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From the sixteenth century on the Dutch landscape has been transformed by the building of country residences called estates and their expansions with gardens and parks. These rural properties were surrounded by impressive avenue systems that (re-)ordered the waste landscape and made remote regions more accessible. Several Dutch avenue systems have remarkable layouts that are comparable with famous palaces like Hampton Court (Great Britain) or Versailles (France). The Dutch castles were owned by members of the Court or their political advisers, who used them as hunting estates. As the geometrical avenue systems expressed political power, they were extended over centuries, regardless of changes in garden fashion. The impressive avenue designs according to classic Italian design principles were initiated by the estate owners themselves. Especially members of the Dutch Court propagated their ideas to connect the avenue systems of the castles with new built churches and village expansions. This laying out of avenues was a new kind of urbanisation and a starting point for the classic Dutch landscape tradition that inspired many estate owners. Some of these early examples of ‘place-making’ are still recognisable as main structures in Dutch cities and landscape and express a well-structured place.
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INTRODUCTION

From the sixteenth century on the Dutch landscape has been transformed by the expansion of country residences with avenue systems around castles, palaces or large mansions. The houses represented the status of their owners in which three categories are distinguished; wealthy merchants, the nobility and members of the Dutch Court. According to a building manual from 1681, their estates expressed their social status. Merchants used their properties as a quiet country retreat, the nobility did not glorify their status, but Court members however did express their position to emphasise their prestige in the architecture of their estates. At the time, estates consisted of an ensemble of a house, a garden and surrounding lands. Except for a country residence, estates were intended as an investment in agricultural lands and for hunting purposes. These rural properties were surrounded by impressive geometrical avenue systems that (re)ordered the landscape and made remote regions more accessible.

Several avenue systems, such as the ones at palace Het Loo (Apeldoorn), castle Renswoude or castle Rosendael have remarkable layouts that are comparable with famous foreign palaces like Hampton Court (Great Britain) or Versailles (France). Enjoying the ‘most delightful, (...) advantageous, (...) healthiest and (...) blessed [country] life’ confirmed the free status of the nobility being not bound to the town by their profession. When the economic situation improved in the early seventeenth century Dutch merchants became the third important group of estate owners. The merchants commissioned architects to build modern new country houses, unlike the nobility who in general re-used or improved old medieval castles and palaces to expressing their noble backgrounds.

There was a desire and need to organize the uncultivated landscape into good order by the laws of art and architecture. The design of nature was seen as an act of science. As Jan van der Groen, head Gardner of the Stadholder Willem III described; the outdoor areas were imperfect. Many land surveyors played an important part in the layout of Dutch gardens combining horticulture, surveying and mathematics as design principles. Geometry and uniformity were used to lay out avenue systems that expressed political power. However estate owners, in particular Dutch Court members, developed plans themselves to protect and enlarge their open spaces. For centuries, they were planted and extended at their hunting estates, regardless of changes in garden fashion. The avenue system at palace Het Loo for example shows several stages of extensions, even into the early twentieth century. The impressive avenue designs were undertaken by the Court members themselves; the stadholders, kings and queens, who were inspired by classic Italian design principles and propagated a pragmatic manner of applying these principles. Their ideas were put into drawings by land surveyors, while the head gardeners executed the details in the terrain.

The grand architectural organization of the ground plan derived partly from a land distribution system stemming from the late medieval times. With the avenue systems they connected their castles to new build churches and village expansions. The typical first step in the planning of these ensembles was the planting of trees, that had to be kept well to maintain the structure. The laying out of these avenues can be considered as examples of early Dutch place-making; a new kind of urbanisation as a starting point for the classic Dutch landscape design tradition that inspired many (foreign) estate owners. Most of these early examples of ‘place-making’ are still recognisable as main structures in Dutch cities and landscapes.

According to several authors place-making contains cultural activities that renders unique communities through creative designs that possess the potential to influence an urban environment profoundly. Place-making was often part of a private economic development that reflects the specificity of the place, culture, history or community. This capital investment is recognised as a simple desire for profit and speculative gain. History, memory and connections to the landscape are part of a social grid that is invariably woven in good part by flows of capital. Yet the intertwining of the two is omnipresent.
This paper describes a new understanding for avenue systems, why they were made and what they expressed. It explores place-making with avenue-systems as an Dutch architectural urban planning strategy that was actively deployed from the sixteenth century on. Several authors distinguish the fact that the planting of avenues was intended for display and decoration of estate properties, and was a costly investment that could be, according to the owners attitude, for all kinds of economic and domestic purposes. As was expressed in a travel journal in 1695: ‘The Dutch are great Improvers of Land, and Planters of Trees, of Ornament as well as Profit’. Just a few authors described the design principles of avenues systems. The publications Architecture and Landscape and The Villa and the Landscape analysed German, Italian, French and English estates and the role avenues played in their layout as place-making attributes. Although Courtly Gardens in Holland 1600-1650 is a thoroughly analyse of Dutch garden design it appointed insufficient the importance of avenue-systems at Dutch estates in their surrounding landscape or recognised it as a urban planning strategy. The Dutch Garden in the Seventeenth Century doesn’t describe any relation between avenues with urban planning or place-making. There is a clear knowledge gap on this matter. Edmond Bacons Design of Cities (1967) however is an important exception and compares the ancient Greek urban spatial system with the straight sightlines realised as avenues in the city of Rome that inspired the urban planning of so many European and American cities. He even compares three small Dutch cities (Culemborg, Zaltbommel and Wijk-by-Duurstede) and their symbolic nodes with Roman principles. Interesting is his comparison of space used at some estates by projecting them on city plans. Nevertheless his discourse doesn’t describe how space was made by the lay-out of avenues around Dutch estates and the role they take in an international context is missing.

The urban planning strategy of Dutch estate owners during the stadholders period (1550-1800) will be stated in this paper by showing several examples of place-making with avenues. At first the application of classic design principles to express political power with urban expansions will be described. Secondly three examples of urban planning along goose foot avenues (palace Het Loo, castle Renswoude and castle Rosendaal) will be explained. This approach shows the specific marking of Dutch place-making with avenue systems on bases of ownerships of the estates by comparing two categories; Court members and nobility. Explaining the knowledge gap can enhance the meaning of Dutch urban planning with avenues systems in an European design context.

**DUTCH FOUNDING FATHERS**

The typical Dutch tradition of place-making started in the fourteenth century, when cities were realised by individual landowners using their possibilities of borderland. For economic reasons these new cities were situated next to castles and along trading routes. Under the rule of bishops or dukes new cities arose along rivers to become economic and political power centres. From the seventeenth century wealthy merchants, citizens and the nobility fled crowded, noisy and unhealthy cities, and built country estates for a summer retreat. The explosive increase in estate possession reached its peak in the second half of the seventeenth century and persisted until the nineteenth century. During this period of growth we also notice an expansion of straight lined avenue systems around estates.

The design of avenue systems in the Low Countries was based upon a long tradition that had been started by Dutch stadholders in the sixteenth century when hunting rights only were preserved for the Court members. In their designs, the stadholders applied classical Italian architectural rules and military science to the arrangement of their hunting grounds. Long straight roads, suitable for their beloved ‘parforce’ hunt, were surrounded by double rows of trees on each side. The specific way of planting in ‘quinconce’, applied into the geographical situation by the laws of perspective, gave the user a great perspective on the landscape. According to Florence Hopper this planning practice was conceived by four important men: Prince Frederik Hendrik of Oranje Nassau (1584-1647), captain general and admiral of the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands and stadholder of five of the seven provinces; stadholder prince Maurits of Oranje Nassau (1567-1625), the older half-brother of
Frederik Hendrik; Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629), one of the most influential engravers at the time, and the mathematician and engineer Simon Stevin (1548-1620). In 1594 Stevin adapted the layout of Italian ideal towns for Dutch town planning and recorded his rules in Vande oirdeningh der Steden. The rectangular plan he created was used as an important reference for the development of Dutch fortified towns. According to Florence Hopper these basic principles were applied for the first time to gardens and parks by stadholder Frederik Hendrik at palace Honselaarsdijk in 1621 and described by the garden designer André Mollet in 1651 in his book Le Jardin de Plaisir after he had visited it in 1633, eight years after its construction. The laws of perspective was introduced and applied by engravers and engineers in the designs of parks by the Dutch Court members and only later by garden designers.

THEORIES AND IDEAL GEOMETRIC FIGURES

Dutch gardens consisted of a large number of internally ordered architectural forms based on simple geometric shapes. All parts of the garden were related to each other and to their natural setting. The man-made forms expressed the harmony between man and nature. The Roman architect Vitruvius (ca. 85-20 B.C.) and the Italian architect leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) based their theory of ideal architecture proportions on the principles that they deduced from the proportions and symmetry of the human body. This so called Vitruvian man can be shaped into four ideal geometric figures; circle, triangle, rectangle and cross.

Except for ideal proportions and forms, in his architectural treatise De re aedificatoria (1452) Alberti described the perfect location for a villa. Its position should enable a view of hills, plains and a town and should express the social and economic status of its owner. In 1570 the Italian architect Andrea Palladio (1508-1580) summarized his thirty years practice in guidelines for classical architecture, in the treatise I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura. He also gave criteria for an ideal villa location. Villas should be situated in the middle of their fields, close to a navigable river for access to running water, next to regional roads, on a prominent spot to be visible from all sides and if possible on the top of a hill or elevated terrain. The villa site should be demarcated and separated from the surrounding fields and farmlands by low walls or avenue trees, to make the size of the grounds clearly visible from the outside. Palladio emphasized the need for good infrastructure. He thought that roads should be built for military use like the Romans did: following the mathematical laws of universal order. If possible they should be realised as perfectly straight, continuous lines, so one could look far ahead and enjoy beautiful perspectives of the landscape. After having stated these rules he recommended that these roads would be more attractive and comfortable when planted with trees on both sides, to cheer the traveller with their leaves, and provide shadow. Intersecting access roads and visual axes not only connected villa’s with the surrounding landscape but also connected them with new built churches and urban planning expansions in the villages to symbolize the landowners political power.

As the Dutch stadholders studied these classic Italian principles they used them not only in the lay-out of their fortified cities, but also in the lay-out of park designs. The straight line, as a path, avenue or road, whether or not edged with trees, is a constant element in the ideal landscape that was created around the Dutch country manor. From then on the characteristic avenue systems were frequently copied at country seats of the stadholders and their circle of friends. Except for aesthetic reasons, avenues were planted for protection against the harsh and windy Dutch climate. They marked the owners property as a seventeenth century ‘skyline’ in the uncultivated and open landscape and generated a regular income through wood sales. Practical benefits, economic profit and architectural beauty in ideal geometric figures were simply combined in the lower countries in a typical ‘Dutch Way’ with the planting of avenue-systems.
EXPRESSION OF POWER: URBAN PLANNING ALONG SIGHTLINES

Debie & Verkuijl's study of avenues (executed in 2012) shows that the avenue systems were part of a geometric system that were formed by the ideal geometric figures; circle, triangle, rectangle and cross. The figures formed ideal sightlines or visual axis to give perspective on features they connected. In the Dutch avenue designs urban planning became an important design element which will be explained hereafter.

The Dutch Stadholder-King Willem III (1650-1702) built sightlines in front of Hampton Court palace in London (1661) and at palace Het Loo in Apeldoorn (1685) starting from an exedra, a half round square. These 800 metres long sightlines might have been inspired by his ancestor, stadholder Frederik Hendrik, who extended his palace Honselaersdijk in Rijswijk with a sightline and exedra between 1620-1625. The avenues were planted with two rows of oak trees on each side. Willem III accentuated the sightline at Hampton Court with a Grand Canal, that might have been inspired by the Palladian villa Barbaro (1557) in Maser. This 750 metres Palladian sightline was extended with a Grand Canal to an impressive length of 1,650 metres.

Initially sightlines to position new palaces in the landscape, formed a cross with the access road that ran perpendicular on it. The palaces of court members were situated conveniently in the landscape, using occupation patterns or existing landscape elements like hills to situate them and being connected with the straight avenues. One would approach the castle from aside, not from the front, which is often proclaimed to prevent access roads blocking the sightline. The sightline in front of palace Het Loo for example is only used as the main entrance road since 1807, on behalf of King Lodewijk Napoleon. Its paving was one of the improvements he made for the main roads around the palace to be accessible for the French army.

FIGURE 1 Comparison of schemes of sightlines (red = avenues, blue = Grand Canals) with the exedra's or half round squares (black = exedra with palace). The length and execution is striking; the 800 metres long avenue of Palace Honselaersdijk is as long as the avenue sightline of villa Barbaro. The complete 1,650 metres long sightline, consisting of an avenue and a canal, of villa Barbaro is almost of the same length as the canal at Palace Hampton Court or the avenue at Palace Het Loo. [drawing Debie & Verkuijl]
Connecting palaces with natural elements like hills was a design concept implemented in 1585 in the city of Rome by Pope Sixtus V (1558-1590). He had the seven hills of the city connected with various landmarks like churches and obelisks by straight roads.\(^1\) (see fig. 2) The Dutch stadholders imitated this ordering principle in sightlines of straight avenues that ran from their palaces towards hills in the landscape and situating obelisks on them. To express the status of the monarchs these sightlines were often part of a goose foot. Therefore it is interesting to compare several goose feet. Although Versailles (1664) is well known of its greatness and grandeur and Hampton Court (1708) is extended splendidly in a triangle and a Grand Canal, Het Loo (1685-1691) shows an exceptional position by placing its goose foot 800 metres on distance of the palace. Although Het Loo is usually described as a rather small hunting estate we can recognise a kind of competition between the French and Dutch monarchs in this lay-out comparison. (see fig. 3)

The application of a goose foot was for the first time made by Palladio at villa Pisani Bonetti in Bagnolo (1569).\(^2\) It formed an ensemble with a church, several houses and the villa on the other side of the river Gua and had a sightline that reached out to the hills in the distance. This kind of urban planning with a goose foot consisting of straight roads can also be demonstrated with three Dutch avenue examples that not only connected palaces with churches but also with new housing as will be explained in the following text.
The first example of a goose foot described here was built in 1686 at palace Het Loo by stadholder Prince Willem III. It connected the palace with the existing medieval church Oude Kerk of the village Apeldoorn. Het Loo’s second goose foot was built in 1808 in front of the palace by the French King Lodewijk Napoleon. It connected the palace with a new urban expansions called de Nieuwe Haven with an exedra that was twice as large as the exedra in front of the palace. The Nieuwe Haven consisted of a bloc of 24 small terraced houses, a large guesthouse and a market square with two detached new churches which were planned as counterpart of the former Provenierswoningen Oude Haven.  Between 1907 and 1912 a third reversed goosefoot was realised by Queen Wilhelmina to complete a diamond shape avenue system and connected it with her new build church, the Grote Kerk. The extensions of this complex avenue system made since then settling in the neighbourhood of the palace Apeldoorn popular for wealthy retirees, former Dutch East Indies and industrialists. In spite of the involvement of several landscape architects who made drawings for these extensions, the stadholders, kings and queen preferred their own design for the avenue system at Het Loo. This complex avenue system, that consisted of ideal geometric figures (triangle, rectangle and cross) became an important structure for the urban development of Apeldoorn in the twentieth century, and expressed the power of the involved monarchs. (see fig. 4)
FIGURE 4  Schemes of urban planning along sightlines being part of the extensions of several goose feet over three periods, initiated by the monarchs of palace Het Loo. (red = new avenues and new buildings; grey = existing elements; black = important existing elements like palaces, castles or churches). The sightlines connected the palace with different new build churches and even an obelisk, in the same manner as Pope Sixtus V did in 1585 when he applied this urban design principle to the city Rome. [drawings Debie & Verkuijl]

FIGURE 5  Schemes of urban planning along sightlines being part of the extensions of a complex avenue system in four periods, initiated by Johan van Reede, the political advisor of stadholder Frederik Hendrik and owner of castle Renswoude. (red = new avenues and new buildings; grey = existing elements; black = existing main avenue structure). The sightlines connected the castle with a new build church, a rectory, fifteen new worker houses and two farms. In later centuries the number of houses rose and turned Renswoude into a small town. [drawings Debie & Verkuijl]
The second Dutch example of a goose foot was built between 1639-1641 at the medieval castle Renswoude by Johan van Reede, the political advisor of stadholder Frederik Hendrik. This goose foot was part of an impressive avenue system that was designed as an urban plan. It consisted of an ensemble of a prestigious new dome church, a rebuilt castle, fifteen worker houses for his employees, a rectory and two farms. The goose foot of castle Renswoude was of strategic importance because it marked the border of the region Het Sticht (nowadays known as the Province Utrecht) with the region Gelre (nowadays known as the Province Gelderland). The avenues reached out to the border, that was marked with a dike. The middle ‘toe’ of the foot was a sightline at the front of the castle accentuated with one of the largest Grand Canals of the Netherlands at that time. The whole avenue system of Renswoude expressed the political power and status of its owners, as they were the political advisors of the stadholders Frederik Hendrik and stadholder-king Willem III. The number of houses along the main avenue was enlarged in 1704 up to 17, and in 1818 up to 33, thus turning Renswoude into a small town.

The third example is the lay-out of avenues which formed the basis for urban planning around the modernised medieval castle Rosendaal (1615) nearby the capital city Arnhem (province of Gelderland). From 1667 the avenue system was extended and decorated by Johan (Jan) Van Arnhem (1632-1721), who was a member of the prestige nobility family, mayor of Arnhem and personal advisor of king Stadholder Willem III. In 1711 the nobleman Lubbert Adolph Torck (1687-1758), who owned Rosendael and was the mayor of Wageningen became bailiff of the Veluwe and political advisor of the Stadholder Willem V at the remarkable age of eleven. From 1721 he modernised the castle and its surroundings radically, but kept and extended the avenues realised by his predecessor. The seventeenth century goose foot was a symbolic axis lines towards Arnhem and Wageningen. The main avenue Rosendaalse Allee clearly being part of place-making connected the castle to Arnhem running five kilometres down from the bushy slopes toward the city centre and its Eusebius church. Remarkable is that it centre points starts from the park and not from the medieval castle. A few month before Torck died the construction of the extended goose foot and the new church ‘Herenkerk’ was finished. He realised several country homes for the family and business relationships and built houses in farmhouse style for their staff. Also a school, post office, tailor shop, blacksmith and laundries were built; everything that was required for an autonomous municipality. After the death of Torck his wealthy widow Petronella van Hoorn created a community known as the village of Rosendaal that in 1818 became an independent town. The presence of these facilities and a large financial legacy enabled the village of Rosendaal to keep its estate appearance untouched.

These three examples of Dutch urban planning along avenue systems specifically related to goose feet, show strong similarities with Palladio’s goose foot at Bagnolo and the planning ideas of Pope Sixtus V in Rome, both designed to strengthen a region and the city. Since the 17th century avenues became an important design tool for the lay-out of landscapes. Not only did avenues express political power of their initiators, nor were there avenues being planted just for profit and speculative gain. Being extended over several periods as an urban planning strategy avenue systems they can be considered as an important place-making statement that influenced our urban environment profoundly.
REGIONAL IDENTITY

Place-making with avenue systems was an important way to structure the landscape. It possessed the potential to influence an urban environment. One might question if these historic avenue systems around estates have such strong patterns that they can be meaningful in our collective memory. Therefore the first step is to unravel its clarity so we can develop strong landscape symbols and accentuate its regional identity.

At the moment Debie & Verkuijl performs a research on avenues of estates in the stadholder period (1550-1800) in different regions in the Netherlands on a larger scale. The research examines its regional identity or an existing regional avenue typology and their similarities or differences for three different provinces; Gelderland, Utrecht and Noord-Holland. In this research already some interesting facts have been acknowledged as we have shown in the previous paragraphs. The Italian design concept of Rome is recognisable in Dutch examples as we have described. They create an unique routing system that provided a similar rhythmic experience. Comparing Dutch avenues in different regions and with other countries can give greater meaning to the Dutch avenue systems and places its design principles in an international context. Something which was missing in previous publications.
CONCLUSION

The Dutch avenue systems described in this paper show a large number of internally ordered geometric forms that are related to another and to the natural terrain that can be compared with the urban spatial system that the American urban planner Edmond Bacon described in his book Design of Cities (1967). Bacon explained that the straight lines that were realised in the city of Rome were of such great meaning because they connected important spaces that were meant to last forever. To compare the geometric Dutch avenue systems with Bacons analyses and other avenue sightline examples places Dutch garden art in a remarkable international position.

The case studies show that since the beginning of the seventeenth century in the Netherlands around estates a unique landscape was formed with straight-lined avenues and canals. Court members and the nobility participated in urban planning by applying avenue systems, in particular goose feet, and building churches and housing. They expressed political sense and prestige with charity for their employees. These structures formed a social grid that was invariably woven in urban planning during the stadholder period and were a starting point for the growth of the cities as we recognise them nowadays. This new kind of urbanisation can be seen as a starting point for the classic Dutch landscape design tradition that inspired many (foreign) estate owners. This Dutch place-making, was often part of a private economic development designed to strengthen a region and the city.

The importance and recognition of avenues as identity systems should be emphasized. Avenues reflect the specificity of the place, culture, history or community. Today, regions can significantly enhance their identity by using these avenue structures to create a high-quality heritage and cultural climate. The avenue systems around estates express a well-structured place. Their designs have influenced the urban environment profoundly and their patterns are strong enough to give meaning to our memory. Therefore the first step is to unravel its clarity of regional structure so we can develop strong symbols and accentuate its identity in our urban landscape.
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The stadholders studied classic literature, urban planning, architecture and garden art. Their private library consisted of many classic works. Hopper 1983: 106.

The goose foot is in fact a simplified triangle, a diamond shape are two reversed triangles. Patricia Debie, Koos Bosma (ed.) and Jan Holwerda (ed.), Lanen met vorstelijke allure. Historisch onderzoek lanenstelsel Paleis Het Loo, Renswoude 2012. 79-80, 83. Patricia Debie, Historisch onderzoek & toekomstvisie landgoed Zuylenstein, Renswoude 2013.

The designs were measured and compared with the current situation in Google maps. See the painting of Palace Hampton Court by H. Danckerts (1665-1667) and the painting by Leonard Knuff (1702-1714) (Royal Collection Trust). Or the descriptions of William Harris during his visit at palace Het Loo (William Harris, A Description of the King’s Royal Palace and Gardens at Loo. (…), Londen 1699. 7) The map of Honselaersdijk (1620-1625) by Floris Jacobz. van der Sallem (Algemeen Rijksarchief’s-Gravenhage, Nassau Domeinraad, eerste afdeling, vervolg nr. 1475, fol.22).

Fieldtrip in 2014 to Palladio villa maser (1557-1558) on basis of Schmienk and Niemeijer 2011. 95 and measured with Google maps.

The ‘Proveniershuizen’ was a residential complex where residents bought themselves for a one-time fee and then could enjoy a lifelong ‘free’ room and living. C.A. Evers, Het Loo in de Franse tijd 1795-1813, z.pl. 1916. 353 from kind remarks of mister H.A.M. Ummels.

The church was built in 1842 by King Willem I and was after a fire in 1890 was rebuilt by Queen Wilhelmina in 1891. Debie 2015. 45-46.

In 1806 the French landscape architect Alexandre Dufour designed four sketches and the Dutch landscape architect Leonard Springer designed one sketch which are not realised. Debie 2012. 27, 59-62, 65.


Johan van Reede (1593-1682) was from 1634 member and from 1652 president of the state Utrecht and was the political advisor of stadholder Frederik Hendrik van Oranje Nassau. Frederik Adriaan van Reede (1659-1738), grandson of Johan van Reede, was from political advisor of stadholder King Willem III and delegate of the Court. Since 1705 he was on military duty and in 1713 he contributed in the peace negotiations of Utrecht. Egbert Wolswinkel, Renswoude. Geschiedenis en architectuur, Zeist 1998. 96 and Debie 2016. 74-79, 80-81.

Johan (Jan) van Arnhem made important improvements at the estate Rosendael, and realised an impressive avenue system with extensions of gardens. As an advisor he also was involved with other garden design. Johan Carel Bierens de Haan, ‘Rosendael, groen hemeltjen op aerd’: kasteel, tuinen en bewoners sinds 1579. Zutphen 1994. 23, 28, 39.

The birds view of Rosendael by Jan Smit drawn after Barnd Eloshof (1718) shows the existing large avenue system around castle Rosendael. Coll. VGK (Vereniging Gelderse Kastelen) Rosendael in; Johan Carel Bierens de Haan 1994. 83-85, 94, 135, 199.

In his will Thorck captured the maintenance of the estate, were no trees were to be cut down, except for improvements of the gardens or use as lumber. Johan Carel Bierens de Haan 1994. 83-85, 89-90, 93-94, 135, 199.