

Sustainability and the Planned Community: Kohler, Wisconsin and Seaside, Florida

PAUL J. ARMSTRONG

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Sustainable Development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- World Commission on Environmental Development

The concept of "sustainability" as related to architecture and planning has recently been used to define environmentally sympathetic design.¹ However, for the purposes of this paper truly sustainable planning and design encompasses the broader issues of long-term viability and adaptability of communities to change, the efficient utilization of available physical resources, as well as use, scale, and density related to urban space, population density, and morphology. The renewed respect for traditional urbanism and environmental consciousness, while having mutually beneficial effects, may also produce conflict. "Environmental determinism," the notion that sun angles and other energy-related factors should exert an overriding effect on building form and orientation, is often at variance with those planners who advocate formal planning codes for new towns and insist on contextualism for old ones.² A decade ago, Sim van der Ryn and Peter Calthorpe promoted environmental planning at the expense of urbanism in *Sustainable Communities*. In recent years, historicism and regionalism have reawakened architects and planners interests in working with nature rather than against it. Today, traditional town planning concepts are again being re-evaluated as models which can potentially be adapted to the requirements of modern planning and town design.³

This paper will compare and contrast Kohler, Wisconsin and Seaside, Florida as examples of planned communities with respect to long-term sustainability. As an established company town, Kohler has an historical linkage to the garden communities of the early part of the twentieth century as well as the factory towns of the nineteenth century. Kohler's viability as a community as well as its continued ability to maintain sustained growth and development is principally due to its strong industrial base and its accessibility to larger metropolitan areas. Like Kohler, Seaside is based, in part, on Garden City as well as traditional small town planning

models. However, Seaside by contrast is a newly planned resort community with no industrial base and little of the political, cultural, or social infrastructure which are typical of a true town. Although Seaside's planners have aspirations of making it a town in the full concept of the term, Seaside's long-term sustainability will largely be determined by its own ability to evolve beyond its current economic and social limitations as a resort community and develop an infrastructure that will create and support economic growth.

PLANNING MODELS AND AMERICAN NEW TOWNS

Lynch presents three normative models for city design: the cosmic model or crystalline city based on hierarchy, symmetry, and order; the rational machine model comprised of autonomous, undifferentiated parts serving different functions; and, the organic model.⁴ The contrast between the organic model and the machine model is relevant to this discussion. The machine model, a product of twentieth century modernism, preserves the autonomy of its parts thus allowing individual freedom and adaptability. However, its standardization also creates isolation. The organic model, developed in the eighteenth century, conceives the city as an organism and as such an autonomous individual with a definite boundary and definite size. Unlike the machine model which changes its size by the limitless addition of parts, it reorganizes its form as it changes size. Form and function are indissolubly linked, and the function of the whole is complex and not simply understood by knowing the nature of the parts, since the interaction of the parts is quite different than the mere collection of them. Like a biological organism, the organic city is self-regulating, self-organizing, and self-repairing. The organic model emphasizes the cooperation that maintains society, in contrast to seeing society as a competitive struggle.

America's garden cities are descended from the Progressive reform movement and reflect the values of that period. The City Beautiful movement originated with the World's Columbian exposition held at Chicago in 1893. Derived from Hausmann's plan for Paris with its emphasis on broad

boulevards and Baroque axial planning, the City Beautiful movement demonstrated both what city design should and could be like and to show the American public what an appropriate civic character for their cities might be.⁵ Modern new towns trace their origins to Ebenezer Howard's Garden City concept in England presented in the 1902 publication *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*.⁶ Garden cities were intended to free the pressures on existing cities by transferring population to new and much smaller towns, built outside the city in virgin countryside.⁷ Howard's Garden City concept was ostensibly devised to stem the drift of population from rural to urban areas. The Garden City combined the advantages of the cultural amenities of the town with the pastoral and healthful benefits of the countryside.

American new towns reflect aims and philosophies quite different than Howard's.⁸ New towns in general reflect arcadian premises more than utopian ones. Utopia is a social genre dealing with institutional change, whereas the arcadian tradition emphasizes rural peace and simplicity, spontaneous innocence, aesthetic equality, and harmony with nature.⁹ The institutional restructuring required by Howard's concentric and hierarchical scheme has been supplanted by the need to create contemporary cities responsive to current economic, social, and technological trends; and to design neighborhoods that support neighborhood and family life. Howard's diagram of self-contained communities separated by Greenbelts were perfectly adapted to the railroad as the primary means of transportation, but not to the automobile. Furthermore, economic viability for a planned community is more difficult to achieve than Howard anticipated.¹⁰

According to Carol Christensen, garden city planners in America have adhered to a long-standing intellectual tradition of suspicion of the city which is related to a cultural belief in the superiority of physical nature.¹¹ In this view, man-made institutions are viewed as artificial and, therefore, are at variance with an ideal where nature as landscape and nature as natural law are presumed to cohere. Christensen also points out that the emphasis of the "garden" over the "city" suggests that social planning in new cities is intimately connected with this cultural legacy. Consequently, the American attitude toward the city is very much related to an ambivalent attitude toward community and those values associated with it.¹²

In his collection of essays *The Highway and the City*, Lewis Mumford recognizes the value of the garden city concept as a planning model and the picturesque amenities of countryside. However, he is also critical of the design of new towns based on old prototypes and rhetorically ponders what the modern city might be:

Something important in the old towns and villages that these New Towns often surround has been lost in the new designs - something that needs to be understood and adapted. Above everything else a city is a means of providing a maximum number of social contacts and satisfactions. When the open spaces gape too widely,

and dispersal is too constant, the people lack a stage for their activities and the drama of their daily life lacks sharp focus. Because the new planners were mainly in revolt against congestion and squalor, rather than in love with urban order and cooperation, the New Towns do not yet adequately reveal what the modern city should be.¹³

THE COMPANY TOWN AND THE GARDEN CITY

Although the Kohler Company is best known for its plumbing fixtures and hardware, its major enterprise in the late 1800s was the manufacture and sale of agricultural equipment. At the turn of the century John Kohler moved his company's operations to a large tract of farm land located four miles west of Sheboygan, Wisconsin.¹⁴ Several employees proceeded to build homes in the vicinity of the plant site and by 1912 Riverside was a small unincorporated hamlet located near the Sheboygan River. Disturbed by the nondescript appearance of the community, Walter J. Kohler endeavored to create a model village which would showcase the Kohler name, product, and philosophy.¹⁵ Prior to the years before World War I, Walter Kohler visited several industrial communities in America and Europe - particularly in England and Germany. While in England in 1912, Kohler visited Letchworth, the first development sponsored by Ebenezer Howard and the Garden Planning Association, and also made a journey to Port Sunlight.

Impressed with the appearance of the English garden city, Kohler later met with Howard in Welwyn Garden City. Although Kohler lauded certain aspects of European Planning endeavors, he did not wish to impose on an American community the direct paternalism of a central industry which parceled out company owned homes to employees.¹⁶ In 1916 Kohler contacted Werner Hegemann, a German born planner who was preparing surveys of several American cities, regarding the preparation of a plan for the envisioned industrial village.¹⁷ Hegemann reportedly requested that in addition to R. Phillip, the Milwaukee architect, and J. Donohue, the Sheboygan engineer whom Kohler had already employed, that the landscape architect Elbert Peets be invited to join the design team.¹⁸

Using Howard's Garden City model, an agrarian greenbelt was proposed to encircle the 3,000 acre land holdings of the entire plant and proposed community.¹⁹ Hegemann recognized the natural amenities afforded by the site "as an ideal location for a garden city."²⁰ Hegemann was particularly concerned that a modern garden city should have residential lots of sufficient size to ensure that every house be advantageously oriented to sun and wind: "The houses should not, by exigencies of economy, be packed together in the streets like dead flowers in a book, but shall be grouped opening up to the sun like living flowers and leaves of a tree in free nature. There should be no pedanticism about the placing of the houses on the lots."²¹

Hegemann also advocated cooperative for banks, rental

plans, stores, and insurance programs as the best means of accommodating the economic needs of the community and residents.²² Hegemann also recognized the need to plan for the social and cultural life the community. American company towns of the early 1900s were generally built with certain pragmatic objectives in mind: to attract and maintain a stable group of employees; to increase worker morale and productivity; to regulate the morals and deportment of community residents by prohibiting activities such as gambling, prostitution, and the sale of alcoholic beverages; and so on.²³ In Kohler Village, sports, music, theatrical productions, organizations of civic and artistic events, and promotion of community organizations, such as the Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls, was also encouraged.

Hegemann and Peets provided the a philosophical framework for Kohler's development as a garden city and also developed a physical plan for West I, the residential area situated immediately adjacent to the factory and plant headquarters. Several existing streets and residences were incorporated into the new design. During the summer of 1916 initial plans were prepared for the overall extension and layout of roadways, the development or redesign of lots for new dwelling units, and the creation of a residential block (Lincoln Circle) in the northern area of West I which focused upon a short cul-de-sac.²⁴ Hegemann and Peets in most cases focused on schematic plans for the lots and streets and left specific design details to the engineer, such as the layout of the cul-de-sac. Also during the summer of 1916, Hegemann and Peets directed much of their attention to various park and open space projects endorsed by Walter Kohler.²⁵

Walter Kohler closely supervised overall community development throughout the period of intense planning in 1916. However, disagreements between Kohler and Hegemann led to the dissolution of their business partnership by the end of 1916. Subsequently, Richard Phillip, AIA undertook the development of single- and two-family residences patterned after English cottages. Using various combinations of wood, brick, stucco, and stone for structural and decorative purposes, Phillip sought to further develop the English garden city scheme which he had seen first hand with Walter Kohler during their travels abroad. To lower construction costs, houses were generally built in several groupings at a time. Furthermore, variations in setback and siting arrangements were used to avoid monotony and maximize exposure to light and air advocated by Hegemann.²⁶

Dominating the town's skyline, the Kohler office building, with its central clock and bell tower, was located in the industrial zone. Two major buildings located in West I provided a focal point for the residential area of the community. The American Club, completed in 1917, was a large "hotel" built to accommodate single male workers, many of whom were recent immigrants from Europe. Gothic in appearance, the American club included recreational facilities, lounging areas, reading rooms, baths, a laundry, and a dining hall for 300 persons. Besides housing, it also served to nationalize the company's foreign born employees. The

other major structure within West I was a two-story commercial building which housed several small shops and offices, a few apartments, and a large recreation hall-auditorium.²⁷

Development of Kohler Village continued into the mid-1920s with the development of South I. Kohler called upon J. Donohue and R. Phillip who had been involved with the model community from its onset. The basic street grid was only slightly realigned to accommodate additional residential lots. In this relatively undeveloped area of the village, Phillip created a rather handsome and unified architectural grouping of brick houses and cottages.²⁸

In 1925, Kohler engaged the services of the Olmstead Brothers of Brookline, Massachusetts to undertake the next phase of planning. In their initial planning study for Kohler, the consultants stated that the community could accommodate a total population of 30,000 persons.²⁹ Land for two new residential areas (West II and West III) was acquired and a preliminary platting plan for West II was prepared by Henry V. Hubbard, the partner in Olmstead Brothers firm who oversaw most of the Kohler Village project. Hubbard proposed a curvilinear street pattern to provide an attractive variation in the building line and thereby avoid the design and compositional problems of small houses and wide roadways. Hubbard also proposed placing the houses at the property line "in the English fashion" to achieve a greater sense of enclosure and intimacy. This plan was modified, however, when Walter Kohler replied that use of such shallow setbacks was contrary to the planning philosophy established for the village. Compared with the rest of the village, the residential architecture of West II was somewhat more eclectic and included English, American colonial, and traditional bungalow designs built of brick, stucco, or wood.³⁰

All further development of Kohler Village, including West III, ended in the 1930s with the onset of the Great Depression and conflicts between the Kohler Company and its employees. In 1962, after more than thirty years of inactivity, residential construction once again began to take place in the community. The preliminary plan for West III, prepared by the Olmstead Brothers in the 1920s, was modified to provide for larger lot sizes and lower housing densities.³¹ More suburban in layout and architecture than the preceding developments, West III was completely oriented toward single-family housing units and sacrificed communal open space for large private lots and yards. Innovative planning gave way to imitation and Kohler began to lose its original planning focus.

Even more significant than the differences between the physical character of the newer and older areas of Kohler, were the discernable social and economic changes which affected the entire community. The various shops and stores which formerly provided residents with opportunities to purchase household necessities no longer exist. The picturesque commercial block which once acted as a major hub of the community has been transformed into the Kohler Design Center and company offices. A new shopping center development has since replaced the neighborhood shopping district.

In 1975 the Kohler Company commissioned the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation to prepare a new master plan for the village and its environs.³² The new master plan is predicated upon a population of 20,000 persons by the year 2025. To protect the qualities of the older village area and to chart the course for the future, the new plan designates three development zones: a village center embracing the existing community consisting of multi-story and mid-rise structures, river parkland for leisure activities, and an 800-acre farm community consisting of five- to ten-acre agricultural and garden units. According to the Kohler Village Planning Commission, if development does not proceed as projected the community will have to bear significant increases in utility, street, and service costs. An influx of new residents will encroach upon the greenbelt and will undoubtedly modify the existing village-like character of the community.³³

THE RESORT COMMUNITY AND THE AMERICAN SMALL TOWN

Although the differences which separate Kohler and Seaside in terms of region, time, and *raison d'être* are significant, the comparison between the two communities as models for sustainable planning is compelling. Designed by Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk Architects in close cooperation with the owner and developer, Robert Davis, Seaside is derived from the American small town. The generic post-World War II suburban subdivision is not a town or a community but rather a large tract of privately owned land overlaid with curving streets and a platting plan.³⁴ Typically, real estate development practices and traffic engineering patterns become the common denominator for planning standards. Housing patterns conform to types based on generalized standards of value set by developers and financial institutions. Provisions for variation of building types or styles and communal open space are seldom incorporated into suburban planning guidelines.

The American small town is a special form of urbanism, distinct from the big city, with its own forces to regulate size, growth, and the formation of the public domain.³⁵ It defies a rational formal analysis; understanding its structure requires careful examination of spatial experience as well as plan diagram. The unique relationship of building to landscape is evident in American planning as early as the eighteenth century. The residential street is one of the fundamental structures of small town urbanism and the first meeting ground of public and private space.³⁶ As Michael Dennis observes:

Here public and private are both accommodated in a respectful dialogue; and adherence to the conventions of street, sidewalk, front yard, porch, and public rooms is precisely what allows for the possibility of invention and private variation.

Unfortunately, the very characteristics that give the small American town its positive qualities are also

those which make it extremely vulnerable. What is not defined by the buildings must be completed by the trees, and the slight weakening of either element can result in a serious erosion of the system.³⁷

Applying their observations of towns in Florida and throughout the South to the plan of Seaside, Duany and Plater-Zyberk began altering the pieces of typical residential development and arrived at a scheme that had the characteristics of a small town. The graphic formulation which emerged from their empirical exercises based on observation and formal analysis emerged several years later as a plan and aesthetic code for Seaside. Duany and Plater Zyberk devised a method for radically reconfiguring the composition of the typical residential street and for replacing its ersatz formulas of making fabric and space with coherent guidelines for controlled incremental growth.³⁸

The basic matrix of the Seaside plan is based on the public space of street and square. A two-lane shoreline highway connecting all the ocean-front communities, serves as the main public thoroughfare, meeting ground, and planning armature for the community. A grid network, modified by a radial and concentric organization system, recalls various American hybrids of the City Beautiful and the Garden City. Thomas Fisher summarizes the characteristics of the new town planning concepts:

This new suburban model combines the physical advantages of small towns - intimate scale, through streets, varied housing types, a mixed-use center within walking distance, clearly defined public space - with social and environmental concerns of the past few decades, such as reducing the use of automobiles, increasing the use of public transportation, creating a more diverse mix of residents, and respecting the natural environment and the historic character of place.³⁹

Unlike the post-World War II subdivision which usually has a limited hierarchy of streets, Seaside's hierarchy of streets and thoroughfares descends in size from the main street. From the boulevard to the alley, each street has a special function and position within the town. The street hierarchy contributes to the dialogue between public and private space by extending public territory from major streets to minor streets.⁴⁰ Unlike conventional subdivision traffic plans which route all traffic along a major arterial street, Seaside's flexible hierarchical network allows a variety of routes that filter traffic through the town. Smaller scale streets, thereby, become more intimate areas in which to build a home and enjoy privacy: "[The new towns] have rectangular and radial street grids, avoiding the inefficient branching street systems of today's suburbs. All have houses arranged in tighter configurations and oriented toward the street, countering the waste of land and isolation of people in most current developments."⁴¹

The Seaside urban code sets up an interdependency

between road width, landscaping, lot size, and housing type.⁴² The regulation of spatial modeling of the street define the lot size and setback in relationship to street type and scale. Therefore, streets with back alleys or sideyards may have smaller roadways, smaller lots, and reduced setbacks. A larger boulevard may allow for a greater setback, larger lots, and larger buildings.

Seaside's architectural code is based on southern vernacular housing. Each building class accompanies a street type thereby linking building type and section to street type and section. The front porch, found on in most southern residential types, mediates between building and landscape. Through its extension of entry and visual penetration from the street, it also mediates between the public and the private realm. The architectural code also establishes window and massing proportions, roof pitches, material restrictions, and some mandatory construction details. Code restrictions, however, are lifted for the main public square and subsidiary public spaces within the neighborhoods.

Although development of an urban code is Seaside's most important planning contribution, the architectural code has received the most emphasis from the architectural press.⁴³ Seaside's aesthetic code suggests a style of building based on southern vernacular building types, such as the Charleston House or the dog trot. The picturesque characteristics of the houses, often dominated by their cupolas and white picket fences, belies the thoughtful planning strategies which unifies the town into a cohesive argument for urban planning codes. The plan requires incremental change and growth to be executed by a number of contributors over time. For instance, the number of public buildings and their function are subject to change. Architectural variation and interpretation within the code is anticipated and encouraged thereby making Seaside a more elusive target for superficial market appraisal.⁴⁴

SUSTAINABILITY AND TOWN PLANNING

Perhaps most critical to our understanding of Seaside is the concept of "town." During the planning of Kohler Village, Walter Kohler was careful to distinguish between the democratic planning concepts of the Garden City and paternalistic practices of the company town. Although Kohler maintained rigorous control over all stages of the planning process, like Hegemann, he recognized that the long-term viability of Kohler could be insured only if the original planning guidelines dictating the balance between public and private realms were maintained and that the social and cultural needs of the community were also met. Furthermore, Kohler began as an existing community. Today, Kohler Village is a town in the full sense of the word. It has its own industry, infrastructure, schools, churches, and civic and political organizations. Furthermore, Kohler has a history of sustained growth and change.

Seaside calls itself a town even though it is not large enough to be a municipality in the state of Florida and its

form of self-governance is more comparable to a homeowner's association rather than the true body-politic of a true town.⁴⁵ Closer in scale to the neighborhood unit of the 1920s and 1930s, any building within Seaside's 80-acre tract is within walking distance. Anticipating future growth and additional centers of development, Duany and Plater-Zyberk have developed schemes that reflect their belief that a larger town should be comprised of smaller neighborhood units dictated by convenient walking distances.⁴⁶

Vincent Scully has observed that there are two traditions of suburban design: one that is romantically inspired with winding streets, large lots, and abundant landscaping, and another that is Classically inspired, with street grids, small lots, and figural public space.⁴⁷ The nihilism that seems to pervade much of the current architectural avant garde has led many architects to dismiss any effort at social reform and progress as naive or futile. The new towns and their neo-urbanist planners - promoting improved living and working environments, a viable public realm, a creation of community through physical means - represent the continuation of idealistic Modern planning principles which saw architecture as a positive catalyst for social change.⁴⁸

Seaside is already being applied as a prototype for neighborhoods within larger towns as well as new subdivision planning. Seaside's limitation, therefore, is its very appropriateness as a suburban model, but its inability to produce a critique concerning larger patterns of urban growth in America with regional, ecological, and political ramifications.⁴⁹ Whether Seaside itself can evolve beyond a bucolic and picturesque resort community into a truly sustainable town capable of supporting and maintaining all the physical, economic, political, social, and cultural infrastructures of a town in the full sense of the term remains to be determined.

NOTES

¹ Mark Alden Branch, "The State of Sustainability," *Progressive Architecture*, March, 1993, pp. 72-79:

Just how a growing environmental consciousness will affect architecture is the subject of debate. Many rank-and-file architects seem to want the body of environmental knowledge to trickle down in the form of codes and recommendations, or through the use of special consultants. But the most visible leaders of the sustainability movement see sustainability as a set of tenets that must change profoundly the way architects think and work.

² *Ibid.*, p. 74.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁴ Kevin Lynch, *A Theory of Good City Form*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1981, pp. 73-98.

⁵ Jonathan Barnett, *The Elusive City: Five Centuries of Design, Ambition and Miscalculation*, Harper & Row, New York, 1986, p. 28.

⁶ Carol A. Christensen, *The American Garden City and the New Towns Movement*, UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978, p. 1.

⁷ Geoffrey Broadbent, *Emerging Concepts in Urban Space Design*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, London, 1990, pp. 123-124.

⁸ Christensen, *The American Garden City and the New Towns Movement*, p. 7.

- ⁹ Ibid., p. 7.
- ¹⁰ Barnett, *The Elusive City*, pp. 79-80:
For example, Howard's plan included detailed descriptions of how it might work within the limits of common business practices of the early twentieth century. Farmers would be encouraged to raise whatever crops were deemed feasible on large tracts of agricultural land surrounding the community. The factories sited in the new community would be ordinary factories, and the garden city corporation would have no control over them, beyond ensuring that they observed some health and building regulations. Howard's major miscalculation was that it took longer than he estimated to bring the community up to a size that generated sufficient income to pay off its debts.
- ¹¹ Christensen, *The American Garden City and the New Towns Movement*, p. 7.
- ¹² Ibid., pp. 78.
- ¹³ Lewis Mumford, "Old Forms for New Towns," *The Highway and the City*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1981, pp. 29-30.
- ¹⁴ Arnold R. Alanen and Thomas J. Peltin, "Kohler, Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism in a Model Industrial Village," *AIP Journal*, April 1978, p. 146.
- ¹⁵ W. H. Uphoff, *The Kohler Strike: Its Socio-Economic Causes and Effects*, Privately Published, 1935.
- ¹⁶ J. C. Young, "A Model Town that Grew on a Prairie," *New York Times Magazine*, October 1931, p. 11.
John S. Garner writes that the practice of paternalism in company towns was common and had its attendant advantages and disadvantages. Paternalism was a means for shaping an industrial society that drew heavily on environmental planning and architecture. Although many workers viewed paternalism as social engineering, many nineteenth-century businessmen saw it as a moral responsibility, protecting and safeguarding society while furthering business. Thus, it prompted employers to exercise responsibility not only in the internal affairs of their companies but in external matters as well.
(John S. Garner, *The Model Company Town: Urban Design through Private Enterprise in Nineteenth-Century New England*, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1984, p. 53.)
- ¹⁷ Alanen and Peltin, "Kohler Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism," p. 147.
- ¹⁸ Walter J. Kohler, January 15 letter (not sent) to W. Hegemann, 1917.
- ¹⁹ W. H. Uphoff, *Kohler on Strike: Thirty Years of Conflict*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1966.
- ²⁰ Werner Hegemann, November memorandum to W. J. Kohler, 1916.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Alanen and Peltin, "Kohler Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism," p. 148.
- ²³ L. Magnusson, *Housing by Employers in the United States*, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 263, Washington. D.C., 1920.
- ²⁴ Alanen and Peltin, "Kohler Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism," p. 149.
Barnett writes that the cul-de-sac creates a hierarchy of streets, by distinguishing between streets needed purely for access to individual dwellings and streets that carry traffic. It also encourages the grouping of buildings into courtyards or common spaces so that each house has both a street and a garden view. (Barnett, *The Elusive City*, pp. 7475.)
- ²⁵ Walter J. Kohler, January 15 letter (not sent) to W. Hegemann, 1917.
- ²⁶ *Kohler of Kohler News*, April 1917, pp. 12-14.
- ²⁷ Alanen and Peltin, "Kohler Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism," p. 150.
According to Garner, community facilities in the form of public buildings were prominent additions to company towns. Together with factories and houses, they established the overall character or urban design of a place. Aside from landscaped parks and grounds, the buildings represented the town's ultimate visual achievement and local distinction.
(John S. Garner, *The Model Company Town*, pp. 77-78.)
- ²⁸ Ibid., p. 150.
- ²⁹ Olmstead Brothers, *Preliminary Report on the Development of Kohler, Wisconsin with Special Reference to the Direction of Future Growth*, Brookline, Massachusetts, 1925.
- ³⁰ Alanen and Peltin, "Kohler Wisconsin: Planning and Paternalism," pp. 150-151.
- ³¹ Ibid., pp. 154-155.
The overall density in the three older sections of Kohler was 3.45 units per acre whereas the comparable density for West III was only 1.59 units per acre.
- ³² Ibid., p. 155.
- ³³ Ibid., p. 155.
- ³⁴ Keller Easterling, "Public Enterprise," *Seaside: Making a Town in America*, David Mohoney and Keller Easterling, editors, Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 1991, p. 48.
- ³⁵ Ibid., p. 52.
- ³⁶ Ibid., p. 52.
- ³⁷ Michael Dennis, *Court & Garden: From the French Hôtel to the City of Modern Architecture*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1986, p. 240.
- ³⁸ Easterling, "Public Enterprise," p. 53.
- ³⁹ Thomas Fisher, "Do the Suburbs Have a Future?," *Progressive Architecture*, December, 1993, p. 36.
- ⁴⁰ Easterling, "Public Enterprise," p. 55.
- ⁴¹ Fisher, "Do the Suburbs Have a Future?," p. 36.
- ⁴² Easterling, "Public Enterprise," p. 55.
- ⁴³ Ibid., p. 56.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 56-58.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 58.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 58.
- ⁴⁷ Fisher, "Do the Suburbs Have a Future?," p. 38.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 38-41.
- ⁴⁹ Easterling, "Public Enterprise," p. 58.