tennis, hockey and netball were provided, although as S. Philips has argued, at other firms such as Boots in Nottingham, the facilities for women were inferior to those for men.[[25]](#footnote-25) This could have been as much due to levels of interest in joining works sports teams as to discrimination by gender. However, in general terms, sporting opportunities in the workplace for women improved between the Wars, meeting a demand for sports that was not as accessible or affordable elsewhere.[[26]](#footnote-26)

For men too, a place to loaf, gossip and relax away from the shop floor or office, could be beneficial, although research suggests that if available, few workers used outside spaces during the working day.[[27]](#footnote-27) ***[Slide Cadbury dancing – propaganda – 1 hour for lunch***] However, for those who liked to play sports after work and at weekends, the availability, proximity and affordability of company sports clubs and ground contributed significantly to sporting cultures from the 1920s until the 1970s when social and economic change precipitated a decline in industrial recreation.[[28]](#footnote-28)

**Corporate Landscapes Today**

***[Vodafone campus, Newbury, 2015***] As in the past, technology is a key driver for change in the ways we work and the places we inhabit for work. We are increasingly living inactive lives in virtual space, and the evidence suggests that knowledge workers report more symptoms of stress than other types of workers.[[29]](#footnote-29) The evidence we have now for the benefits to our health of using outside space is substantial[[30]](#footnote-30)and the practice of providing recreation and rest space for employees is again on the increase.

What can we learn from this research about landscaping for corporate clients today? If we are designing landscapes for offices and other workplaces, how should we be advising our clients? We know from the past that some employees resented the expenditure on social and welfare facilities including the gardens and recreation grounds when the money could have been transferred to their wage packets. This is perhaps one reason why employees today are more often consulted about the kinds of spaces they prefer and the amenities provided in them, as here at Vodafone where the workers asked for beanbags on the lawn for informal lounging.

I have visited a number of sites and collected anecdotal evidence which has enabled me to reach some tentative conclusions. Let's look at two examples, one a campus and one a roof garden. ***[Slide Vodafone campus running track]*** At Vodafone near Newbury, employees have generous and varied outside spaces to enjoy on clement, or even inclement days. On this a peri-urban site, permeability between private and public space is facilitated by a mile-long path around the perimeter of the campus, open to all, providing for walking or running. Plentiful lawns between buildings offer lounging space on the grass. ***[Slide Vodafone campus – ponds]*** And the site was designed to be supportive of the local ecology and to biodiversity. Ponds filled with rainwater run-off from the surrounding buildings are planted with water plants and filled with fish. This type of ecology-focused discourse is of course absent from the early 20th century examples, although the benefits of nature contact are frequently mentioned.

At Vodafone, a memorial garden, a space created in response to employees’ wishes, commemorates those who have died in service and provides a contemplative space and quiet retreat. ***[Slide Memorial Garden at Vodafone]*** Talking to employees, I have also discovered that privacy is important to them, a retreat, somewhere to make a private phone call, a break from the office, to clear their heads.

***[Slide: Nomura Bank roof gardens, London]*** At the Nomura Bank roof garden in London, a space the size of three football pitches, the bankers are treated to panoramic views of the city. Here they can make phone calls in private, take a break from the trading floors, eat outside in the summer, connect to water and to wildlife, or chat to the three female switchboard operators who tend the large vegetable allotment in their lunch hour. The gardeners told me that the experience of gardening, digging their hands into the soil and growing vegetables is a good antidote to stress, physical and mental. The garden also connects them to the bankers, some of whom chat while they are working, or even lend a hand. However, the women’s agency is compromised when the company cooks cut the vegetables without their permission and before they are ready for harvesting, a lack of control over their space that causes resentment.

Like the examples from the past, corporate landscapes today are superficially Utopianist. Employees identify many benefits including privacy; improved creative thinking, sense of place, wellbeing, socialisation, and connecting to nature. However, if the office workers don't go outside or take part in the exercise programmes offered to them, are they overlooked for promotion, as one Cadbury employee found to her cost? Or, if they spend too much time outside, will they be criticised for slacking, an anxiety expressed by one Google employee. At the Google campus in Mountain View, how patronised do they feel by the signs around the grounds exhorting them to drink more water, a practice seen around the factory grounds at the NCR in the early 20th century and to my amazement repeated at in the 21st century. ***[Slide]*** Is there an uncomfortable hierarchy and class discrimination in a company that asks its switchboard employees if they would like to 'volunteer' to manage the company vegetable garden? Above all, do these high-quality spaces simply encourage people to spend more time at work?

Company gardens are heterotopic spaces, not supplied through altruisim, although this is a factor, but by corporate leaders’ own admission, for good business sense, to attract the best employees, to increase productivity, reduce absenteeism, improve their image and above all increase profits. I am not suggesting that office landscaping should be avoided, but there are some principles that can be adoped to assist their success. ***[Slide: Google’s ‘Secret Garden’ on their roof terrace, Central St. Giles, London]*** If you find yourself designing a corporate garden, consult the employees in the design process and some might even be willing to help maintain the gardens. Link the inside and outside spaces visually and physically: for example place the gardens near the cafeteria so that eating time can be combined with outdoors time. Avoid any hierarchy of use and do not provide gardens exclusive to senior management. Advise your clients not to restrict the time employees can spend outside or make them feel bad for doing so. They might be doing their best, most creative work.

**[Slide: Heatherwick and Ingels 2016 design for Google Campus, Mountain View, California]** My research into corporate landscapes suggests that design for office gardens today, particularly for those of the new tech companies, has returned in some respects to the paternalism of the early to mid 20th century when companies sought to create productive space to engineer employees in the image of the model employee. While green space in the workplace can improve our working lives, perhaps companies should instead fund not private space, for their elite employees, but better public green spaces in their neighbourhood, where everyone can benefit and where employees can find respite away from the office. These would be less monitored spaces where office workers would be more connected to the wider community.

Heatherwick and Ingels’ new design for the Google campus in Mountain view is taking one step in this direction in creating a corporate commons, shared, permeable space that breaks down barriers between public and private. I suggest corporate development could go further than this, to move away from the campus/business park model, to construct mixed use, humane and ecologically diverse spaces in the suburbs where office workers can freely mix with the local community.
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