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Abstract

This study examines the significant architectural commissions of James Thomas Douce in Cambridge and the surrounding districts between 1914 and 1928. The major component of the thesis will encompass a historical and an architectural discussion of 15 of his major works that were constructed in concrete. Added to this discourse there will be a conversation around their relationship with the town of Cambridge, the urban environment, contemporaries who constructed the vernacular in concrete, the importance of these buildings in their setting.

The focal point of the study will highlight Douce’s prowess and contribution as an architect. During the early part of the twentieth century he was at the height of his career when he received commissions from prominent Cambridge identities. An onsite investigation will underscore the exceptional qualities and design of each structure.

Attention to the architectural merits, historical context and heritage values of each bungalow will be analysed. The examination of primary and secondary sources will focus on; historical records, the construction and the design elements, how his bungalows contributed to the architectural landscape and what impact Douce’s bungalows had on the Cambridge streetscape during the early 1900s.

Douce was Cambridge’s most successful architect from 1910 to his retirement in 1945. An honours paper undertaken at Auckland University (2003) established that many vernacular and commercial buildings in the Cambridge District can be attributed to him. This thesis encompasses a time frame that reflects his principal commissions and their relationship in the urban setting of Cambridge.
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**Introduction**

James Thomas Douce was one of the most important architects to practice his profession in Cambridge from 1910 to 1945. The focus of this thesis is to analyse a number of iconic concrete houses he designed in Cambridge between 1914 and 1928. It was a period in his career where he received his most notable commissions from a number of well-known Cambridge identities.

A starting point for the thesis was established in 2003 as part of an honours paper undertaken at Auckland University to research Douce’s architectural career and track his architectural commissions.¹ This study revealed that throughout his professional architectural career his proficiency as an architect was attested by the number of commissions he received. His legacy is the culmination of over 80 commissions in the bungalow style that includes a number of prominent commercial buildings. Added to this are a number of commissions he undertook that included extensive additions and alterations, villas and the conversion of villas to bungalows. In terms of built heritage and historical significance Douce has given the streetscape of Cambridge a series of noteworthy concrete bungalows designed in the ‘Craftsman Style’ and two major commercial structures in the Cambridge central business district. The first of these prominent bungalows will be 100 years old in 2014.²

The key objective of this thesis is to establish the historical context and the architectural merit of each of the selected houses. The other important issue is their relationship within the urban and the rural streetscape. The study of each house will provide the basis of the thesis; all will be formatted to be consistent throughout and provide a thematic approach to the research. Individual studies will contain pertinent information about the architect and the builder and historical data on the land and who commissioned the construction of each dwelling. The historical investigation will provide some background on the Militia subdivision of Cambridge East by the British Military. The certificates of title will show historic links between the times of militia settlement to the time of construction of the dwellings. It will

² Ibid.
examine the tendering process and council records and include the architectural and the construction merit. Further to this the historical examination will scrutinize construction materials, design of the exterior and the interior and similarities between each of the bungalows.

In the course of this investigation no extant personal documents of Douce’s architectural practice were located. It has to be assumed that he disposed of his papers and architectural plans when he moved from Cambridge to live in Auckland in 1945. This has made the process of discovery time consuming. Primary sources such as the Waikato Independent and incomplete council records were the only documents available to establish Douce as the architect.³

This thesis relied on the examination of a diverse set of primary historical records. The Cambridge Museum archives were a starting point and provided the basis of much of the early research. The museum has extensive historical records on Cambridge that were established over a number of years which has specified insight into the development of the town. This includes many building tender records drawn from the Waikato Independent newspapers, Cambridge Borough Council (CBC) building permit records, biographies and family histories. The CBC committee minutes also gave insight into community issues (1920s) and into the towns infrastructure and works programs. All of these resources helped to facilitate and confirm who commissioned Douce to design their houses.⁴

The assessment of other primary sources revealed further historical data. These documents were scrutinized to ascertain: the history of the land and ownership, Cambridge as a town in the 1920s, the developing streetscape, the architectural merit and fabric of the buildings, and the construction materials used. Certificates of title revealed the history of the land and aided the determination of the date of construction. Online survey map resources offered an opportunity to discover additional information when a survey was undertaken by an owner; this information was referenced on the certificate of titles. Each house was subject to an on-site examination to assess the exterior and the interior design values and its architectural merit in a wider context of the streetscape and New Zealand architectural landscape.

It was discovered that only a fraction of the Cambridge Borough Council building permit records were archived. It appears importance placed on the storage of essential council

³ Ibid.
⁴ Cambridge Museum Archives.
documents was not readily undertaken in the 1920s and not all permits were recorded in the CBC minutes which created further anomalies.

A further source for establishing, which houses were designed by Douce was the public notices of the local newspaper The Waikato Independent. This mainly covered the tendering process, but on occasions the ‘Local and General’ news published who commissioned the recent new buildings in the town. It was through all these sources that a picture emerged of Douce’s architectural practice and the buildings he designed. The main sources for establishing the design elements were through a thorough onsite examination and assessment of each property and an interview with the current home owners. All avenues of research developed a depiction of Douce’s professional career.

During the 1920s Douce’s architecture began to make a mark on the urban and rural landscape of Cambridge. During this period the American bungalow was the favoured domestic housing style in New Zealand. These bungalows were designed between the two world wars so they can be coined as ‘Inter-War’ buildings. These are all iconic domestic structures that display robustness that gives the impression they will stand the test of time.

There are many questions that remain unanswered such as what was the driving force that made Douce leave England. Douce, who was a carpenter and a joiner by trade, left England to establish a new career in architecture in the colonies. From 1907 to May 1910 he settled in Australia, and there are inferences he may have gained architectural training on his arrival in New Zealand, but this cannot be confirmed, however he quickly established himself as an architect and he practiced until his retirement in 1945.

In the first two decades of the twentieth century Douce’s Craftsman bungalows had a major impact on the Cambridge streetscape. Before 1914 the major architectural styles that dotted the town of Cambridge were the colonial cottage, the villa and some smaller bungalows. A major change appeared when Douce and other Waikato architects began to design houses in concrete. Douce earlier in his career worked alongside John Currie, an Auckland architect,

on the construction of a Cambridge Hotel built in Concrete. In particular Douce built a number of houses in Cambridge East and several in a rural setting in quick succession and many at a cost in excess of £1000 which was a substantial sum in those days. Visually the Cambridge streetscape welcomed this new bold bungalow architecture to its repertoire. It demonstrated a new style of construction in a material that previously was not considered appropriate for domestic buildings. Somewhat American in design the style was referred to as ‘Craftsman bungalows’. However, elements of English bungalows were included and remnants that were inherent in villa architecture were incorporated. Some of these ‘cross over’ elements persisted in Douce’s architecture throughout his career.

On his arrival in Cambridge Douce initially worked as a tradesman for the funeral director George Dickinson where he soon established a small architectural practice in the premises. In 1912 he married Dickinson’s daughter and on his death, Douce continued his architectural practice in conjunction with the funeral business and a taxi business. He became a Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge in the town and he and his wife Alma were part of the Anglican Church community. At that time the Waikato Independent was the source of all local news reporting including social functions, weddings, visitors to the town, public meetings and other general items about Cambridge and the wider Waikato District. Despite this there is a general absence of articles about Douce or his architectural work; except when occasionally on completion of a project his architectural standing was commented on. These were the few times that Douce was mentioned despite being an outstanding architect and designer and a prominent local citizen. It would appear that Douce avoided publicity.

There are many parallels between American and Douce-designed bungalows. It is not clear if Douce intended to adhere to the true principals of American bungalow architects and their desire for the house to blend into the landscape. American bungalows were set low to the ground, were restrained in styling with subdued colouring, had built-in and purpose built furniture, which was complimented with textiles to complete the overall effect. Douce did design bungalows with low pitched rooflines that extend beyond the walls creating deep eaves with the foundations laid close to the ground, giving the appearance of the house nestling into the environment. However, he varied his designs and widely integrated other

---

10 Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register and Cambridge Museum Photographic Collection archived at the Cambridge Museum and on-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford.
features such as incorporating the second floor in the roofline that was common amongst other New Zealand architects.¹² This helped to disguise the upper storey and underplay the size of these houses. Both Douce and American bungalow designers used strong horizontal and vertical lines in their architecture to compliment the landscape.¹³

A PHD thesis and two Master’s theses assisted in the analysis of the architectural and the historical background of New Zealand bungalows and the settlement of Cambridge. Dr Ann McEwans’ thesis “An American Dream’ in the ‘England of the Pacific: American influences on New Zealand Architecture 1840-1940” disclosed how and why the American bungalow was exceedingly successful as a type of dwelling and why this style was so strategic in becoming one of New Zealand’s most favoured form of domestic housing. Diana Joyce Murray’s and Diana Porteous’s geography theses explored the historic settlements of the Waikato. Porteous examined the physical expression of the landscape environment and an interpretation of housing styles. In this discussion she highlights how the infilling of one militia acre sections began to occur in the 1920s and the impact it had on the urbanscape.¹⁴

The thesis will examine the various elements of 15 domestic bungalows designed by Douce. The dwellings were selected for the stylistic analysis based on the following:

a. all were constructed in concrete,

b. each building was substantial in its footprint and in the height,

c. prominence in the urban and in the rural landscapes,

d. similar design elements, and

e. the design characteristics of each dwelling.

It will examine each dwelling to establish whether Douce developed a distinctive style of his own and the prominence of his work in the district.

The methodology will consider Douce’s background and his development as a draughtsman and architect. It will consider his early adoption of bungalow architecture and how he developed his own styles which became distinctive to him. Consideration will be given to the

---

historical context, design, development of the style, setting in the streetscape and prominence in the town. The certificate of titles will provide the historical link from militia settlement to the construction of the dwellings between 1914 and 1928. The analysis will provide a thematic approach that includes background information on the owner who commissioned the construction of the dwelling, the builder and the architect. Further discussion will cover construction materials, design of the exterior and the interior and similarities between the 15 chosen bungalows.

The first section establishes the biographical framework of James Douce from his beginnings in England to his emigration to New Zealand and establishing himself as a craftsman and architect in the Waikato.

This is followed by placing Douce’s work in a historical and in a modern context. A summary of the establishment of Cambridge as a militia settlement and its subsequent formation into a town with the eventual implementation of urban town planning (1920s) is addressed in this section. The examination of the streetscape during the 1920s and the assessment of the overall visual qualities of the structures in 2012 will be used to illustrate this point.

It will then relate to the emergence of the bungalow as New Zealand’s first modern home. It will show how the bungalow became a symbol of modernism to reflect a new lifestyle after WWI and how the style adapted to regional tastes.

The following chapter discusses Douce and some of his contemporaries who established architectural practices in the wider Waikato District. These Waikato architects all practiced at the same interval as Douce and favoured the bungalow style and the use of concrete as a domestic building material. The first single storey concrete domestic house designed in Cambridge by Arthur Bibra Herrold was in 1912 and was a forerunner of Douce’s own distinctive styling.

The thesis then looks at the development of concrete construction for vernacular housing which became pronounced in the Waikato in the 1920s. At the time discussion over the merits of the use of concrete for domestic dwellings was debated throughout New Zealand by the New Zealand Institute of Architects. The suitability of the material came into question as it was generally considered by the architectural profession that it was more appropriate in
a commercial setting. The first two-storied house Douce designed in concrete was as early as 1914; he continued to use this material throughout the 1920s.15

The main body of the thesis develops the case studies. An introduction of the 15 houses will set out the importance of the buildings in a historical context and showcase the architectural elements that Douce included in the design. An on-site investigation and discussion with the current owners establishes the merits of the 15 dwellings. The historical and architectural assessment of each house will identify its history, its construction and its design qualities. The analysis will establish the importance of his craftsman bungalows and how they interact with each other. ‘The Californian Bungalow, which grew out of the Craftsman bungalows of New York, was the style of architecture that Douce most favoured for his group of important concrete structures.’16

---

16 Ashford, p.18.
Chapter 1

Biography

James Thomas Douce was born at 9 Providence Place, Grays-Thurrock, Essex, England on 8 July 1882. He was the eldest child and the eldest son of Thomas and Elizabeth Douce (née Pellow). In 1901 James Thomas Douce was eighteen years old, and worked as a carpenter in the village of Fobbing a short distance from Grays-Thurrock. There are no records of the building firm he worked for or of his employer. By the time he immigrated he had spent seven years learning the carpentry trade.

At the age of twenty five James Douce left England as an unassisted passenger aboard the SS Ormuz bound for Sydney, Australia. Shipping records noted that Douce was registered as a carpenter and he planned to work in Sydney. It is unclear if Douce had aspirations to become an architect before he left for Australia or was drawn to it while working in Sydney. While Douce lived in Sydney, Technical Colleges were being established (one thing is clear, on his retirement he had in his possession volumes from the International Correspondence School in Pennsylvania, America).

It is unclear why Douce left Sydney Australia to live in Cambridge, New Zealand. On the 6 April 1910 Douce arrived in Wellington aboard the TSS Manuka as a steerage passenger. On his arrival in Cambridge Douce worked for George Dickinson & Company; Funeral Directing and Cabinetmaking business as a Funeral Director’s assistant. The 7 May 1910 was the first mention of Douce living in Cambridge when he became part of the Anglican community and was elected as a vestryman of St Andrews Anglican Church as reported in

---

17 English 1881 census recorded that the marital status of Thomas Douce, James Thomas Douce’s father, was a widower. James Thomas Douce in his last will and testament stated that if he outlived his wife his estate would be shared between his sisters who lived in England.
the Waikato Independent. It was further reported in the local paper that he was appointed to the position of the Hon. Secretary Vice of the local branch of the Church of England Men’s Society on 26 May 1910. Dickinson often travelled to Sydney and left Douce in charge of the business. George Dickinson was a local businessman and was profoundly involved in local community affairs and local politics in Cambridge.

Douce became a member of the Masonic Lodge, Alpha No. 81 in Cambridge. This was an influential group of men who were in business in the Cambridge community. His soon to be father-in-law George Dickinson had been a member for many years and probably introduced James to the Order. He joined the Lodge in 1910 and he was inducted as the Master of the Alpha Lodge and served the required one year period in this role in 1919. Douce gained a number of important contacts within the Masonic Lodge in Cambridge. There was no reference in the Waikato Independent of Douce being involved in local body politics or local community boards.

It is unclear when Douce actually started his architectural practice but he advertised his skills as an architect in the local newspaper, the Waikato Independent, ‘Modern Homes and Bungalows a Specialty’ in October 1911. His first recorded commission was in November 1911 when he designed two cottages on land behind the funeral business in Alpha Street, Cambridge. At this time he set up his business in the premises of George Dickinson, the Cambridge funeral director and embalmer whose offices were on the corner of Alpha and Empire Streets. It appears Douce was never articled to an architect.

---

20 This was the first recorded reference of James Douce living in Cambridge. Monthly Anglican Church news recorded in the Waikato Independent, 26 May 1910, p.5. Recorded in the Intention to Marry Register 8 June 1912 stated that Douce had lived in New Zealand for two years.
22 ‘Local and General News’ The Waikato Independent, 10 April 1913, p.5.
23 To become a master of Lodge Alpha a member had to serve the required ten years. Interview, Mrs. Betty Stewart, 8 May 2003 by Jennie Gainsford.
26 Sally Parker, Cambridge an Illustrated History 1886-1986 (Cambridge: Cambridge Borough Council, 1986), pp 172-173. Cambridge Museum Archives. George Dickinson served as a councilor from 1903 to 1910 and was mayor for two terms from 1910 to 1913. George’s previous occupations included 20 years as a traveling salesman, a bookseller in Hamilton and Duke Street, Cambridge and a Funeral Director and Embalmer from 1904 until his death in 1923. Mr. George Dickinson first established his funeral business next to Saint Andrew’s Church,
On 10 June 1912 James Thomas Douce married Alma Gertrude Dickinson.\(^{27}\)

In August 1918 James Douce moved his practice from Alpha Street to Wilson Street, Cambridge\(^{28}\). It appears although he drew his architectural plans at the new premises he continued his employment at Dickinson’s funeral business.\(^{29}\) This is evidenced by the fact that completed plans and specifications were still viewed at the funeral parlour in Alpha Street.\(^{30}\)

The \textit{Waikato Independent} was the source of all local news reporting of the time. Reports included social functions, weddings, visitors to the town, public meetings and other general items about Cambridge and wider Waikato District. Despite this, there appears to be a complete absence of articles written about Douce or his architectural work. In the early 1900s bungalows were such a departure from the style of choice ‘the villa’ that they would have had a dramatic impact on the town; however, this was never mentioned in the press.\(^{31}\)

Apart from his tender notices and the occasional article on a commercial building that Douce designed there was very little written of his work and his designs. Between 1911 and the late 1930s he designed many domestic bungalows and commercial buildings that were substantial double and single storey dwellings constructed in concrete and wood.\(^{32}\)

There are no known personal or business records of Douce’s activities. The only business item found, was a photocopy of his business card, which was located in the Sheppard Collection housed at the Auckland University School of Architecture. The main sources for

---

\(^{27}\) Cambridge Museum Biographical Index File. Alma Gertrude Dickinson was born on the 25 September 1885.

\(^{28}\) In the week starting 17 August 1918 his trade advertisement in the \textit{Waikato Independent} shows that he was still operating his practice out of Alpha Street but an advertisement on the 27 August 1918 showed that he was at his new premises in Wilson Street. \textit{The Waikato Independent}, 17 & 27 August 1918, p.1

\(^{29}\) There are not many commissions throughout the period of 1918 & 1919. In May 1919 Douce who was a regular advertiser in the ‘\textit{Waikato Independent}’ stopped advertising for a period of a month. These were the last years of the war and in 1918 the influenza epidemic hit Cambridge just as the economy in Cambridge was beginning to recover.

\(^{30}\) The Alpha Street address appears on all Douce’s tender notices. This was where all plans and specifications could be viewed. By 1923 builders viewed all plans and specifications at his residence at 96 Hall Street.


\(^{32}\) Interviews, Moya Newton-King, 1 May 2003 by Jennie Gainsford and Interview, Mr. and Mrs. Cox, 30 April 2003 by Jennie Gainsford. Moya Newton-King and Mr. and Mrs. Cox both indicated that Douce was a private individual. Only two photographs of Douce were located throughout the 2003 and 2013 studies.
establishing which houses were designed by Douce were the historic Cambridge Borough Council Building Permits and tender notices placed in the local newspaper the Waikato Independent. Many of the building permit records for the period 1910 – 1945 had been lost so there were many gaps in the council records to show which houses Douce designed. To establish the date of his first commission required ascertaining when Douce established his architectural practice and when he started calling for tenders in the Waikato Independent public notices. In 1911 the first of Douce’s tenders that were advertised in the newspaper and the first CBC building permit was issued in 1913. As far as can be ascertained, Douce’s last known commission was recorded in the Waikato Independent in 1938.

According to the New Zealand Institute of Architects Douce was not a registered member. However, Douce had the words architect recorded on his business cards. During the 1920s there was a push from the NZIA to regulate the industry and encourage the employment of registered architects when building a house as early as 1926. They insisted the word architect could only be placed on a business card if they had received architectural qualifications. They wrote to local councils to further cement their case; this was an attempt to highlight the differences between professionally trained and those who graduated

---

33 Sheppard Collection, Index of New Zealand Architects, Architecture Library, University of Auckland.
34 Research of the New Zealand Institute of Architects’ members revealed that Douce was not a member of the NZIA nor had he received architectural training in New Zealand.
from the ICS course such as Douce. 36 By the commissions Douce received it appears he was trusted to carry out architectural designs.37

Douce was a prolific businessman; he spent 35 years working as an architect, a funeral director, in conjunction with providing a taxi service. After the death of his father-in-law he continued the funeral business, alongside his architectural practice as well as operating a taxi business.38

After the death of his father-in-law in 1923, Douce continued to operate the funeral and cabinet making business under the same name ‘George Dickinson & Company’ alongside his architectural practice.39 At this time Douce re-located part of the funeral business and his architectural practice to his residence at 96 Hall Street. Douce used an outside workshop at 96 Hall Street to make coffins and the parlour at his residence was used as a place where family members could view the deceased 40 and the morgue and the embalming remained at the Alpha Street premises.41 The only other established funeral business operating at the same time as Douce was Simmons and Savory who were in business from 1923 to 1934.42 Despite working as the local undertaker he considered his main business to be that of an architect and he continued to advertise for and procure architectural commissions. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s Douce listed his profession as an architect in The Bradbury’s and Wise’s Business Directories.43 He continued his architectural practice and the funeral business from his home until his retirement.44

Douce had a successful architectural practice. He was responsible for approximately 80 dwellings, commercial structures with many other domestic houses that cannot be

40 Douce used a Chandler as his hearse and later replaced it with a Reo. When Mr. Williams purchased the funeral business he replaced the ageing Reo with a Studebaker. In 1951 Mr. Williams moved the funeral business to Lake Street opposite the Cambridge Town Hall. At this time he added a chapel to the premises. ‘Douce’ Cambridge Museum Archives.
41 By 27 November Douce advertised his architectural practice was now established at his residence in Hall Street. The Waikato Independent, 20 November 1923, p.1.
44 This was established by tender notices placed in the Waikato Independent.
substantiated. He was responsible for the design of 15 significant concrete constructed bungalows in Cambridge from 1914 to 1928. All but one of these buildings still has a prominent place in the Cambridge streetscape.

Douce was a man who smoked woodbine cigarettes, had a love of the sea, fishing and horse racing. On his retirement Douce sold his collection of books. Amongst the various architectural literature he had a collection of ephemera that included books from the French writer Bulzac. It is imperative to put Douce into the context of Cambridge in the mid 1920s. It had a population of 2,026 people and he would have been recognized as an architect of note and as a designer of over 80 domestic and important commercial buildings in the town. In 2013 his concrete bungalows are still landmarks in the streetscape of Cambridge.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Auction Notice’ \textit{The Waikato Independent}, 31 August 1945, pp.1-2.
Chapter Two

Imprint of History: the urban Characterisation of Cambridge, a historical and a modern perspective

During the first two decades of the twentieth century the town of Cambridge, its architecture and its streetscape were transformed; this was heavily influenced by James Douce who designed a number of substantial concrete houses that were built during this period. The overall development and transition from a militia outpost to the creation of a colonial settlement and the establishment of the town’s infrastructure will be addressed in this chapter.

Since its beginnings in the mid 1800s the town of Cambridge has undergone several metamorphic changes. Firstly, it was established as a militia outpost and following the Waikato Wars it was surveyed into one acre allotments by the British Military.46 These

46 Eric Beer & Alwyn Gascoigne, *Plough of the Pakeha* (Cambridge: Cambridge Independent, 1975), pp.54-66. In 1864 Mr. Gwyneth was responsible for the survey of Cambridge; the town belt consisted of 392 acres and was 10 chains wide. The township was 426 acres (172.4 hectares). Diana Joyce Raethal Murray, “The rationale
allotments were initially settled by militiamen who were allocated land after their tenure in the army and then by European settlers.\(^{47}\) In the 1870s the countryside was covered in tea tree and scrub with virtually no large trees as part of the extended landscape.\(^{48}\) However, there was a conscious effort by new settlers to create a ‘home away from home’, a little part of England sub-planted in the southern hemisphere.\(^{49}\) As the colonial settlement became more established they transformed the town and the rural landscape with English tree varieties such as oaks, pin oaks and copper beeches.\(^{50}\)

---


---

**Fig. 3 Cambridge c1875**
The continued urbanization of Cambridge was stereotypical of many smaller settlements throughout New Zealand. In September 1919 the CBC discussed the idea of formulating a council plan to provide better utility services and to implement a works programme for the Central Business District and the suburban streets. However, the Council was slow to react to the problems of insufficient drainage, noxious weeds, lighting, pavements, channelling and kerbing and roads that were not frequently graded and gravelled; a general dissatisfaction amongst ratepayers developed in terms of the town's general appearance and overall character. It wasn't until May 1921 that a proper works agenda was formulated and it would take the CBC a decade to establish good infrastructure that would ultimately benefit the wider community.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{51} Cambridge postcard collection, Bev Dean, Cambridge.
\textsuperscript{52} Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 25 July 1919, p.95 and 27 June 1919, p.93, The Town Planning Conference was held on 20 – 23 May in the Wellington Town Hall and was driven by the Minister of Internal Affairs, the Rt. Hon. G.W. Russell. The main focus of the conference was to find solutions, and how to implement sound town planning strategies in conjunction with the need of improved social housing. Headed by
During the first two decades of the twentieth century the section size had primarily been one acre but during the 1920s the subdivision of land became common place. In the early stages the CBC had no strategic vision for future growth even though the efforts by some residents advocated for the implementation of town planning. Speculators were buying much of the land and there was little thought for sound planning to accommodate growth. However, the fundamental structure of one acre subdivision as laid out by the British Military did mean that the historical configuration would remain intact as plots were reduced in size. Although prior to the 1920s the subdivision of urban one acre sections was minimal, as town planning evolved the Cambridge streetscape was slowly engulfed by a fusion of smaller to medium sized wooden bungalow style houses and craftsmen bungalows many of which were designed by Douce.

Fig. 6 Copy of the British Military Subdivision Plan c 1865

Samuel Hurst Seager who was a ‘mover and shaker’ in town planning circles. The prime outcome from the conference was to establish a solid housing policy shaped by social reforms.

53 In 1922 the Cambridge Borough Council started to receive plans from property owners for the subdivision of the one acre militia allotments. Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 14 March 1922, p.195.
56 University of Waikato, New Zealand Collection Map Library, Reference 580.1222 B4 c 1922.
This was also a period of relative prosperity when central government invested in New Zealand in preparation for increased migration and infrastructure. Large public buildings such as the Cambridge Court House (1909) and The Cambridge Town Hall (1909) were built at this time. There was new wealth in the town and this heralded the need for more commercial building and more substantial residential dwellings for wealthier business people.

Douce designed his craftsman bungalows in an urban and rural environment as opposed to close proximity to the central business district. From the early 1900s there was a national shift in demographics where local inhabitants moved from living in close proximity to the central business districts to becoming suburban dwellers.\(^{57}\) This was also the case in Cambridge, however the move from living close to the Cambridge town centre was reasonably slow due to the inadequate extent of sanitary and roading infrastructure.\(^{58}\) It wasn’t until the early 1920s that the Cambridge Borough Council began the process of town planning and the implementation of good infrastructure and amenities.

When Douce designed his first concrete house in 1914 Cambridge was quite underdeveloped in terms of housing. There was only a smattering of dwellings including a small number of cottages, villas and farm buildings in and around the town. Between the 1911 and 1916 national census the population of Cambridge rose from 835 to 1507 and the estimated total number of dwellings increased from 313 to 359.\(^{59}\) The 1916 census noted there were four concrete houses that had been constructed.\(^{60}\) However, the CBC’s continued commitment to urban infrastructure encouraged further development and this brought a distinct change to the streetscape. It was during this period that Douce designed a series of concrete ‘Craftsman Bungalows’.\(^ {61}\) The architectural statement made through the presence of these large imposing homes amongst a relatively small number of moderate dwellings was a significant enhancement for the district. As the 1920s progressed the CBC

\(^{57}\) In Cambridge it was due to increasing car ownership. In other New Zealand centres increased public transport also added to urban sprawl. Ashford, pp.26-27.

\(^{58}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 9 September 1919, p.102., 30 April 1920, p.15. and 10 May 1921, p.44.


\(^{60}\) National Census October 1916, p.44.

\(^{61}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 9 September 1919, p.102. and Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register archived at the Cambridge Museum.
allowed further historic one acre sections to be reduced in size to a quarter of an acre; this encouraged further housing development.\textsuperscript{62}

By 1921 the population of Cambridge had increased to 2,065 inhabitants but by 1926 it had decreased to 2,026; the Cambridge district was not densely populated.\textsuperscript{63} A proportion of the original one acre allotments remained unoccupied and numerous others were owned by the CBC, Cambridge Domain lands or Endowment lands, many of which were later sold and subdivided.\textsuperscript{64} Slowly through council directives the town's infrastructure was eventually implemented and Cambridge became more like a suburb and less like a wasteland incorporated inside the town belt.\textsuperscript{65}

After winning the national elections in 1891 the Liberal Party had put pressure on local bodies to fund public works that were previously paid for by the government. This trickle-down effect to local council level forced councils to start taking responsibility for improving infrastructure in their towns and to play a more active role in caring for their communities. These changes took some years to have an effect but slowly resulted in better town planning and public works programmes such as water reticulation, roading, footpaths and electricity.\textsuperscript{66}

In New Zealand throughout the period of 1919 to 1931 there was considerable transformation, where local councils began to show a more positive attitude and became more pro-active towards town planning.\textsuperscript{67} More constructive town planning was one area that would make considerable difference to the lives of the lower and middle class New Zealanders.

Cambridge had started with an early form of town planning; the advantage it had over many other New Zealand towns was that it was surveyed by the British military using the grid as a

\textsuperscript{62} Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 14 March 1922, p.95., and the grid for all its flaws gave the Cambridge streetscape definition; visually all the streets have symmetry and order. Giselle Byrnes, \textit{Boundary Markers: land surveying and colonisation of New Zealand} (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2001), pp.51-57.

\textsuperscript{63} Department of Internal Affairs, 1921 Census taken on 17 April 1921 and 1926 Census.

\textsuperscript{64} Cambridge Museum Archives, Surveys maps of Cambridge East archived at the Cambridge Museum.


The inclusion of town ‘green belts’ completed the overall structure of separating the urban from the rural. However, after formal planning guidelines were introduced it took more than a decade for good town planning to have a real impact and most progress was made in the 1920’s but halted for a period by the great depression of 1929.69

The New Zealand government lending policies promoted home ownership and this led directly to increased land subdivision.70 Increased home ownership in Cambridge saw the gradual subdivision of the militia one acre lots. The infilling of the militia lots changed the appearance of the streetscape.71 Rapid growth required a high-quality town planning;72 urban change through hurried subdivision and expansion throughout this period through infill housing changed the fabric of the streetscape. For instance, throughout the 1920s in Cambridge there was a steady flow of the one acre militia allotments that were subdivided; slowly the section sizes decreased.73 However, the CBC by-laws of the time controlled the size of a street frontage and section size, which could not be less than one rood (quarter of an acre or 0.1 hectares).74 It was recorded in CBC minutes that residents did try to push the boundaries by submitting subdivision plans for sites that were less than one rood so further pressure was being placed on housing density. In conjunction with the smaller section sizes a new housing style ‘the bungalow’ followed.75

The New Zealand Town Planning Act did not come into effect until 1926.76 In January 1927 the Director of Town Planning wrote to all borough engineers and registered surveyors giving his views of the subdivision of town properties. His instructions included the

68 Byrnes stated that contours of the land were not considered by the British Military when planning the subdivision of Militia settlements and towns in New Zealand. Byrnes, pp.51-57.
72 McEwan, p.2.
74 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 29 October 1920, p.94.
75 Ferguson, p.89.
76 McEwan, p.8.
requirement that subdivision of land was to be carried out by a qualified surveyor\textsuperscript{77} and he was not in favour of right-of-ways to back sections.\textsuperscript{78} Even though there was a steady stream of subdivision applications to council the population and the number of residences in Cambridge remained static at 2026 and at 457 respectively.\textsuperscript{79} This indicates that even as late as 1927 there were less than 500 dwellings in Cambridge.\textsuperscript{80}

In a modern context Cambridge is frequently referenced as typical of an English Village. However, the architecture of Cambridge streets is more reminiscent of American styles. Douce’s urban houses were constructed on large sections during a period when land was plentiful and town planning was rudimentary. However, over time there has been little consideration for the curtilage or spatial leverage\textsuperscript{81} and all of the lots have been divided several times. In particular during the 1970s Cambridge suffered from insensitive infilling and the majority of these large sections have now been reduced to a third or quarter of an acre. It wasn’t until the 1980s that the phrase ‘streetscape’ and ‘holistic approach’ were coined and began to be taken into account in council policy and planning.\textsuperscript{82} Today the local (Waipa) District Council has robust policies in place and has a sound district plan for future generations.

\textsuperscript{77} Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 27 January 1927, p.99.
\textsuperscript{78} Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 17 March 1927, p.124.
\textsuperscript{79} New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, 1926 Census, p.11. In 1916 the population of Cambridge was 1507. New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, 1916 Census, p.18.
\textsuperscript{80} New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, 1926 Census, p.13.
\textsuperscript{81} Harris, p.23. and Ferguson, p.88.
\textsuperscript{82} David Hamer, ‘Historic Preservation in Urban New Zealand’ New Zealand Journal of History, vol 31, number 2, October 1997, pp. 262-263.
Fig. 7 A typical example of infilling depicts the changes of the historic militia grid between 1922 and 2009\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{83} Waipa District Council District Plan, Cambridge Character Area, 2009, p.11.
Chapter Three
Douce’s Bungalows

‘Landmarks in the Cambridge streetscape and markers of Craftsmanship’

The emergence of the bungalow as New Zealand’s first modern home; how it became the linchpin between the villa and Modernism, the symbol that reflected a new lifestyle after WWI and how the style incorporated modern design and adapted it to regional tastes.

Douce arrived in Cambridge in 1910 at the moment the bungalow was making its appearance. Four years after his arrival he designed his first substantial concrete bungalow. A contract of this nature could only be embarked upon with the necessary skills that further suggested he had received architectural training.84

During the 1920s when Douce designed the majority of his major concrete structures the bungalow was at its zenith. The bungalow in terms of design had the most potential; its plan was not too radical and quite adaptable.85 An increasing number of wealthier middle-class people began to use the services of an architect for their domestic dwellings. At this time architects became interested in the former Gothic notion advocated by Ruskin of humane and healthy standards for the urban dweller; these ideals became part of the bungalow revolution and the principals that Douce incorporated into his designs.86

Douce’s style of bungalow architecture was defined in a set of concrete structures in the American Craftsman style. They were not a set of standardised plans but were designed individually for a select group of clients between 1914 and 1928. All houses were well-

84 On his retirement Douce sold all his household and architectural contents. Part of the contents that were sold were 13 volumes of ICS and a set of G.A.T. Middleton’s The Principles of Architectural Perspective. The Waikato Independent, 31 August 1945, pp.1-2. In 1891 the American ICS was established with a total of 115 students enrolled in the first year. By 1901 enrolments had increased to 251,310. In 1905 New Zealand, you could only put the word ‘architect’ on your business card if you had received architectural training. Ann McEwan, ‘Learning by Example: architectural education in New Zealand’ Fabrications, the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians of Australia and New Zealand, vol.9. 1999, pp.1-16.
86 Johnson, p.42.
proportioned and designed on a rectangular or a square footprint; the majority of his bungalows were constructed in this manner, which were key components of American bungalows. The houses discussed in this thesis (case studies), will demonstrate the modern approach he extended to the designs of his bungalows.

The bungalow was New Zealand’s first representation of Modernism and they are easily recognizable throughout the urban streetscape. Ashford in his book *The New Zealand Bungalow* described this type of dwelling as New Zealand’s first true domestic dwelling. The emergence of the bungalow as New Zealand’s first modern home became a symbol that reflected a new lifestyle. The bungalow with its modern innovations allowed New Zealand to have the highest home-ownership rate in the world after State Advances loan reforms in 1923. After years of rigidity and conformism to the villa in terms of design and social structure the bungalow offered domestic cosiness. Post WWI the bungalow was the type of house that perfectly suited the ‘suburban ideal’; a type of dwelling that could move between ‘popular and high culture’. Improved communications with America and Europe, the distribution of architectural magazines and people who travelled abroad all added to the proliferation of the bungalow in New Zealand. Inter-War bungalows were an eclectic mix of American and British influences a housing style that incorporated modern architectural designs, building materials, technologies and were adapted to suit regional tastes; in essence it was the ‘self-reliance’ trait of New Zealanders that adapted the bungalow to suit it needs.

In 1911 the *Progress* periodical described the California type bungalow as a domestic building that was more suited to a warmer climate. However, due to its rise in popularity solutions were found to create a type that would suit colder climates without sacrificing the

---

88 Gainsford, 2003 and Ashford, p.9.
peculiar features and charms of the style that would have an appeal to a wider audience; it also stated the bungalow type produced ‘some of the handsomest homes in New Zealand’.

According to William Toomath the bungalow was the prominent housing type in country from 1920 up to the beginning of the depression in 1929.

The visible expansion of the bungalow can be seen throughout the urban environment in Cambridge. Bungalows were frequently tagged as the design of speculative builders; they promoted them as ‘a modern home’ suited to a modern family that could be built at a reasonable cost. This led to a number of run-of-the mill bungalows and in a number of cases unimaginative in their design. Others described it as cheap and nasty and in particular A.R.D. Fairburn, writer, commented in an article for the Planning magazine (August 1946) that ‘carpitects’ had derailed the design process with ‘dreadful little hovels, at once sordid and pretentious in style began to spring up like toadstools throughout the suburbs’ and ‘Jerrybuilding became one of our basic industries’. Contrary to Fairburn’s comments the bungalow and its variants, whether designed by an architect or a builder, became the favoured housing style in Cambridge and the rest of New Zealand.

Osbert Lancaster was of the same mind as Fairburn, Lancaster commented, in England the speculative builder constructed row-upon-row of mass-produced low-priced single and double storey bungalows; these were often referred to as ‘By-Pass Variegated’ during the 1920s. Douce was a designer of the vernacular in the Craftsman style as well as a designer of number of medium price-range California bungalows. McEwan in her PhD thesis suggested that New Zealand bungalows are ‘arguably some of the most distinctive within New Zealand’s built environment’.

---

95 ‘California Bungalow’ Progress, 1 June 1911, V.1 No. 8, p.698.
98 Ashford, p.7.
99 Osbert Lancaster, Pillar to Post: the pocket lamp of architecture (London: Murray, 1940), p.68.
101 McEwan, pp.49-50.
Ashford described Douce’s vernacular style the most consistent group of houses in the Craftsman style’. Inferences can be made that Douce in his quest for a personal style used a combination of American architectural designs and philosophies of the craftsmen’s bungalows but also incorporated elements of English influences and designs.

Fig. 8 A typical example of a medium-range Californian bungalow designed by Douce for the Wilkinson family on the corner of Bowen and Princes Streets c1925

The American contribution cannot be understated; their designers, popular culture and technological innovations became part of bungalow design and therefore heavily influenced their counterparts in New Zealand. The architectural landscape of Cambridge during the early settlement was once primarily dominated by English style cottages. However, villas, which also had American architectural roots, soon rivalled the cottage. The next dominant architectural style to succeed the villa was the bungalow; the urban character became interspersed with another American architectural design.

The ‘Craftsman’ bungalow movement began in New York in the early 1900s. It was a style that related directly and was heavily influenced by the English Arts and Crafts Movement promoted by William Morris and John Ruskin. The Americans observed the same viewpoint as the English of simplicity, harmony and craftsmanship. As advocated by the Craftsman magazine they were recognised as the two people who most influenced this style in America.

---

102 Ashford, p.46.
104 Photograph courtesy of the Wilkinson Family, Cambridge.
106 In America and the first two editions of the ‘Craftsman’ magazine were dedicated to Morris and Ruskin. Ashford, p.18.
Clay Lancaster in *The American Bungalow 1880-1930* defines the true characteristics of the ‘Craftsman’ bungalow. He states the original intention was for bungalows to blend into their environment, have a prominent roofline, broadly projecting eaves and casement windows. Douce incorporated these philosophies that define the style; however, he also integrated elements of the California bungalow, the English Cottage and the villa. Douce designed bungalows to be low slung and nestle into the landscape a shift from the vertical (that defined the villa) to the horizontal. In effect this element reduced the overall height of the dwelling even though the roofline dominated the height of the house.

Hodgson stated in *Looking at the Architecture of New Zealand* the Californian bungalow lacked proportion and well thought-out detailing compared to the design of the villa. His sentiments were echoed in Australia by Professor Leslie Wilkinson. He considered the invasion of American bungalows was characterised by complicated and broken rooflines of all shapes and sizes, massive piers, misplaced lead-lights and many forms of would-be ornamentation as well as differing types of building materials. At times he regarded a portion of houses were too big for their site. These sentiments were echoed in New Zealand and a conversation was had ‘do we consider the California Bungalow expressive of New Zealand needs.’ The NZIA felt it was more important to adopt a style of architecture that expressed our national identity.

The 1920s was the decade of individualism and this was reflected in the design of Douce’s 15 concrete houses. He was at the forefront of these ideals; he designed bungalows to cater to individual client’s taste. Examination of individual case studies will clearly illustrate that he drew inspiration from American and English bungalow philosophies, principles and designs. However, Douce successfully meshed together the best of both to create a set of Craftsman bungalows that are distinctive to Cambridge.

---

108 Villa architecture was defined by the vertical as the bungalow shifted to the horizontal. Ashford, p.32.
Previously domestic houses had a hierarchical system in their design and no more so than the villa. Social etiquette played an important role during the Victorian and Edwardian periods prior to WWI. Post-War, etiquette of how each room was arranged became less important. The bungalow changed the way a house was organised in terms of internal subdivision. Douce continued to use a form of etiquette in his designs. A portion of his houses had a layout that included a maid’s room even though there was a reduction of domestic staff that lived under the same roof as the family. Even the garden during the villa period was created with clear social distinctions but faded with the popularity of the informal lifestyle the bungalow created. The bungalow became the vehicle to a modern way of life.

---

A Two Storey Modern Bungalow in Auckland

Rough Cast on cavity blocks, Marseille tiled roof and conveniences

Constructed on a double section close to Takapuna Beach and near the bus route

For £2300 (GVT Valuation)

£800 cash £1500 mortgage would have secured the deal

Apply, ‘Bungalow’, Waikato Independent office, Cambridge for full details

---

Bungalows embraced modernity. In New Zealand the bungalow was heralded as a modern home for a modern family. It was a housing type that suited families in a more global world, a style that was at the forefront of this revolution. The bungalow also evoked a sense of a more relaxed lifestyle, simplicity, cleanliness and the kitchen was modernised with the

---

116 Leach, p.81.
advent of electricity. A gravitational move towards this aim produced a house with the housewife in mind and because of this considerable changes were made to the internal layout. Women's magazines became the vehicle for advertising home appliances and furnishings as the home became a servant-less place. Areas of the house became lighter and airy. This philosophy was best represented in the interior layout and ultimately house plans began to reflect this approach. Clear markers of the Inter-War bungalows saw the creation of a more functional hygienic house with clean water piped to the house and homes connected to electricity. More than anything else the concept and the importance placed on domestic and personal hygiene saw the expansion of bathrooms with a flushed internal toilet replacing the outhouse and the laundry, which once occupied a separate building, moved to the back porch. The explosion of new household appliances was designed for the sole purpose of a servant-less home. Added to this was the proliferation of new building technology and building materials that kept the cost of construction to a minimum.

A comfortable five roomed **bungalow** for sale

All conveniences – gas and electric

Close to Hamilton Road

Apply owner – ‘Woodlea’ Grey Street, Cambridge

Cost £550

The influence of American bungalow design had a profound effect on the architecture of New Zealand bungalows. The reason the bungalow was able to proliferate was the versatility

---

119 Salmond, pp.185 and 206-208.
122 Moloney, p.13.
of its design, it could be easily adapted to any size and could be built at a reasonable cost.\textsuperscript{125} The dominance of the horizontal line, wide gables, projecting eaves (sun protection), emphatic brackets and upstairs rooms accommodated within the roofline, distance between porch piers, windows set the same distance above the floor, built in cabinetry, sliding doors between rooms were some of the new design features.\textsuperscript{126} In American designs the front door opened directly into the lounge, this was not the case for the majority of New Zealand bungalows and a feature that Douce only used once.\textsuperscript{127} Another modern approach was the concept of harmony between the house and its surroundings.\textsuperscript{128} The ubiquitous porch, a truly American feature, was promoted as a flexible living area, a place to connect with nature, to dine, and could be used as a sleeping area, all key elements of bungalow design.\textsuperscript{129}

During the bungalow period there was an explosion of modern innovative building materials and reduced ornamentation that had previously been a substantial and essential part of villa design. The transition from rich and complex designs of the villa period became reduced during the Inter-War functionalism period. During this period new types of buildings were mass-produced and due to the rising cost of building plus the shortage of labour all helped produce a type of dwelling with simpler ornamentation. Its architectural diversity\textsuperscript{130} enabled the bungalow to be cost effective in its construction.\textsuperscript{131}

The bungalow borrowed former building styles to use in a modern context. Tudor Revival, Spanish Mission, Georgian Revival, Moderne, International and Functionalist all contributed

\begin{itemize}
\item Maddex and Vertikoff, pp.12-13.
\item Leach, p.85. and Maddex and Vertikoff, p.23.
\item Cherry advocated the correlation between the house and the street was important as an intermediary space. In America the front yard flowed seamlessly to the street without the interruption of fences or hedges to hinder the view. Cherry, pp.48-49. and Maddex and Vertikoff, pp.19-20.
\item Phillips, p.9.
\item Ferguson, p.89. and Harvey, p.2.
\end{itemize}
to what is perceived as the bungalow style. Douce incorporated designs from these periods; however, he readapted to suit his particular bungalow style.\textsuperscript{132}

In the 1920s the spatial structure of Cambridge’s section size for villas and of cottages, which were originally on an acre or more, were reduced in size due to increased homeownership caused by the advent of suburban sprawl.\textsuperscript{133} Urbanisation was here to stay; urban change from historical roots to modern expectations; the villa versus the bungalow. As Harris stated in \textit{World patterns of Modern Urban Change 'the itch for building} began after WWI.\textsuperscript{134} The bungalow was the product of a global culture. In New Zealand the population growth required more houses sited on smaller sections. In Cambridge during the bungalow period the quarter acre became the general standard; an influx of applications to council to subdivide the historic one acre lots resulted in the construction of additional houses. This was an instrumental factor on the dissemination of the militia one acre with infill housing and in particular the bungalow.\textsuperscript{135}

In the twentieth century the ‘Bungalow era’ heralded a new period in domestic housing throughout the developed world. In New Zealand there was a continued preference amongst a portion of the population to own a villa, however, the bungalow eventually eroded its popularity. Bungalows became the domestic house of choice; the process of loosening the grip of the Victorian era where social conventions were applied to the exterior and the interior of private dwellings was losing favour in society.\textsuperscript{136}

New Zealand was not detached from the world. Bungalow architectural ideals were transported from England as well as from one colonial nation to another.\textsuperscript{137} Toomath suggested the impact of bungalow books, plans and designs including newspaper articles from America created the popularisation of the style.\textsuperscript{138} The rapid expansion of its success

\textsuperscript{132} Bryce Raworth, \textit{Our Inter-war Houses: how to recognise, restore, and extend house of the 1920s and 1930s} (Melbourne: National Trust of Australia, 1991), p.10.
\textsuperscript{133} The NZIA Journal reported the State Advances Act was amended to accommodate new homeowners. They were now entitled to a loan of 95\% of the total cost but no more than £2000 on a first mortgage with a low interest rate and a 5\% deposit. ‘State Guaranteed Advances Act’, \textit{New Zealand Institute Journal}, May 1923, Vol.11 No.2., p.31. Ferguson, pp.90-92 and p.295. and McEwan, pp.1-4.
\textsuperscript{134} Harris p.23.
\textsuperscript{135} Cambridge Borough Council Minutes 1910-1945 archived at Waipa District Council, Cambridge.
\textsuperscript{136} Maddex and Vertikoff, p.23.
\textsuperscript{137} Lancaster, pp.120-129.
\textsuperscript{138} Toomath, pp.153-157, 161-162 and 178.
as a domestic housing style was due in part to the promotion of a style that was free from convention, displayed cosy domesticity; a humbler form of the larger Arts and Crafts bungalows and New Zealand’s egalitarian society was more akin to American society. The New Zealand bungalow type, as was the case with Greene Brothers of California, were masters of eclecticism in designing American bungalows.¹³⁹

Fig. 9 An example of wallpaper used during the 1920s

Cambridge was part of the Auckland Provincial District and prominent Auckland architects such as John Currie ANZIA and Arthur Bibra Herrold and well known Waikato architects such as Frederick Charles Daniell, Harold C. White ANZIA, J.H. Edgecumbe ARIBA, ANZIA, Jack E. Chitty, Thomas Stephenson Cray and Archie MacDonald FIAA and others all designed in concrete construction throughout the wider Waikato district. Douce was part of this important group of early twentieth century architects to design vernacular houses who left a visual architectural record on the Waikato landscape.\textsuperscript{140} Douce saw the potential for a local architect who lived in Cambridge community; he established his own architectural practice at George Dickinson’s funeral parlour in Alpha Street around 1911.

There are a number of dwellings that have all the classic hallmarks and distinct similarities of a Douce design. For these reasons it can be difficult in differentiating between the designers of some of these buildings and in a few cases there will always be an element of speculation determining the architect for a particular dwelling. The architects noted above designed domestic and commercial buildings, and all favoured the bungalow style and the use of concrete as a building material.

In 1913 Douce worked alongside a significant Auckland architect, John Currie, on the construction of the National Hotel in Cambridge. Currie was the architect for Hancock & Sons, brewers, and throughout his career he carried out numerous commissions for the company. Currie was an exponent of the use of ferro-concrete in housing construction. The rise in the use of material began in the latter years of the nineteenth century but became immensely popular in the first decades of the twentieth century. Currie designed a building using this method of construction as early as 1898.\textsuperscript{141} It cannot be proven that Douce was a registered architect but his training in England and in Australia proved he was capable to assist Currie and to manage the construction of the hotel in his absence; Douce had lived in

\textsuperscript{140} John Currie (the Masonic, the National and the Criterion Hotels) and A. B. Herrold (the Cambridge Town Hall, the Cambridge Bowling Club and the Monavale Homestead for the Buckland family). \textit{The Waikato Independent}, 12 August 1920, p.1.

\textsuperscript{141} Sheppard Collection, Index of New Zealand Architects, School of Architecture, University of Auckland.
Cambridge for less than three years but had obviously gained the respect of Currie. 142 This demonstrated Douce’s skills as a builder and an architect, in concrete construction and in the management of a project. The style of the hotel is Spanish Mission and is still an iconic building in Cambridge, and even though it no longer serves as a hotel. It has retained its character and its original features and, for all intents and purposes, it still gives the impression of a hotel. It is unclear if Douce continued to assist Currie in this manner on other projects as there are no records to substantiate this proposal.

Herrold, another Auckland architect, was the designer of a concrete house built in Grosvenor Street, Cambridge in 1912. It was for the Richardson family and was an early example of a single storey concrete bungalow. 144 The structure was well-proportioned and has a wide porch that wraps a significant part of the house. An unusual feature of the house was the inclusion of a small prayer room off the lounge. It is a transitional bungalow; but has some villa elements in its design. This is a significant example of early concrete construction in Cambridge; it is worth noting here Douce designed his first concrete house less than two years later.

143 Bradbury, p.250.
144 ‘Tender’, The Waikato Independent, 2 September 1913, p.4.
It is probable that the design and type of material used in the construction of the Richardson house was the catalyst for Douce to design a series of important concrete structures. One thing is clear, the Richardson house would have made a statement and would have impacted on the appearance of the streetscape, as at the time the street comprised mainly of wooden cottages and villas. In the past, wood was the favoured building material because of its availability but concrete began to make inroads as an alternative building material.

Daniell was a very important Waikato architect who established an architectural practice in Hamilton in 1908. He was an exponent of concrete construction and designed a considerable number of buildings in Hamilton and in the surrounding towns. He was reputed to be the first architect to design a building using the ‘Camerated System’ of concrete construction for the Waikato County Council offices in Grey Street, Hamilton in 1910. He was the architect responsible for the design of a house for J. Bryant in Tauwhare Road who was involved in the establishment of the Matangi Glaxo Dairy factory and workers dwellings. This particular house looked very much like a house designed by Douce, however, architectural plans held by the Waikato Museum of Art and History proved that Daniell was the architect. He also designed many Presbyterian churches and church halls; he was commissioned to design several buildings in Cambridge one of which was the Presbyterian Trinity Church ‘Peace Memorial Hall’, Victoria Street, Cambridge in 1925.

---

145 Practically jointless cavity walls of concrete (not blocks).
146 “The Waikato Independent reported” that F.C. Daniell was the first architect in the Waikato to experiment with the ‘Camerated System’ for constructing buildings. The Waikato Independent, 15 February 1910, p.4, and Hamilton City Council, Hamilton Heritage Study, 2012 by Matthews & Matthews Heritage architects Auckland (research by Jennie Gainsford).
147 Waikato of Museum of Art and History, Architectural Plans Archive.
Fig. 11 A Daniell's design for T S Bryant

Fig. 12 Example of the Camerated Concrete system

Photograph courtesy of the Waikato District Council.
Herrold and Daniell never established an architect's office in Cambridge, however, both Cray and Edgecumbe and White, prominent architects in their own right, secured offices in the town. Cray purchased the Masonic Hotel in Duke Street and became a hotelier but still practiced as an architect (he later formed partnerships with Daniell and Chitty); he was responsible for the design of the St Andrews Church Parish Hall in Cambridge (1932), and was responsible for the design of Calvert Chambers in Victoria Street, Cambridge; both these buildings were constructed in concrete. It is worth mentioning that until this time Douce had designed all the alterations and the additions for the Anglican Church. Douce had been a parishioner since his arrival in Cambridge (1910); so it is interesting that the Anglican Church selected another architect to design the hall. By 1932 Douce had already designed many concrete domestic dwellings and substantial commercial buildings. Edgecumbe and White established an office in Duke Street, Cambridge in 1920. Edgecumbe and White have left their own indelible architectural legacy. They designed a prominent concrete house named ‘Summerleas’ for Alfred Henry Gascoigne located at 1 Coleridge Street, Cambridge in 1920. Mr. Gascoigne was a prominent barrister and solicitor in the town who was actively involved in local body politics. For some time the Cambridge community thought this structure was designed by Douce, however, recent research discovered that it was an Edgecumbe and White design. Three other important Cambridge buildings built in concrete were designed by the Edgecumbe and White partnership: the Cambridge Town Clock (Spanish Mission), the commercial premises for Easter & Waghorne in Victoria Street, and considerable extensions to the Cambridge Post Office.

---

151 Edgecumbe was the son of the former proprietor of the ‘Argus’ a well-known Hamilton newspaper and White was the son of W. White an important member of the Leamington community and the brother of William James White, a Cambridge builder.
A house in Bruntwood Road was also thought to have been designed by Douce. Douce stuck very much to a similar plan for his concrete houses and this house was quite distinctive in its design. It was built in concrete and built to replicate the style of a square pavilion with a central light well similar to that of a lantern tower. However tender documents in the *Waikato Times* confirmed that this dwelling was designed by renowned Hamilton architect, Jack Chitty. It was built for the Waikato Hunt Club as club rooms in 1927. Earlier in his career Chitty designed another pavilion type house on the corner of Von Tempsky and Dawson Streets, Hamilton in 1903.  

---

154 Photograph courtesy of Mrs. P. Wallace owner of ‘Summerleas’ in 2003.
156 Hamilton East Heritage Study commissioned by the Hamilton City Council, by Ian Bowman, Heritage Architect, 2008 (research by Jennie Gainsford).
MacDonald was an architect who certainly stuck to one particular type and style of architecture. He favoured a style that used a considerable amount of ornamentation, and this is visible in many of his buildings. However, the Midland Hotel in Cambridge stands in stark contrast to his usual style. On first glance it looks like a house designed by Douce because of the simplicity of its design. The Waikato Independent once described the building as a ‘modern design’ and the hotel would include many up-to-date features. It was built in concrete, brick and timber at a central location in close proximity to the Cambridge Town Hall, the National Hotel and a short distance from the central business district.

In 1929 W.W. Brown Esq. commissioned MacDonald to design a commercial building in Hamilton. This particular building and another he designed for Campbell Larnach MacDiarmid and Edward James Mears in the same year were similar in design. A prominent corner building in the Cambridge CBD was designed by MacDonald for a Miss

---

157 ‘Tender’ Waikato Times, 30 July 1927, p.5.
160 Matthews and Matthews Heritage Architects, Auckland, Hamilton City Council, Heritage Study 2012 (research by Jennie Gainsford).
Davies in 1931; at this time this style of building in terms of design was considered old fashioned, however, this could have been the client’s preference.\footnote{‘Tender’ The Waikato Independent, 30 April 1931, p.1.}
In summary there are distinct similarities between the houses of prominent Waikato architects and those designed by Douce. He would have witnessed the construction of these houses and the type of materials used by these architects. As a professional architect Douce may have been influenced by their styles and them by his. However, Douce will be best known for his distinctive set of Craftsman bungalows using a style that was a hybrid of American craftsman bungalows and English architectural trends.¹⁶³

¹⁶² Waikato Times, 27 April 1929, p.15.
¹⁶³ Frederick Daniell built a house for Mr. T. Bryant, Tauwhare Road, Hamilton. The exterior of this house has many architectural features that are similar to houses designed by Douce. Interview, 3 August 2003, Mr. & Mrs. MacDonald, Jennie Gainsford.
Chapter Five

'Cemented in Time'

Cambridge Inter-war concrete domestic bungalows; the use of concrete in construction and the building trade

Concrete gave a modern look to domestic housing. Cambridge architect James Douce was at the forefront of concrete construction and his bungalows were at the ‘cutting edge’ of modernity in vernacular architecture during the first two decades of the twentieth century. It was a material that was once considered only suitable for the construction of commercial architecture, bridges and such like but not for domestic architecture. It wasn’t until the early part of the twentieth century that many architects, who had previously designed commercial buildings in concrete, turned their attention to the residential market. A material that engineers had previously realised its constructive value, concrete gathered momentum as a building material amongst many architects. Because of its functionalism it became a serious contender in the construction of domestic buildings. Due to the rapid growth in suburbia and the rapid increase of homeownership architects saw the potential of using concrete in the construction of bungalows.

In 1907 England G.A. T. Middleton wrote several volumes on the construction of buildings including a volume on concrete construction. Middleton described concrete as a material that had a greater strength than masonry. The ingredients for mixing cement must be balanced: the greater the density the greater the strength. Concrete depended on the quality of the cement; the type, the size and the strength of aggregate. He noted the strength of concrete varied with the amount of water when mixed; concrete had elastic properties, and was particularly effective in the case of earthquakes and was especially desirable as a

---

167 Middleton, p.33.
168 Homer A. Reid, *Concrete and Reinforced Concrete Construction* (S.I.: s.n., 1907), pp.185.
building material because of its fire resistant properties. In the first decade of the twentieth century one of the objections to concrete was that it expanded and contracted after construction. Homer Reid, who wrote a book at a similar time to Middleton, discussed the rapid growth in the cement industry and he and others felt the world was entering a ‘Cement Age’. He reiterated there was demand for concise and reliable information with regard to concrete construction. The construction of concrete buildings with or without reinforcing metal was on the increase and he believed England was going ‘concrete mad’. Concrete required similar rules that were applied to historical forms of building construction. Douce used reinforcing iron in the construction of his concrete house.

‘under such conditions enthusiasm for a given form of construction should be tempered with good judgment, and the most suitable building material chosen unless this is done the ethics of good engineering will be violated.

As early as 1915 British councils restricted the use of concrete for domestic architecture and the RIBA thought concrete construction was not subject to rigid restrictions. The debate over concrete as a suitable material for domestic housing was still under discussion in England as late as the 1920s and continued to be discussed in the 1930s. The RIBA thought concrete was unsightly but noted that, as a building material, it could be useful but not for domestic construction. In the 1930s Modernist architects began their love affair with concrete.

At the first New Zealand Town Planning Conference and Exhibition in 1919 a paper presented by F.W. Furket, Public Works Department inspecting engineer stated that the cost to construct a concrete house was £100 more than wood (wood was £700 and concrete was £800). He added the cost of concrete was to be reduced to be in line with wood.

169 Middleton, p.33.
170 Reid, pp.111-vii.
175 Ibid, pp. 325-326.
John Campbell, the government architect for the Public Works Department (PWD) in Wellington after WWI wrote ‘the only famine New Zealand experienced was the housing market and the lack of materials’. However, the war was not the only factor that contributed to the shortage of construction materials. Higher wages and strikes also contributed to rising cost of materials therefore the rise in cost of construction. Campbell discussed the new material concrete and ferro-concrete as a building material suitable for domestic housing.

In 1919 Robert W. Montalk, a Wellington architect, gave evidence before the New Zealand Government Industrial Committee of the advantages of concrete construction for the residential market. He stated that reinforced concrete houses could be built as cheaply as wooden houses, and advocated concrete had many benefits such as: cheap and quick to construct, permanent, vermin and fire proof that would ensure reduced fire insurance premiums.

The account of concrete construction is well documented by the architect Geoffrey Thornton in his book *Cast in Concrete*. He noted Chapman-Taylor was one of New Zealand’s leading architects in concrete construction. One of the earliest houses he designed and built in concrete was ‘Whare Ra’ in 1915. Judy Siers notes that this was the period when Chapman-Taylor began his love affair with concrete. Douce also had a love affair with concrete and designed his first of 15 Craftsman style bungalows in 1914.

---

177 First New Zealand Town Planning Conference and Exhibition, p.215.
179 Geoffrey Thornton completed his architectural studies after WWII. He worked for the MOW, was assistant Government Architect and served for a period on the NZHPT Trust Board. Geoffrey Thornton, *Cast in Concrete: Concrete Construction in New Zealand 1850-1939* (Auckland: Reed Books, 1996), dustcover.
The use of concrete as a building material was well established by the 1920s. In March of that year the Waikato Independent reported there was a Portland cement shortage. The supply of cement from the South Island became governed by territorial agreements so the supply to the North Island halted temporarily, which almost brought building operations in the Dominion to a standstill.\(^{182}\)

A housing shortage was caused during the 1920s due to this shortage of building materials. Local councils lobbied government to have the import duty removed from cement; they could only remove duty under certain circumstances.\(^{183}\) At this time the Board of Trade controlled the supply of building materials and those seeking a building permit had to gain their approval.\(^{184}\) Eventually the BOT gave powers to local councils and the town clerk was given the power to grant a building permit and materials.\(^{185}\) The Waikato Independent reported that several new buildings were contemplated due to the shortage of materials caused owners to put their plans on hold.\(^{186}\) However, it reported more houses for Cambridge: ‘one enterprising individual has secured cement and materials to erect four new houses in the

\(^{182}\) ‘Cement Shortage’ The Waikato Independent, 13 March 1920, p.6.
\(^{183}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 30 July 1920, p.36.
\(^{184}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 27 August 1920, p.52.
\(^{185}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 24 September 1920, p.63.
At this time Douce was the only architect designing domestic concrete houses in Cambridge and he was the only architect who had four concrete houses in the process of erection. For Douce to complete the construction of these houses it appears he would have had access to a constant supply of cement. There is no clear evidence from whom he gained such a quantity, at a time when building materials were in short supply. New Zealand experienced a mini recession in 1921-1922; by June 1922 the Portland Cement Company reduced the price of cement. After this time there was a relative period of calm even though the economy continued to be unstable.

Concrete construction brought changes to the way domestic housing was constructed. During the period Douce constructed his concrete houses, the CBC building permits documentation did not always record information that would enable identification of houses.

---

188 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 23 July 1920, p.35.
189 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 23 July 1920, p.35.
that were constructed of reinforced concrete. As the Lewis House (1914) was the first house constructed in reinforced concrete it could be assumed that the remainder would have been built in the same manner. The CBC documentation indicated that concrete walls were four inches thick with reinforcing iron rods of \(\frac{1}{4}\) inch. Cambridge builder William White who often advertised in conjunction with Douce reported that he could build all classes of buildings in concrete, brick and wood and all concrete construction was undertaken by machinery.\(^{192}\) The inference is that all exterior walls were poured in situ. It is unclear if the walls were smoothed with plaster or, as suggested by Jeremy Salmond, were covered in a variety of sheet linings that were used as the base for the stucco. In New Zealand there were local products such as ‘Eternit’ (1908), ‘Poilite’ asbestos building sheathing (1913) ‘Konka’ board (1915), ‘Gibraltar’ sheathing and plus a number of imitations. Gibraltar sheathing was first used as a base prior to the application of the stucco finish.\(^{193}\) Either way, the walls were finished with rough-textured stucco. In all cases interior walls were a combination of either solid concrete or battens with lath-plaster applied between the spaces.

\(\text{Fig. 19 Concrete construction}\)


\(^{193}\) Salmond, pp.204-205.
For the duration of the 1920s numerous magazines featured articles on recent innovations in concrete construction. These included steel reinforced concrete (a nineteenth-century invention), Camerated system (c1907), Veandhor breeze blocks and the O.K. Dry Wall System. Thomas Henry White who settled in New Zealand in 1863 constructed a granary at Newcastle in concrete in 1873; and another Waikato architect Frederick Charles Daniell designed offices for the Waikato County Council in Grey Street, Hamilton East in 1910 in the Camerated system; it was reported as the first building of its type to be built in the Waikato. This was the year that Douce came to live in Cambridge.

One of the major shifts in bungalow construction was the development of the solid concrete perimeter (foundation wall). It was designed to bear the weight of concrete walls: this was developed to support the weight of brick or concrete walls and to prevent cracking. However, Douce used a foundation wall in the design of some of his concrete houses but not all. Sub-floor ventilation was important and ventilation grills were used for this purpose. A cement-based rough plastered finish was applied to the walls and was referred to as stucco or roughcast. Another change was the dimensions of floor boards; previously they were 5-6 inches (125-150mm) in width but in the bungalow period this changed to a narrower board.

---

194 Ashford, pp.45-46.
195 Newcastle was renamed Ngaruawahia.
196 Thomas Henry White. Sheppard Collection, Index of New Zealand Architects, School of Architecture, University of Auckland.
In the case of Douce houses the width was 90mm. In the case of Douce’s houses the majority of rooflines were gabled not hipped and were a single span covered in a short length corrugated galvanised steel.199

During the late 1920s companies were advertising different types of cement finishes and types of waterproofing for domestic housing. A British product ‘Wallfortis’ was a waterproofing product that would be ideal for brick, cement, concrete, plaster, roughcast and Stucco buildings.200 Another product produced by Portland cement was ‘Snowcrete’; a white finish that had varying stucco textures and was cheaper than any other Portland cement sold in Britain.201

Fig. 21 Advertisement for ‘Snowcrete’.202

In September 1924 the NZIA reported on a lecture that was given by Professor Leslie Wilkinson of Australia titled ‘The Trend of Present-day Architecture’. In it he discussed the invasion of the American bungalow, characterised by its multitude of different construction materials and styles.203 In the case of concrete construction the NZIA believed it had a future in domestic architecture. They noted that it was structurally strong but was not necessarily

199 BRANZ, pp.30–46.
200 Advertisement, NZIA Journal, January 1927, p.x.
203 The Trend of our Present Day Architecture, NZIA Journal, September 1924 vol.111. No.4., p.95.
aesthetically pleasing; however, it was argued that if it was structurally strong by definition it would have essential beauty.\textsuperscript{204} In 1928 the architect R.A. Lippincott\textsuperscript{205} wrote an article for the NZIA ‘the development of concrete as an artistic architectural material’. He put the case that the attributes of concrete as a plastic material meant that it could be modelled into shape. Since WWI Portland Cement had made advances through science and skilled research in the manufacture of concrete.\textsuperscript{206} A new British standard for Portland cement was implemented in 1926; the last time the specifications had been reviewed was in 1920. The new specifications were required to bring it closer in line with the highest quality cement of the time ‘Blue Circle Cement’.\textsuperscript{207}

Concrete bungalows were complimented by the inclusion of a front fence built in the same material. Therefore, a holistic approach to design in conjunction with the surroundings; a correlation developed between the materials of the house and the material used for the construction of the fence.\textsuperscript{208} The adoption of the American ‘front yard’ exposed the front garden to the street; historically during the Victorian era the front yard was edged in hedges and fences.\textsuperscript{209} With these barriers removed the integration of the house with the garden was a key element of bungalow design and the impact of garden and house gave the streetscape a visual garden.\textsuperscript{210} However, not all New Zealanders were prepared for a communal front lawn, and in the case of Douce’s houses many had hedges but others had a low fence constructed; this was still a barrier but of low impact.\textsuperscript{211} Another feature, which was to compliment the concrete houses designed by Douce was the inclusion of a concrete garage. As car ownership increased so did the design and construction of concrete garages.

In 2010 Douce’s version of the Craftsman bungalow style built in concrete are historical architectural markers that have created a unique feature in the urban streetscape of Cambridge. Not all of his houses remain on their original parcel of land; overtime these large

\textsuperscript{204} The Future of Concrete Construction, \textit{NZIA Journal}, November 1924 vol.111. No.5. p.115.

\textsuperscript{205} Lippincott designed St Peters School in Cambridge.


\textsuperscript{208} Raworth, pp.5 and 26.


\textsuperscript{210} Chase, pp.29-36.

\textsuperscript{211} Leach, pp.81-108.
sections have been subdivided; however, in spite of this they continue to be prominent landmarks. In ten years time these 15 vernacular dwellings will be at least 100 years old.
Chapter Six

‘English Vision or American Reality’

Introduction to Douce’s Concrete Bungalows

The generic term ‘Bungalow’ created a problem when assessing style and the more common term ‘California Bungalow’ was adopted to cover all bungalow designs.212

As the title suggests the architectural styles of James Thomas Douce’s concrete bungalows reflect numerous American and English characteristics. Douce worked as a carpenter in England and inferences can be drawn that he was predisposed to the English Cottage style early in his career. Some of his houses reference the influence of the English Arts and Crafts movement. However, the majority are reminiscent of American influences and in particular the craftsman bungalow. His architecture displays simplicity and solidness, and his style could be coined as ‘pick and mix’ as his houses reflect both elements of American bungalows and English designs.

The group of 15 houses designed by Douce discussed in this thesis are distinctive to Cambridge to the point where many of Cambridge residents would recognise Douce’s style of bungalow.213 Architecture reflects the most important and interesting physical evidence in the history of one’s culture. Buildings perform an important role in the historical memory within a community. David Lowenthal and Marcus Binney suggest that historic vernacular offered today’s society a sense of place and belonging214 and they further suggest ‘that heritage refashions the past into the present’.215 Another important figure in the ‘Arts and Crafts’ movement William Morris proposed that ‘…. that the public had an overriding interest in the preservation of historic buildings’.216 Bungalows established a new ideal in house

214 Lowenthal and Binney, pp.24 and 46.
design and concrete gave a modern look.\(^{217}\) Functionality of the internal subdivision followed the style and layout trends of both American and English trends.\(^{218}\) However, Inter-war functionalism was attributed more to the lack of availability of building materials and rising costs than any one trend during the 1920s.\(^{219}\) The period of the rise of domestic architecture was 1914-1927 was cut short by the Depression and the internalisation that followed of 1927-1934.\(^{220}\)

For his wealthier clients Douce specialised in sizeable bungalows constructed in concrete. The dwellings clearly demonstrate the robustness of his bungalow style. His structures are statements of their time; a new approach to domestic architecture using cement and in many respects ‘avant-garde’ in their design. They stand proud in the streetscape or rural landscape; they are single and two-storied, have high pitched rooflines and porches and tall chimneys often add to the height and overall effect of the buildings. The construction of each dwelling ranged in price from £1500 to £2000, a significant amount of money for a homeowner in the 1920s; those who commissioned these dwellings were prominent businessman and farming families.\(^{221}\)

James Thomas Douce was a prolific designer of bungalows throughout his career with 80 plus buildings that have been identified as his work. The thesis seeks to identify key characteristics of Douce’s designs for concrete bungalows and so will undertake a stylistic analysis of his most prominent domestic commissions. The key objective is to institute a format for each case study that is consistent throughout and provide a thematic approach to the research for all 15 houses. Each case study will include: the builder and the architect, the tendering process, council records, the certificate of title will provide the historic link from militia settlement to the construction of the dwellings, style analysis, planning and biographical on who commissioned the construction of the build.

\(^{219}\) Hill, p.5.
\(^{220}\) Hill, p.2.
\(^{221}\) Gainsford, 2003.
These dwellings were only a fraction and only a part of the breadth of Douce’s architectural commissions. He was a prolific builder-architect and his professional career spanned 30 years; he was responsible for the design of many domestic dwellings and several important commercial structures. His lesser known works were reminiscent of a typical styled Californian bungalow and are dotted throughout the suburban streets of Cambridge; they are an eclectic mix of styles, and often occupied corner sites. Douce began his career designing simple colonial cottages and completed his career with sizeable commissions. In the 1920s Douce was considered by the community as an architect of note.

The 15 dwellings discussed in this paper are in their own right individual, but there are many similarities that mark them as the work of one architect. Four of these houses (two urban and two rural) adhered to the philosophy of the Arts and Crafts movement (a common feature found in the architecture of the American architect Frank Lloyd Wright); they were designed to be low-slung and to nestle into the landscape. They were designed for Sam Lewis, Dr. Stapley, Alexander and Gilbert Watt. Ten dwellings are imposing structures and are almost square in design and follow the style of the American craftsman bungalows. The remaining dwelling is a combination of both types. They make important contributions to the visual landscape of Cambridge.

Douce incorporated a limited range of materials in his designs. The exterior walls were constructed in concrete, approximately four inches (100mm) in thickness and finished with an irregular textured ‘rough-cast’ finish. The walls were constructed using a system of boxing, which was filled with concrete. This process continued until the desired height was achieved and some of the interior load bearing walls were constructed in the same manner. The exterior was complimented with the use of materials such as zinc sheathing, scalloped timber shingles, gabled brackets, paired wooden columns, lead-lights, ventilator grills, casement windows, exposed rafter ends; all these bungalow features added a striking feature to the overall design. Other principle features include tall dominant chimneys, large
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222 There are 30 bungalows that appear to be the work of Douce but cannot be verified as such. Gainsford, 2003. Material archived at the Cambridge Museum.
224 Important architectural commissions by Douce were noted in Waikato Independent at the conclusion of each project.
covered porches, and steep rooflines. The interior layout of his houses were well planned to maximise useful space but a few replicated a villa hallway that ran the length of the house that formed the central axis of the house\textsuperscript{226} and another common feature was the inclusion of a central entrance. The ceilings in the majority of the houses are board and batten with decorative plaster work; both were typical bungalow features.

Balance, harmony and symmetry appear to be key components used by Douce in his design. He designed homes that are dramatic and appear imposing, however, he was careful and particularly mindful that these houses were for families and implemented a modern layout and living standards for a more comfortable abode; all these elements were taken into consideration in the planning process. It is evident in the interior design that each house appeared as a unified whole; the interior space was arranged to allow flow from one room to another and each room was spacious, but not as large as might be expected in a traditional villa\textsuperscript{227}. Another American influence was the yard, the set back from the street and a front fence built low to the ground, was deliberate to compliment the lines of the house and to present a pleasing visual effect. Importance was placed on street appeal as not to jar with the landscape. This space between the house and the fence allowed a garden and large trees to be established\textsuperscript{228}.

\textsuperscript{227} Stewart,pp.49-51.
\textsuperscript{228} Ashford, p.51.
A few of Douce’s houses illustrate the social constraints that were imposed on architecture during the villa period. The demarcation zone between private and public areas, due to social status of the owners, was ever present in Victorian villas and appears in a small number of Douce’s designs. However, the majority of his designs conform to American influences such as having the conveniences located inside and using the roofline space for wardrobes. One English feature Douce retained in all his designs was the inclusion of a hall in the entranceway, which is not present in most American bungalows which lead directly into a lounge.

The majority of Douce’s structures were initially constructed on large sections. Since then the section size has decreased and a number of houses are now crowded by unsympathetic infilling; in the past curtilage was never a consideration by council planning staff and over time these decisions have impacted on the urban streetscape.

When evaluating Douce’s architectural designs it is apparent that he was greatly influenced by the style of American bungalows. The external appearances of his houses have American design influences that have given Cambridge streetscape an American flavour as well as the appearance of an English settlement. Generally New Zealand bungalow styles were hugely influenced by Craftsman and California bungalows. The extent of the influence of the California bungalow can be seen row upon row in New Zealand provincial towns and cities; New Zealand became part of the bungalow phenomenon. However, Douce did not strictly adhere to the true form of American bungalows; it appears he was determined to stamp his own signature style on the Cambridge landscape.

Architectural inspiration comes in many forms. It can be inferred that throughout Douce’s career he would have gathered inspiration from local building projects and publications and during the course of his career witnessed other architects designs come to fruition. American publications were readily available throughout Australia and New Zealand. Other sources

229 Stewart, p.49.
230 During the 1920s in Cambridge the section size decreased from one acre to half an acre then to a quarter of an acre. Since the late 1920s the section size has diminished to 420m2 but it is recommended by the Waipa District Council in their revised 10 year plan to raise the section size to 620m2.
231 The American influence upon Douce’s style is clearly demonstrated in the American magazine, Ladies Home Journal, American Gordon-Tine Co., April 1919, p.70.
232 Ashford, p.7.
of inspiration that would have contributed to Douce developing his personal style of bungalow architecture was from publications by New Zealand architects and architectural magazines. On occasion his architecture can be confused with other architects such as Frederick Charles Daniels, Arthur Bibra Herrold, Harold White and Edgecumbe who were also prominent local architects; they designed concrete bungalows at a similar time as Douce. On closer examination it is easy to differentiate between the different bungalow styles. Douce in some respects was at the cutting edge of bungalow design in New Zealand. Of the 18 known concrete bungalows built in the Cambridge district in this period 15 were designed by Douce.

During their working careers, many architects develop their own individual signature style. Sometimes a style will be used many times in a career and will eventually be easily recognisable as the work of a particular architect. Douce’s work was no exception. He established a bungalow style constructed in concrete and with American influences, which is still very evident today in the urban and rural streetscape of Cambridge.

Douce was a man of his time; his architectural legacy easily recognisable in the streetscape and his vernacular structures continue to dominate the Cambridge landscape. The following case studies will establish the importance of his craftsman bungalows in Cambridge. They are arranged in chronological order. Various archival investigations, on-site visits and personal interviews with people who have been connected with the properties form the basis of the research.

Case Study Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Case Study Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Case Study Number One</td>
<td>Samuel Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Case Study Number Two</td>
<td>John Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Case Study Number Three</td>
<td>Walter Stapley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919/20</td>
<td>Case Study Number Four</td>
<td>Samuel Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Case Study Number Five</td>
<td>George Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Case Study Number Six</td>
<td>James Douce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

234 Frederick C. Daniell, Hamilton City Library and the Waikato Museum of Art and History Archives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Case Study Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Case Study Number Seven</td>
<td>John Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920/21</td>
<td>Case Study Number Eight</td>
<td>Gilbert Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Case Study Number Nine</td>
<td>Alexander Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Case Study Number Ten</td>
<td>William White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Case Study Number Eleven</td>
<td>Sarah McCann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Case Study Number Twelve</td>
<td>Herman Stichnothe (William Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Case Study Number Thirteen</td>
<td>Innes Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Case Study Number Fourteen</td>
<td>Herman Stichnothe (Victoria Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Case Study Number Fifteen</td>
<td>William Vosper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concrete Houses Designed by Cambridge Architect
James Thomas Douce

1. House 1911 - Samuel Lewis - 24 Governors Street
2. House 1891 - John Allen - 248 Thompson Road
3. House 1901 - Nathan Dingley - 11 Victoria Street
4. House 1923 - Samuel Hayes - 133 Florham Road
5. House 1925 - William White - 125 Princeton Street
7. House 1922 - John Parker - 280 Hamilton Road
8. House 1922 - Gilbert Watt - 64 Forrest Road
9. House 1921 - William Ware - 94 Penna Road
11. House 1925 - Samuel Haynes - 94 Vail Street
12. House 1922 - Herman Smith - 80 William Street
13. House 1922 - James White - 79 Franklin Road
14. House 1921 - Herman Smith - 79 Vail Street
15. House 1927 - William White - 269 Springdale Road
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Fig. 23 Location of Houses
Case Study Number One of 15

Name of the House: ‘Gowanbank’\textsuperscript{235} \hspace{1cm} Date of Construction: 1914

Original Owner: Samuel (Barrister and Solicitor) and Sarah Lewis

Street Address: 24 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce (extant house plans) \hspace{0.5cm} Builder: C.W. Cooper and William James White

\textsuperscript{235} Samuel Lewis named his house after a village where the family had previously resided in Scotland. Interview, Ken and Beverley Sheldrick, 21 May 2003 and 6 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
Background

In 1914 James Douce designed a house for Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Lewis to be located on an acre of land at 24 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge. The Lewis house was the first of its type to be built in Cambridge and it was the first of a series of important dwellings designed by Douce, constructed out of concrete\textsuperscript{236} over a period of fifteen years.\textsuperscript{237}

The historic patterns are defined in the history of the land and its subsequent ownership. The certificate of title (2011 PT ALLT 318 Town of Cambridge East) revealed the ownership of the land prior to the possession of the Lewis family. Both are significant key areas to the history of 24 Grosvenor Street, and in a broader context the history of Cambridge. Mr. Rutter (regiment number 1595) was allocated lot 318 (one acre) in Cambridge East on the corner of Grosvenor and Williams Streets but this was eventually substituted and allocated to Henry William Moore c1866 (he was also allocated farm lot number 91 at Cambridge). Moore was born on the Isle of Man, and was a carpenter by trade; on 19 June 1866 Moore enlisted in the Third Waikato Militia (his regiment number was 1710).\textsuperscript{238}

The Deeds Index on 2 July 1881 recorded Every McLean as the owner of the militia acre but the historic title for lot 318 issued on 23 October 1893 named the registered owner as the Auckland Agriculture Company Limited. Eight days later on 31 October the land was sold to Robert Morse, a Cambridge Builder. In 1902 the property was sold to Alfred Sturges of Otahuhu, a Draper in Auckland; in 1908 the property transferred to a Herman Feisst a Cambridge farmer; in 1911 it transferred to Clancy James Peake, a Cambridge farmer and on 3 December 1913 the land was purchased by Samuel Lewis a Cambridge Solicitor.\textsuperscript{239}

Tendering and Construction

It is unclear if a tender notice was advertised as there are no extant Waikato Independent newspapers for the second half of 1914 and all of 1915. A copy of the Cambridge Borough

\textsuperscript{236} The Vosper house was the only departure from the extensive use of concrete by Douce. The tender for the construction of the house specified for it to be built in double brick construction but finished with a coating of smooth plaster then overlaid with a roughcast stucco to represent a concrete dwelling. Ashford, p.47.

\textsuperscript{237} Up until 1914 Douce had designed only single storied houses.

\textsuperscript{238} Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v66 f148 and v919 f226.

\textsuperscript{239} National Archives Auckland, Deeds Index IF528 Application No.1749.
Council Building Permit File and the 1916 Rates Book disclosed that a dwelling was constructed in Grosvenor Street, for Sam and Sarah Lewis in 1914.\textsuperscript{240} A Cambridge Borough Council building permit was approved by council in November 1914. It described Gowanbank as a two-storied building constructed in reinforced 4 inch (100mm) roughcast concrete with a corrugated iron roof; the floors were strengthened by 4 inch (100mm) sarking. The layout consisted of 10 rooms plus a bathroom and a toilet; there were three chimneys. It was 915 cubic metres with a frontage of 15.4 metres and a depth of 13.2 metres. It was classified as a Class 3 building, and a building fee of £1 was duly charged.\textsuperscript{241} The cost of construction was £1572, a considerable financial outlay, considering the average bungalow cost between £250 and £500 to build in Cambridge at the time. The builder was C.W. Cooper of Hamilton and the interior joinery was jointly carried out by William James White and Mr. Stichnothe both of whom were prominent Cambridge builders.\textsuperscript{242}

![Fig. 25 Fibrous plaster board used in the construction of 24 Grosvenor Street, Cambridge](image)

**Style and Layout**

Douce designed the Lewis bungalow with emphasis on the horizontal.\textsuperscript{243} Parallel lines are expressed visually in the exterior of the house particularly the façade.\textsuperscript{244} These are

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{240} Cambridge Borough Council Rates Book 1914 and Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register November 1914 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
\item \textsuperscript{241} Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register November 1914 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
\item \textsuperscript{242} Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register November 1914 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
\item \textsuperscript{243} Architectural plans by Douce are archived with the current owners of the property. Interview, Ken and Beverley Sheldrick, 21 May 2003 and 6 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford. and Los Angeles Investment
\end{itemize}
emphasised by the apex of the roof, in the length of the downstairs and upstairs porches, the window sills, the upstairs porch window overhangs and the termination line of the downstairs and upstairs roofline. All these align up in a north south direction.

The most prominent feature of the Lewis house was the inclusion of four substantial porches. One of the key components of the American Arts and Crafts Craftsman bungalows was the promotion of harmony with the landscape. 245 This was a major step forward in housing design; the idea of providing better ventilation with the added advantage of a porch used as a sleeping porch.246 These philosophies were actively promoted by the American Gustav Stickley.247 The Lewis house main front porch encompasses two thirds of the downstairs façade with the upper storey porch two thirds of the downstairs porch. The porch was supported by four sets of square wooden paired columns248 with Japanese style detailing around the capitals; in America during the 1890s was the emergence of the Japanese influence in the interior and exterior detailing of bungalow architecture.249 There were two more porches, one facing north and the other at the back of the house. Both had arched openings with the porch floors constructed of wood and lined in lead with drainage ducts to waterproof the floors but are now enclosed with windows incorporating the porches into the interior of the house. Many upstairs porches in the 15 houses have been enclosed with windows.250

The interior layout of the bungalow was to promote a comfortable way to live for a modern nucleus family.251 The internal arrangement of rooms in the Lewis house promotes this ideal. There are certain elements of formality but it was designed to give the house the

---

244 Ashford, p.32.
246 Lancaster, p.183.
247 Lancaster, p.93.
249 A Georgian architectural feature for verandahs.
250 Onsite-analysis by Jennie Gainsford 2003 and 2011 and Interview, Ken and Beverley Sheldrick, 21 May 2003 and 6 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
251 Ferguson, pp.91-92.
appearance of a more relaxed lifestyle and although this house looks large and imposing from the outside, the interior is compact, largely due to the moderate size of the rooms.

The ground floor plan consists of a central vestibule, a dining room, a living room, two bedrooms, an office and a kitchen. The vestibule or meeting area is the pivotal area of the downstairs the key that links it all together. Simple built-in bracketed screen and settle complimented and dominated by a large concrete fireplace. The decoration of the screen is repeated to good effect in an archway at the foot of the stairs. When the adjacent living and dining room doors are fully open this area makes a large space for social occasions. Interior panelling is a notable addition to this house. The spacious stairwell is a feature of Douce’s two-storied residences except for the Fisher house.

The upper floor has a central hallway that divides the second level. There are three bedrooms (one with a dressing room), a bathroom, toilet and conservatory. The two main rooms open out through french doors onto a central balcony. The conservatory runs along the entire north wall.

A large concrete garage and a small wooden shed are adjacent to the house. These are both original outbuildings on the property.

Some of the features that became typical of Douce’s work are apparent in the Lewis bungalow. In true bungalow fashion Douce integrated common architectural features such as prominent porches, dormer windows, chimneys (that pierce the horizontal), exposed rafter ends, casement windows, ventilator grills, elongated barge boards that extended beyond the line of the gutter that terminated with individual cut out designs. He also added decorative ‘fish scaled’ shingles made popular by American architects that appear on the exterior of this house and were inserted in the pediments, on the balcony wall and at the base of the ground floor front porch. Overall Douce borrowed and blended architectural features to develop his distinctive style.

---

252 Interview, Ken and Beverley Sheldrick, 21 May 2003 and 6 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
253 Ibid.
254 Ashford, p.33.
255 Los Angeles Investment Company, p.10.
256 Henry H. Saylor stated there were ten different types of American bungalows, but this did not take into account for the hybridisation of the style. Saylor, p.19.
In excellent condition, the house still contains a majority of its original features fully intact. It has original door handles, built in furniture, sliding doors with lead lights and the original central light in the dining room is still a feature of this house. A stylistic feature that sets this home apart from other houses that Douce designed is the use of decorative features. The quality of other fittings and fixtures bears this statement out; there are a large number of lead lights throughout the house with a diversity of pattern and colour and a vast array of motifs used in the design of these windows. Influences from the Arts and Crafts, Art Nouveau and inspiration sourced from the glass artist Tiffany are visible in the design. Some of these lead lights were made locally by Speight, Pearce, Nichol & Davys, however, many were sourced from Auckland companies.\textsuperscript{257}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Fig_26.jpg}
\caption{A sample of lead-lights in the Lewis house}
\end{figure}

\section*{Relationship to Setting}

Gowanbank’s presence in the urban streetscape would have created considerable interest within the community; it was the first two-storied dwelling of its type to be built in Cambridge. The house showcased Douce’s ability as an architect and the use of concrete for domestic architecture but it also demonstrated the versatility and the practicality of building in this material. At the time of its construction this house would have been a very up to date home.

\textsuperscript{257} The majority of decorative fittings and fixtures were sourced through Auckland companies. Ashford, p.40.
in architectural terms. It was built to allow several rooms to be opened up to create space but could be closed with sliding doors to create intimate spaces. The other features were the placement of the kitchen in relationship to the dining room and the inclusion of an inside toilet and laundry. Prior to the 1930s the house was surrounded by unoccupied lots and farm land/open country side. The original block of land has since been subdivided and the house now sits on approximately half an acre.\textsuperscript{258}

The house was constructed on a prominent south western corner where Grosvenor and King Streets intersect. The house was oriented in an east-west direction; the facade with its porches faced directly east and received early morning sun and the rear of the dwelling faced due west that captured the afternoon sun.

In the 2012 Waipa District Council ten year plan Gowanbank was protected and given a B Classification, although it is not registered with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. Gowanbank is significant to Cambridge, and in 2014 it will be 100 years old. Its architectural merit has been recognised by the Waipa Heritage Council, a committee designed to protect local heritage, as a significant historic building. In addition the Cambridge community considered that it was sufficiently important to have it protected. Gowanbank because of its 1914 architecture has heritage merits, which are now considered an integral part of the architectural landscape of Cambridge.

\textsuperscript{258} The Cambridge Borough Council Rates Books 1914 and 1915 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Fig. 27 front elevation c1970s

Fig. 28 Architectural plans by James Thomas Douce
Client Background

Samuel Lewis was born on the 11 February 1878 at Te Awamutu, New Zealand. His father was Henry Lewis a hotel keeper. Sam was educated at Auckland Grammar School and at the age of 16 he enlisted for the Boer War and served in the Colonial Light Horse. He was the only New Zealander to have fought with the Bush Lander Borderers. He studied law in Auckland, and in December 1904 he passed the solicitors general knowledge examinations as well as the examination in law for candidates seeking admission as solicitors in November 1905; he applied to be admitted to the bar in December 1905. Supported by M.V. Dixon a Cambridge solicitor, he was admitted to the bar on 6 March 1906. On 6 September 1911 a motion of support by Mr. McVeagh and Edward Robert N. Russell was received for Lewis to be admitted as a barrister. He qualified to practice in: contracts, Real and Personal property, Equity, Voidance, Criminal law and Torts, Practice and Procedure. On his return to Cambridge Lewis went into practice with Malcolm Victor Dixon; their office was in Souter’s building, Duke Street. After the death of Dixon Lewis developed his own law firm and built a modern premise in Victoria Street; however, eventually the firm purchased the legal chambers of the late W.F. Buckland Esq. in Duke Street and practiced law at these premises for 50 years. Even after his retirement Mr. S. Lewis went to the office every working day. He established a New Zealand record for practicing law for 62 years. Samuel Lewis was involved in local body politics, first serving as a councillor and then as Mayor from 1921 to 1923. Sam Lewis was a foundation member of the Lodge Alpha and was Master of the Lodge from 1913 to 1919; he eventually served another term in office.259 Sam Lewis lived in the house from 1914 until his death on 5 February 1976 at the age of 97.260

Fig. 29 Samuel Lewis\textsuperscript{261}

\textsuperscript{261} Photographic Collection archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Case Study Number Two of Fifteen

Name of House: ‘Anchorage’  
Date of Construction: 1916

Original Owner: William John (Farmer and Contractor) and Winifred Kathleen Wilson

Street Address: 239 Thornton Road, Cambridge (situated on the corner of St. Kilda and Thornton Roads).

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: unknown

Fig. 30 The Wilson House

---


263 William John Wilson was the son of John and Anna Bella Wilson.
Background

In 1916 the Wilson residence was the second in the series of 15 concrete houses designed by Douce. In 2014 the house will be demolished; at this time the house will be nearly 100 years old.264

Prior to 1885 the land was owned by The Auckland Agriculture Company. The first certificate of title issued was in the name of John Livingstone on 14 August 1885. In April 1889 he discharged his mortgage and transferred the parcel of land to his daughter Annabella Wilson, the wife of John Wilson a Cambridge settler, on 16 November 1889. By 1905 John Wilson was deceased and Annabelle remarried. On 11 March 1915 Annabella transferred the land to her sons William John and Robert Wilson as tenants in common. It was William John Wilson who built a house on the corner of Thornton and St. Kilda Roads.265

Tendering and Construction

In 1916, William John Wilson, a farmer in the Cambridge District, commissioned Douce to construct a concrete house on the corner of Thornton and St. Kilda Roads, Cambridge. William and Robert were in partnership together known as Wilson Bros.266 On 22 June 1916 a tender was notified in the Waikato Independent by Douce for the erection of a house in concrete for William John Wilson. Plans and specifications could be viewed at Douce's office in Alpha Street; tenders closed Monday 3 July 1916 at 5pm.267

The Wilson residence was then under the jurisdiction part of the Waikato County Council and Douce would have applied for a building permit to construct a house in their district; there are no extant records for this period. Therefore, identification of the original owner was through information provided by the tender and the certificate of title.268

264 NZ Transport Agency miscalculated the land they required for the new motorway and this is the reason the Wilson house will be demolished.
265 Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v40 f 161.
**Style and Layout**

The Wilson house was the first of Douce's five houses to be designed on a square footprint. This house was not on the scale of all the other 14 houses but has many merits in its design.

The exterior design of the Wilson house is simplistic in style. The overall design has incorporated traditional bungalow features such as exposed rafter ends, brackets, casement windows, porches and the vertical height of the roofline. It has a deep foundation wall with ventilating grills. The roofline was extended to create front and rear porches. The facade is the only area where fenestration has been incorporated into the design. The porch gable contains layered wooden shingles and brackets with the lower section incorporating wooden paired columns with a simple horizontal bracket at the top. The rear elevation has two porches; an upstairs porch (now enclosed) and a ground floor porch.

The interior floor plan replicates the square footprint. Each room of the downstairs and upstairs is almost square; an efficient arrangement of interior space. In the layout there is a clear distinction between the public and private areas. The downstairs hallway dissects the house in two beginning at the front door and terminating at the back door. The public areas of the house are located on the left hand side and contain a small office, dining and sitting rooms. The right hand side is the private area of the house, which incorporates the kitchen, the bathroom and the main bedroom. The stairwell divides the upstairs landing with a hallway either side. The upstairs plan has three bedrooms and cupboard spaces in the roofline.

The lounge and the dining room are simply decorated. The lounge has a bay window and the dining room has french doors that led to the back porch. Each room has a fireplace that backs onto each other. The ceilings in both rooms are batten and board with stipple plaster and bevelled skirting boards.

During its lifetime several additions and alterations have been undertaken. The wooden windows were removed and replaced with aluminium, the upstairs porch was enclosed and
the original outbuildings, at the rear of the property, were removed or added to as the stucco finish is completely different to that of the house.\textsuperscript{269}

American bungalows gave a greater degree of informality. The Wilson house has an informal feel more akin to American way of life as opposed to the English cottage and villa formality.\textsuperscript{270} However, as seen in many of Douce’s houses some form of formality remains in terms of the separation of the public and private areas. At the time of construction of the Wilson house (1916) there was reaction against the villa. However, villas and transitional bungalows were still being constructed in Cambridge.\textsuperscript{271}

![Fig. 31 East Elevation](image)

**Relationship to Setting**

The Wilson house was constructed in a rural setting on a prominent corner site on the corner of St Kilda and Thornton Roads. The house is located approximately one kilometre outside

\textsuperscript{269} On site analysis by Jennie Gainsford and Dave Walker, Opus, 19 June 2013.
\textsuperscript{270} Rogerson, 71. and Ann McEwan, pp.65-67.
\textsuperscript{271} Rogerson, p.149.
and east of the Cambridge town belt. The facade was positioned to face south and rear of the property to face north to capture the sun.

**Client Background**

John Wilson was a Cambridge settler as early as the 1880s. John and Annabella (nee Livingstone) Wilson had eight children: William John born c1887 who married Winifred Kathleen Hearsey in 1914, Johnston born 3 April 1889 became a hairdresser, he enlisted in the army on 24 August 1915 and died during WW1 at the Somme, France on the 15 September 1916,272 Emily Maud born 1892, Margaret Dora born 1891, Mina Howie born 1895, Alma Sarah born 1891 and Elizabeth Jane (Liz) born 1884 and married Joseph Belts June 1908. John Wilson was a committee member of the Goodwood School, Fen-Court.

---

Case Study Number Three of 15 (Demolished 1997)

Name of the House: The Stapley House  
Date of Construction: 1917

Original Owner: Doctor Walter and Sybil Jane Stapley

Street Address: 111 Victoria Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: C.W. Cooper

---

Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum.

Cooper operated his business in Hamilton East.
Background

In 1917 the Stapley residence was the third in the series of concrete houses designed by Douce and it was the first of these structures to be demolished. At the time of demolition, the house was 80 years old. The analysis of the Stapley residence will primarily draw from historical CBC records from the time of its construction and a number of secondary sources such as a builder’s report, newspaper articles and WDC reports undertaken prior to demolition. The house was demolished by St. Andrews Anglican Church for resident housing for the elderly.

The land on which the Stapley house (town acre allotment153) was built was originally allocated to Charles Barton who enlisted in the third Waikato Regiment on 15 September 1863 (his regiment number was 674). It is unclear who owned the parcel of land between 1864 and 1881. On 22 March 1881 the corner site and lot 95 (Stapley Lot) was owned by the General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland. They sold part of the land to the Waikato Diocese Trust Board to construct an Anglican Church (1881). It appears excess land was sold by the Waikato Diocese Trust Board to the Union Bank of Australia Limited, they sold lot 95 to John William Murrick a Gentleman of Cambridge (1894) who sold it Thomas Nixon a coach builder in 1899. He sold part of lot 95 back to General Trust Board of the Diocese of Auckland in 1917. On his death lot 95 was sold to Sybil Stapley on 11 September 1917.

Fig. 33 Tender notice
Tendering and Construction

On 3 March 1917 Douce lodged a tender in the Waikato Independent for the erection of a house in concrete situated next to St. Andrews Anglican Church on the northern end of town. Tenders closed at 5pm on Saturday 10 March; the builder employed for the project was C. W. Cooper of Hamilton. The Stapley dwelling was classed as category '3' by the CBC indicating that the cost of construction was between £1500 and £2000; the CBC building register noted the cost of construction was £1450. The CBC building permit also recorded the Stapley house contained nine rooms as well as a bathroom, two toilets, and a washhouse. The dwelling was built with four inch (100mm) reinforced concrete walls and the floors were strengthened with four inch (100mm) sarking. The house measurements were: 2435 cubic feet/710 cubic metres and the roof 10703 cubic feet/230 cubic metres; the total floor area was 149.75 square metres. The measurements of the four elevations are as follows: frontage 54 feet/16.6 metres, depth 41 feet/12.6 metres, height 11 feet/3.4 metres and the façade roofline was 54 feet/16.6 metres, depth 18 feet/5.5 metres, height 8 feet/2.5 metres.

The CBC granted Stapley a permit in May of the same year; however, the certificate of title was not finalised and issued until 11 September 1917.

Before construction of the Stapley residence could commence the land required an inspection by the Cambridge Borough Council due to the water levels on Stapley's section. An assessment of the site was required by the Public Health Department before further work was undertaken and it was noted in the CBC minutes that Dr. Stapley had been informed of the council decision to proceed on 26 October 1917.

275 ‘Tender’ The Waikato Independent, 3 March 1917, p.5.
276 Cooper built many houses within the Cambridge District. Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
277 The CBC established a building fee system around the cost to construct a dwelling.
278 Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
279 It appears the cost of construction went beyond the original price hence the CBC building classification.
280 Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
282 Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum archives.
284 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 26 October 1917, p.20. and 30 November 1917, p.21.
Style and Layout

The Stapley house mirrored typical features of the American bungalow in terms of a high-pitched gable, casement windows, dormer windows, extended rafter ends, porches, modern conveniences, the connection between the indoors and the outdoors and the house to its site.

Douce designed the Stapley house on rectangular lines and to be low-slung; both were strong and noteworthy elements that mirrored the English and American Arts and Crafts philosophies. This substantial dwelling had a number of architectural features including an extensive pitch of the roofline, the extended length of the upper dormer (that almost mirrored the length of the termination point of the ground floor gutter line) as well as the straight lines of concrete window sills and the chimney tops; all completed the exterior horizontal lines.\(^{284}\) Henry Saylor stated in his book on bungalows that the purpose of the upper storey was to be kept unobtrusive by the lowering of the roofline and rounding the dormer windows. Douce applied this to great effect.\(^{285}\)

The architectural illusion can be seen in the vertical. Douce also applied this to great effect and in conjunction with the horizontal the house appeared to be furthered anchored to the landscape. The visual effect was created by the extensive pitch of the roofline that extended over the upstairs shed dormer with the remainder of the roofline extending down to the gutter line, the porch columns, the chimneys and the lengthening of the walls to ground level which were not interrupted by a foundation wall. These vertical facets pierced the horizontal design. The overall visual effect of the horizontal and the vertical gave connectivity of the house to its site.\(^{286}\)

Due to the lack of documentary evidence the last owners of the property have given a detailed account of the exterior and the interior layout of the Stapley house. Keeping in mind primary evidence reported the house contained nine rooms plus a bathroom, two toilets and a washhouse.\(^{287}\)

---

\(^{284}\) Johnson, p.115.  
\(^{285}\) Saylor, pp.41-43.  
\(^{286}\) Salmond, pp.186-191.  
\(^{287}\) Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register May 1917 archived at the Cambridge Museum.
A feature that was common place in the design of villas was used in the construction of the Stapley house. The house was dissected into two clear areas by two long hallways that ran the length of the downstairs and the upstairs. All rooms radiated from this pivotal feature.

The downstairs layout consisted of five main rooms plus a toilet, washhouse and storage. The east elevation (façade) looked directly out to the street, which included the dining room (doors that were recessed or folded back so the dining room and the lounge became one room), the lounge, and a recessed front corner porch. These rooms were well-lit by the extensive windows. The southern elevation, looking east to west, consisted of the dining room on the corner, a porch which gave access to the doctor’s surgery and the house, a dispensary (this room may have originally started its life as a washhouse or a maids room as it can only be accessed off the rear porch). The west elevation from south to north contained the dispensary (ex laundry or maids room), a kitchen, a toilet, a large covered recessed back porch and the back section of the second lounge or billiard room. The northern elevation comprised the porch (façade porch), and a room that extended from the porch to the rear of the house. Because of its size, the room may have originally served as a billiard room. Billiards was popular in the early part of the twentieth century and a number of substantial homes were built with such a room; some of Douce’s houses incorporated a billiard room in their design.288

The layout upstairs comprised two large bedrooms, which occupied either end of the upstairs, and situated between were two smaller bedrooms. All the bedroom windows were of a push-out type. All bedrooms had built in wardrobes with the two larger rooms the wardrobes were built into the cavity under the roofline. Placed at the rear was a smaller shed dormer, constructed between the two chimneys that contained a stairwell window and landing and a bathroom and a toilet.

In all of the case studies porches were a prominent feature. A number of these were a powerful physically architectural feature and in others quietly occupied a corner space. The façade porch at the Stapley house in terms of size was small in comparison to some of the

---

288 A previous owner of the Stapley residence. Interview, Rosalie Lunson, 14 January 2013 by Jennie Gainsford. Douce designed billiard rooms for some of his clients such as two Watt brothers, the Fisher house and the Vosper residence.
houses but comparable in size to others. The length of the rear covered porch would have provided sun and light into the rear of the house.

Additions and alterations are part of the journey of a house. The Stapley house had plans drawn in 1995 for additions and alterations, and at some stage the house was converted to accommodate a bed and breakfast business and later an Art and Fine Arts Gallery. Even though additions and alterations were undertaken the original design never greatly changed and the horizontal and the vertical were ingredients of the interior design. In some aspects the house had similar elements to the Lewis house in as much as they both had a high-pitched roofline that extended over an extended horizontal dormer window that terminated beyond the façade. This was certainly the case with the Stapley and the Lewis houses.

The interior decoration was kept to a minimum in the Stapley house. The downstairs architectural features included: ceilings were of batten and board construction with no added decorative cornices, ceiling roses, the majority of the doors were panelled and had a glass pane in the upper portion of the door and a simple dado railing to break the height of the walls. The decorative treatment of the windows was the only fenestration. The upper panes of the dining room windows were divided into two equal parts. The upper panes consisted of fanlights that had a grid pattern with stippled glass; whilst the lower panes had clear glass and were casement windows. The extended rectangular bay window in the lounge did not mirror the design of the dining room windows. The lounge windows were casement with the top third having a smaller pane; it is unclear if these were fanlights and had lead-lights. The billiard room windows pushed out, which were replicated in the upstairs bedroom. The front recessed porch had a low wall topped with a rectangular capital that surrounded one and half sides of the porch and where the columns connected with the porch roofline a simple L-shaped feature was added.

---

290 Case Study Number One, the Lewis House.  
291 Douce used the same design on his front porch.
Relationship to Setting

In 1917 the Stapley dwelling was built on the southern side of St. Andrews Anglican Church, and in close proximity to the Cambridge Town Hall and the Cambridge central business district.

Demolition

There were several issues that were not addressed when the application for demolition was received by the WDC. Its historical significance, its architectural merits, its categorisation as an important Cambridge vernacular building and its importance to the Cambridge community were overlooked at the time. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust recognised the Stapley house as a domestic dwelling of national importance and gave it a Category A listing. However, this did not protect the house from demolition.

![Fig. 34 During demolition it was discovered the house was reinforced with iron rods](image)

Limited information was available through the Waipa District Council records in as much the independent builder’s report was not lodged; the only record that was archived was for the

---

demolition of the building. Before permission was granted for demolition by the WDC neither an architectural nor a historical assessment was undertaken even though the dwelling was classified as a building of significance and was ranked with the highest historical category ‘Category A’ by the NZHPT. The St Andrews Village Trust owned the property and requested consent to demolish; they intended to build additional dwellings for elderly residents. They commissioned a report, which was undertaken by a builder and not by a qualified engineer. The report suggested there were some exterior and interior cracks.\footnote{The Cambridge community debated the demolition of this important historical house. The Anglican Church Trust intended building more retirement units on the land, which the Stapley house occupied. Even though the WDC had a heritage policy they did not support its preservation.} The report was not extensive in its appraisal and fell short of its obligation; inferences can be drawn that the assessment was to find a reason and justification for its demise. The Cambridge community was sceptical and vigorously debated the reasons given for demolition. It appears its architectural merits or its historical significance and its high status classification were ignored by the WDC.\footnote{Waipa District Council Property File, 111 Victoria Street archived at the Waipa District Council.}

**Client Background**

Walter Stapley was born in Bramfield, Sussex, England in 1871.\footnote{Obituary, *The Waikato Independent*, 22 & 25 May 1926, p.4. and Dr. Walter Stapley was one of three brothers, Lord Sir Harry Stapley (London) and Frank Stapley (Melbourne). Cambridge Museum A-Z Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum.} He studied veterinary science in London, England (he was a member of the College of Veterinary Science) obtaining a DCVSc degree. He left England to work in America where he took his MD degree to become a medical doctor. He travelled to New Zealand in 1905 (through the influence of Dr. Gilruth and Dr. Reakes of Wellington whom he had known in England) and stayed until 1908 (spending two years at Whakatane and one year at Hamilton). In 1908 he moved to Australia taking a five year contract at the University of Melbourne where he lectured in anatomy. In 1911 he married the widow Mrs. S.J. Cannon from California.\footnote{Obituary, *The Waikato Independent*, 14 December 1912, n.p.n. Cambridge Museum A-Z Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum.} In December of 1912 he left Australia and returned to New Zealand where he purchased D.E.E. Roberts practice in Cambridge. In 1916 Dr. Stapley held office as captain at the defence camps where he was the medical officer for WWI recruits in Cambridge.
Dr. W. Stapley was heavily involved in the community of Cambridge sitting on many boards and clubs. He died suddenly on the 21 May 1926 aged 55 years. Mr. & Mrs. Stapley did not have children and Mr. Stapley was survived by his two brothers Sir Harry Stapley of London and Alderman Frank Stanley of Melbourne (at one time mayor of the city). There is a memorial seat dedicated to Dr. Stapley at the entrance to Saint Andrews Church.

Fig. 35 Dr. Walter Stapley 1871-1926

297 ‘Obituary’ The Waikato Independent, 22 May 1926, p.4. A seat that occupies the entrance to St. Andrews Anglican Church was built as a memorial to Stapley. Cambridge Borough Council A-Z Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum.
298 Dr. Stapley’s brother Sir Henry Stapley died on the 23 October 1926. The Waikato Independent, 23 October 1926, p.4.
299 ‘Obituary’ The Waikato Independent, 30 April 1927, p.3.
300 Photographic Collection archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Case Study Number Four of 15

Name of the House: The Holmes House\textsuperscript{301}  
Date of Construction: Construction started prior to WWI but wasn't completed until 1920

Original Owner: Samuel (Farmer) and Phoebe Holmes

Street Address: 151 Pickering Road, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: W. Hogan\textsuperscript{302}

\textsuperscript{301}When the ‘Broadmeadows Estate’ was subdivided Samuel Holmes purchased lots 12, 13 and 14, which equaled 150 acres one rood and 12 perches – hectares. In 2000 the farm was sold to Cambridge Stud, who currently owns a large portion of the former ‘Broadmeadows’ Estate.

\textsuperscript{302}Interview, Myrtle Pearce, 7 February 2013 by Jennie Gainsford.
Background

Construction of the Holmes property commenced prior to WWI, however, the house wasn’t completed until 1920. According to the family, the unavailability of materials, the shortage of labour, because of men who enlisted for WWI, and Samuel’s enlistment in the army all contributed to the lengthy time it took to construct.\footnote{Samuel’s and Phoebe’s daughter Myrtle recollects conversations with her mother on who was the architect and the length of time it took to construct, and that she was only a few months old when they moved to their new house. Interview, Myrtle Pearce, 14 February 2002, Jennie Gainsford}

The Holmes farm was originally part of the Broadmeadows Estate, which comprised several crown grants that were issued to militiamen at the close of the Waikato Wars; the size of the allocation depended on their rank. The original allocations were to: James Tait (3 August 1866), Jeffrey Hall (29 November 1866), Robert Kirkwood (29 March 1867), James Rowles and John Runciman (30 March 1867), John Cooper (2 April 1867), David Wheatcroft (19 June 1867), William Stewart (16 August 1867) and Robert Hogarth (5 November 1867).\footnote{Land and Information New Zealand Application No. 6148 and Certificate of Title v265 f281.}

John Runciman together with his brother James subsequently purchased all these militia scripts to create a farm, which they named ‘Broadmeadows’. Some years later they sold the estate, which comprised of 500 acres to John Martyn.\footnote{Cambridge Museum Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum Archives.}\footnote{Eris Parker, Cambridge World War One: Something to Remember (Cambridge: Eris Parker, 2000), p.32.} Following Martyn’s\footnote{Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v293 f194.} death in 1916 the farm was left to William Main (brother-in-law), Ernest Martyn (Land Agent) and Alan Murray (cousin and Auckland solicitor). It appears these men subdivided the estate and leased their farms up until Holmes took title of part of the property on 31 October 1930.\footnote{The Waikato County’s jurisdiction covered the rural land outside of the Cambridge town belt.}

Tendering and Construction

The Waikato County Council was the civic authority that issued Samuel Holmes a building consent to construct a single storey dwelling on his farm in Pickering Road.\footnote{The Waikato County’s jurisdiction covered the rural land outside of the Cambridge town belt.} However, the paucity of architectural records and no extant WCC building permit record mean that confirmation of the date of construction cannot be verified through these sources. Although there are no official records, Samuel and Phoebe Holmes surviving children have confirmed the date of construction was 1920. Further confirmation was noted in the Waikato District Council Rates Books for the period of 1920/21 (Bruntwood, Hautapu Parish) that Samuel
Holmes rates had increased to £11/6s per annum, which was affirmation that a dwelling had been constructed during that rateable period. Even though Holmes had constructed a house on the farm the certificate of title was not issued until 31 October 1930.

**Style and Layout**

The house was a single storey dwelling built in concrete and designed on a rectangular plan with a low pitched roof where porches and extended square bay windows dominated the exterior. During the Inter-War period bungalows were at their height of fashion in architectural circles, and there were many styles and variants to cater for all clientele. The house does not totally fit the stylistic ideal description of a ‘Craftsman Bungalow’, ‘California Bungalow’ or English Cottage. In this instance Douce has blended bungalow styles and therefore the design of the Holmes house cannot be pinned or defined into one particular category. Two examples that best represent the Holmes dwelling can be seen in two bungalow types, one designed in England and the other in America. The British example of a seaside bungalow was designed in 1871 and was constructed on a standard rectangular plan with a low pitched roof; the only decorative elements to offset the plainness of the building were brackets and triangular patterns that were found within the gable. The American example known ‘Seacoast’ was built as a seaside abode. The architectural plan used the rectangle for the body of the building but expanded the design outwards to incorporate a complex rooffline over bay extensions. Both of these vernacular examples adhered to the principal of the rectangle. Saylor stated in ‘Bungalows’ (1911) ‘that the horizontal lines of the building was an intimate relationship between a home and its surroundings that creates an impression of peace and stability’. It is clear the Holmes dwelling adhered to Saylor’s comments and in part to the Arts and Crafts ideals of harmony with the landscape. This was reiterated later by Frank Lloyd Wright who designed buildings

---

309 Interview, Myrtle Pearce, 14 February 2002 by Jennie Gainsford.
310 Holmes may have rented the farm of William Main and Alan Murray Hume until such time he was able to purchase the property. Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v293f194. Holmes property was recorded as Bruntwood, Hautapu Parish, 292 acres, rated at £11/6s pa. Waikato County Council Rates, rateable period, 1920/21. The legal description in 2003 was Lot 1 DPS57965 BLK V111 Hamilton SD. The property became part of Cambridge Stud. In 2011 the legal description was Lot 2 DP 307374 Lot 2 91534 BLK VII HAMILTON SD.
311 Stamp, p.4.
312 King, p.78.
313 Saylor, pp.8 and 48.
314 Saylor, p.48.
using the American Arts and Crafts movement philosophies of the adherence of harmony with the environment. Strictly speaking the Holmes dwelling does not adhere completely to the Arts and Crafts principals but Douce has cleverly incorporated their ideals of harmony of a building and its site, which Douce followed religiously in many of his designs.

Fig. 37 Holmes House, English seaside bungalow c1871 and an example of the American seaside bungalow ‘Seacoast’


316 Mrs. Myrtle Pearce supplied the photographs of the house, 14 February 2002.
The Holmes family described the original interior layout. It included a lounge, a dining room, a kitchen, a study and five bedrooms with a laundry (a room off the back porch) and a toilet located on the back wall but not part of the interior layout; this arrangement did not change until the Holmes sold the farm in 1971. In 1995 major changes were implemented where the front and back rooms of the house reversed roles. Originally, the kitchen was located at the back of the house and two bedrooms occupied the front rooms of the house. At this time the wall between the bedrooms was removed and a kitchen and a family room were created. The former kitchen became a utility room. Apart from some minor changes the remainder of the original interior design remains unchanged.317

Again, porches were a strong feature of Douce's designs; a total of five covered porches were incorporated into the Holmes design. In conjunction with the porches the extended bay windows, as outlined in the design of 'Seacoast', have added an overall balance to the building but still the rectangle was the strong feature and visible in the design.

Some of the original features not connected with the house are still present such as the original concrete front fence with capitals and the 1920s garage. Both elements keep the bungalow style intact.

317 Interview Mr. & Mrs. Hogan, 30 August 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
Douce incorporated many standard features of American bungalows into the design of the Holmes dwelling. These were: exposed rafter ends, brackets, barge boards (at one time the barge boards ends were decorated but these have been shortened), a ventilator grill, overhangs for some of the windows, patterned lead-lights, batten and board ceilings with plastered panels and decorative ceiling roses (a common interior feature found in villas) and panelled and french doors. In the design of his concrete houses Douce commonly used concrete for window sills, capitals, porch sills, deep foundation walls and triangular windows, all are a feature of this residence. He also used simplistic decorative designs. These feature at the apex of the chimneys, panelled doors, porches and extended bay windows. To a point Douce’s designs reflect all that is American but in the Holmes dwelling there are several features that reflect English trends and etiquette reminiscent of the villa period in New Zealand. In American bungalows the front door opened directly into the lounge, however, in the Holmes layout the front door entry led directly into a vestibule where there was access to the lounge, the central hallway and the formal and public rooms of the house. Another villa feature used in the design was the length of the hallway; its role was to divide the house into two separate parts; on one side was located the lounge, the dining and the kitchen and on the other the bedrooms and an office. The exception was the placement of the front rooms; they occupied the entire front of the house. These features were common additions in some of the 15 houses. Originally the roof was covered in concrete tiles; these have been replaced

Stewart, pp.7 and 49.
with corrugated iron. As far can be ascertained this was the only dwelling to have had this type of roof tile.  

**Relationship to Setting**

The Holmes house was constructed in a rural setting. The façade faced Pickering Road and was sighted in a north easterly direction. The house was orientated to receive the morning, midday and afternoon sun. However, the rear of the house where the kitchen was located looked south.

In comparison to other houses discussed in the stylistic analysis the design of the Holmes homestead was not repeated by Douce in Cambridge.

**Client Background**

In 1907 Samuel Holmes married Phoebe Durston Richmond. They had eight children; 1907 Margaret Elizabeth, 1909 Andrew James, 1910 Olive Lydia, 1911 Edith May, 1913 Norman Dudley, Alexander Baird, Myrtle and Samuel Gordon. In 1917 Samuel enlisted in the NZ Expeditionary Force, 33rd reinforcements New Zealand Medical Corps and departed Wellington on 31 December 1917. He arrived in Glasgow, Scotland on 25 February 1918. Samuel Holmes attended the first annual meeting of the dairy farmers Union, Hautapu Branch was held on the 6 July 1922. Holmes purchased 292 acres when the ‘Broadmeadow’ Estate was subdivided but did not take title until 1930. On his death in 1960 the farm was transferred to his sons Samuel Gordon and Andrew James. There were several owners until the property was sold to Cambridge Stud (2002) and the farm once again became part of the former ‘Broadmeadow’ Estate.

---

319 On-site Analysis by Jennie Gainsford 2012.
320 Department of Internal Affairs, Births, Deaths and Marriages and Interview, Myrtle Pearce, 7 February 2013 by Jennie Gainsford.
321 ‘Local and General News’ The Waikato Independent, 6 July 1922, p.5.
Photograph courtesy of Myrtle Pearce nee Holmes.

322 Photograph courtesy of Myrtle Pearce nee Holmes.
Case Study Number Five of 15

Name of the House: ‘Gainsford’  
Date of Construction: 1920

Original Owner: George Robert Clark (Businessman) and Maud Frances Calvert

Street Address: 137 Victoria Street, Cambridge (originally the house was on the corner of Victoria and Clare Streets)

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: Speight, Pearce, Nichol & Davys

Fig. 41 The Calvert house

May Calvert, daughter-in-law of George Robert Clark Calvert, declared the Calvert house was named after the village her father in law had previously lived in England. May Calvert was the daughter of Phoebe and Samuel Holmes. It was her parents who commissioned Douce to design a house for them in Pickering Road, Cambridge. Interview, May Calvert by Jennie Gainsford, 2003 and The Waikato Independent, 16 May 1931, Local and General News.

Background

In 1920 George Robert Clark Calvert commissioned James Douce to design a two-storied roughcast concrete house on a prominent corner site of Victoria and Clare Streets, Cambridge; a modern house for modern times.\footnote{Gould, pp.10-14.}

The historic patterns are defined in the ownership of the land since 1864. On 15 September 1863 Charles Barton enlisted in number 2 Company of the 3rd Waikato Regiment: his regiment number was 674. After the Waikato wars Cambridge was subdivided into one acre lots and militiaman were granted one town acre plus 50 acres of rural land.\footnote{Vennell, pp.93-94.} Barton was allotted allotment153 in Victoria Street in 1867 and was also allocated farm lot number 31 at Karamu (the surveyors for the area were Pitcairn and Winter).\footnote{National Archives Wellington Reference Number AD7771 and Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 2F 502, Reference 2GF 225.}

Some of the one acre lots were not allocated to militiamen and many settlers purchased the land. In 1908 the certificate of title recorded that Edward Evan Roberts owned one entire block, which encompassed all the land bounded by Clare Street West, Bryce Street, Hamilton Road (HWY One) and Victoria Street. After Roberts's death his wife Annie Sarah subdivided the land and George Robert Clark Calvert purchased lots 10 and 11 on 24 July 1919. A mortgage was procured from Neville Souter\footnote{Neville Souter was a prominent businessman in Cambridge.} in 1920.\footnote{Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v 148 f 200 and v 222 f 215.}

Tendering and Construction

A tender was not advertised in the \textit{Waikato Independent} for the construction of Calvert's dwelling by Douce. Confirmation that he was the architect and the date of construction, were recorded in the Cambridge Borough Council building permit register.\footnote{Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register July 1920 archived at the Cambridge Museum.} As noted in the CBC minutes an application for a building permit was received by council on 6 July 1920 and they approved the architectural plans on 9 July 1920 subject to a drainage plan undertaken by them.\footnote{On 9 July 1920 the CBC approved two separate house plans by Douce; one for George Calvert and a house for Douce. Both were subject to Council receiving satisfactory drainage plans. Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 23 July 1920, p.34. and Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 6 July 1920, p.25.} Calvert, McCann and Douce experienced drainage problems before and during the construction of their respective dwellings and required CBC approval before construction
could proceed (a common occurrence for homeowners in Cambridge due to the lack of proper infrastructure during the 1920s).

The CBC building permit registered the house as a two-storied dwelling with a corrugated iron roof. The layout consisted of nine main rooms; however, it appears the laundry was not included in the room count as it was located next to the kitchen. It was 39,732 cubic feet (248.97 m2)\(^{332}\) in total with a frontage of 43 or 48 and a depth of 42, and a height 22. The cost of construction was £2000, a considerable sum in 1920,\(^{333}\) and was classed as a Class 3 building, which meant the cost of construction was between £1500 and £2000; the build incurred a council fee of £3.\(^{334}\) Two years later the CBC reviewed the building by-laws and Calvert’s dwelling would have been elevated to Class 7 and the cost of obtaining a CBC permit had risen by £9.\(^{335}\) The building firm who constructed the Calvert house was Speight, Pearce, Nichol & Davys; they were the largest building firm in Cambridge.\(^{336}\)

**Style and Layout**

According to Ralph Allen, by the 1920s the architecture of New Zealand became more American in style due to the proliferation of overseas catalogues and magazines.\(^{337}\) Douce understood this type of architecture and was influenced by the bungalow style and incorporated American elements in the design of his concrete houses as early as 1914. This was the fifth house in the series of concrete houses Douce designed in the craftsman style, the fourth two-storied house and the second house to be constructed on a square footprint.\(^{338}\) The Calvert residence gave the appearance of solidity and permanence, demonstrated through the stature of the chimneys, the complex roof geometry and elevated gables, which all culminated in highlighting the visual impact of height.\(^{339}\) Decorative bungalow architectural features were inserted in the design of the Calvert house such as brackets to support the barge boards, decorative terminus ends of the barge boards,

\(^{332}\) Valuation New Zealand valuation 1954 (now Quotable Value).

\(^{333}\) The Calvert house was constructed two years after WWI at a time when building supplies and labour were scarce.

\(^{334}\) Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register July 1920 archived at the Cambridge Museum.

\(^{335}\) Cambridge Borough Council new Building by-laws became operative on 1 January 1923.

\(^{336}\) A personal brief account of the Calvert Family, Calvert Family Papers, Roy Calvert, The History of the Calvert Home, n.p.n.


\(^{338}\) The first of this type designed by Douce was for a domestic dwelling for John Wilson in 1916.

\(^{339}\) ‘Architectural Notes’ *Progress*, 1 May 1906, p.166.
overhanging eaves with exposed rafter ends placed underneath, casement windows with opening fanlights and porches. These were clear design markers used by Douce in the construction of his concrete bungalows.340

The square plan allowed for the reduction of hallway space; it was a pivotal philosophy of American bungalow architecture to reduce unnecessary hall space. 341 Spatially, all rooms were designed to radiate from a central hallway. The Calvert house embodied this perspective; the front entrance downstairs was the linchpin to these rooms; this area included the centrally placed stairwell. Rooms such as the office, the dining room, the kitchen and the lounge and a large north facing porch (now part of the lounge) were accessed from this space. The downstairs has a compact layout with ease of movement. The rear of the house faced west and the kitchen, the laundry, maid’s room and the recessed porch were arranged along this wall.

Porches were a prominent feature of Douce’s domestic designs. The Calvert House was no exception it had five recessed porches incorporated into its design; three downstairs and two upstairs.342

The upstairs originally comprised three bedrooms, two porches (one that faced east was a sleeping porch with a canvas awning343 and the other faced west) and a bathroom. Over

340 Wilson, pp.3-16.
341 Maddex and Vertikoff, pp. 11-23.
342 Thornton, p.138.
343 Chase, pp.29-32.
time both the porches were enclosed to create extra floor space. All rooms radiated from a central landing and another small hallway led to the master bedroom. Wardrobes and cupboards were created using the space under the roofline.344

Additions and alterations have changed some areas of the layout in the Calvert house. The kitchen was altered and the maid’s room was redesigned as a bathroom and the upstairs bathroom was reformatted, but not to the degree where the original plan was impaired. In the original design there were imposing lead-light doors that led out to the downstairs north porch from the hall; these were removed and replaced with a window. 345

Fig. 43 Photograph taken 1970s before the land was subdivided

Relationship to Setting

The Calvert house was built for street appeal; an imposing structure built on a corner site. During the villa period the facades of houses were orientated to look directly to the street.346 Even though the orientation of the sun was important the majority of bungalows were built with the façade facing directly and not angled to the street. 347 Not a practical aspect for some houses, however, the Calvert’s front porch received the morning sun. The north facing porch received sun throughout the day and the rear porches that faced west the late afternoon sun. At the time Douce designed the Calvert house he was at the height of his

345 Interview, May Calvert by Jennie Gainsford, 2003., Interview, Kevin Marks by Jennie Gainsford, 7 March 2013, and an on-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 2013.
346 Wilson, p.37.
347 Moloney, pp.1-2.
career and in terms of designing concrete American inspired bungalows he was leading the way.\[^{348}\]

**Client Background**

In 1879 George Robert Cark Calvert born at Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England and was the son of Barnard and Julia Calvert. George Calvert began his career in the drapery trade in Yorkshire before working for a large glove and hosiery business in London. In 1904 he immigrated to Auckland, New Zealand and from 1904 to 1913 he worked for Smith & Caughey Ltd., a prominent Auckland department store. In 1909 George Calvert married Maude Frances Robinson by Rev. G.W. Smailes at the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Auckland.\[^{349}\]

In 1913 George Calvert moved to Cambridge where he purchased Mr. R. Tudhope’s drapery business. Under the guidance of George the business expanded and more floor space was added to accommodate new departments. New premises were built called ‘Calvert Chambers’ (1925) this allowed for more upstairs office and shop space.\[^{350}\]

George became a prominent member in local body affairs. He devoted 25 years of service to the Cambridge Borough Council. He was a member of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, secretary and later chairman of the Cambridge Primary School Committee and also served on the YMCA committee. In 1922 the Waikato Independent reported he was selected as a vestryman in the Anglican Church.\[^{351}\] He was a keen golfer and angler and spent time fishing at his house at Lake Taupo.

George and Maude had three sons, Roy Oldfield, Maurice George and Douglas Frank and three daughters Rona Maude, Barbara Joan and Betty Margaret. George passed away in Te Awamutu on 16 June 1963 leaving 17 grandchildren and four great grandchildren. At the time of his death his estate was valued at £55,000.\[^{352}\]


\[^{351}\] The Waikato Independent, 8 April 1922, p.5.

\[^{352}\] Archives New Zealand, Item ID. R16596339 Record No. 409/1963.
Fig. 44 Robert George Clark seated in the front row supporting the shield
Case Study Number Six of 15

Name of the House: The Douce House                        Date of Construction: 1920

Original Owner: James Thomas (Architect) and Alma Gertrude Douce

Street Address: 96 Hall Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce                             Builder: Unknown
Background

In 1920 Douce designed a two storied house for himself and his wife Alma to be located on two acres of land on the corner of Hall and King Streets, Cambridge.

At the conclusion of the Waikato Wars in 1864 men who had served in the four Waikato Regiments as military settlers were allocated land according to rank. Each man received a town acre and one farm section through a ballot system; however, officers had first choice before the unlisted ranks. Thomas Rennie was allotted the town acre 513 in Cambridge East located on the corner of Hall and King Streets on 30 March 1867 (he was also allocated farm lot 157 at Ohaupo – the surveyor for the area was Maudesley). Rennie had enlisted as a private in Ten Company, regiment number 1053, on 3 December 1863. The first certificate of title was issued for two one acre militia allotments numbers 513 and 512 in Cambridge. They were purchased by George Dickinson in 1915. In 1918 he transferred the land to his daughter Alma Gertrude Douce nee Dickinson, wife of James Thomas Douce, Architect. The house was recorded and all mortgages were raised in her name. On 11 August 1945 the property transferred from Alma Gertrude Douce to Lloyd Albert Williams. He purchased the house and the business from James and Alma on Douce’s retirement. It appears the acre allotments 512 and 513 were subdivided during the 1960s, and in September 1963 lot 9 of DPS 8546 became a public street.

Tendering and Construction

Recorded in the CBC building permit register the cost of construction was £1700 and the house was 29.971 cubic feet (875 cubic metres) in size: (frontage: 34 feet/10.5 metres, depth: 41 feet/12.6 metres, and height: 21.6 feet/6.6 metres). A builder’s fee of £1 was charged by the CBC, which was recorded as paid. Defined in the 1923 CBC building guidelines for new structures, the cost of obtaining a building permit had increased from £1 to 15 shillings and number 3 class of building.

---

353 Vennell, pp.93-94.
354 Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 2F 502, Reference 2GF 225.
355 Archives New Zealand, AD 77I, 1866 Land Army Department Land Register.
356 Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, Application 5477 and v234 f 238.
357 Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register archived at the Cambridge Museum.
On 23 July 1920 Douce applied to the CBC for a building permit; this was approved by the Cambridge Borough Council on 31 July 1920. However, before construction could take place the council inspector had to approve the site due to a drainage problem. It appears Hall Street experienced drainage problems prior to and throughout the early part of the 1920s and the council engineer would approve Douce’s house plans as long as the drainage problems were remedied. The Board of Trade granted a permit for building materials for this house. During later additions and alterations it was discovered that Douce had constructed his house on a concrete base with a layer of hard pressed red clay.

A tender was not advertised for the construction of the Douce house and there are no records to establish what builder was contracted to build his home. He had used the services of many builders, from Cambridge and Hamilton; the most likely candidate was William White because they had worked together on previous projects. Mr. White had built 94 Princes Street and 1682 Hamilton Road, Cambridge and he was advertising his services in conjunction with Douce in the local newspaper.

Style and Layout

It's apparent that a straightforward approach was inaugurated in the design of this house. New Zealand bungalows had a tendency to follow American trends in style and decoration as opposed to the English Cottage style. However, the inter-war bungalows were an eclectic mix of both with the American style the most prominent. The Douce house was constructed in concrete with a textured rough-cast finish constructed on a square footprint akin to American bungalows. In the design of the exterior Douce has achieved simplicity and he limited the fenestration in the design of his own home. The complexity of the roofline was reduced; its steep pitch to the gutter line was intercepted by three shed dormers; the façade and two at the rear. The façade dormer gable was bracketed and not embellished and it

358 Reported in the Waikato Independent the CBC had granted Douce a Building Permit at the CBC meeting 30 July 1920, p.4. Cambridge Borough Council drainage report. The Waikato Independent, ‘Local and General’ 31 July 1920, p.5.
359 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 23 July 1920, p.34.
360 During renovations the owners of the property discovered the house had been constructed on concrete, with a layer of red clay. Douce used this form of construction for a commercial building for the Veale Family on the corner of Victoria and Duke Streets, Cambridge. Interview Mr. and Mrs. Braggins by Jennie Gainsford, 9 August 2011.
362 Stamp, p.3.
363 Robertson, pp.8-9.
appears the rear dormers originally had small balconies. The walls are not intercepted by a foundation wall but were built to ground level as found with Arts and Crafts bungalows. However, because of its height the house does not give the impression of being part of the landscape. In some respects it is a blend of the craftsman bungalow and the Arts and Crafts styles.364

The interior was treated in the same manner as the exterior. The decorative elements in the Douce house were kept to a minimum with few interior fixtures; no decorative plaster work, picture railings or panelled walls, however, the doors are typical panelled doors that were used during the bungalow period. The only notable interior decorative features are the fireplaces, the newel posts, ocular windows365 and the cross hatched pattern of the remaining lead-lights. The living room and the billiard rooms are large; the doors between these two rooms do not appear to be original as they are not of a style that Douce favoured. The living room has two circular lead light windows either side of the fireplace with the same cross hatched pattern as the fan lights. The Douce house is very American in design; simplicity and internal division.

![Ocular cross hatched lead-light window](image)

The downstairs and upstairs were designed to reduce unnecessary hall space keeping it to the minimum.366 The spatial area of the interior was condensed that gave a square-like appearance that replicated the exterior. Douce made good use of the interior space similar to the designs of Craftsman and California bungalows. The design was compact and he

---

364 Butler, p.4.
365 The ocular window was a feature often used in the design of English Cottage bungalows. Garden City Houses and Domestic Interior Detail, The Architectural Press, 1924.
366 Saylor, pp.63-85.
eliminated unnecessary space by keeping hall areas to an absolute minimum. A small vestibule was the centre of downstairs interior of the house, through, which the living room and the kitchen are accessed. All other downstairs rooms including a dining room, study, and billiard room are interconnected to cut down hallways. Douce continued the same concept upstairs with the bedrooms and bathroom arranged around a small central landing. Each of the four bedrooms was designed with built-in wardrobes and there are several built in storage cupboards making use of the space under the roofline. Both of these aspects are akin to American bungalow design. Phillips stated ‘the standard of achievement in a bungalow was its general simplicity’.

Recessed porches constructed under the roofline are a strong feature of all 15 houses. The front porch a vital part of American bungalow design was the pivotal and restful space that connected the indoors with the outdoors. Douce designed different and varying sized porches for each of these houses. He planned his porch on rectangular lines with a deep recess. The rear porch was designed in the same manner.

Fig. 47 Plans drawn by Tessa Smulders (Antanas Procuta Architects, Hamilton): first and second floor scale 1:200

First Floor

Second Floor

368 Phillips, pp.9-11.
369 Ibid, p.11.
Relationship to Setting

The location of James's and Alma's residence was situated on the western side of Cambridge East on the corner of Hall and King Streets, Cambridge. Historically Hall Street was the main thoroughfare from the Waikato River to the Cambridge Racing Club in Taylor Street. The street lined with oaks has given this area of Cambridge a majestic setting. While Douce constructed his own house he also designed a house for the McCann's, which was built on the opposite corner. Both would have made a strong architectural statement because they were constructed in concrete with an American influence in their design. The Douce house was constructed on a prominent corner site with the façade facing Hall Street and the rear of the house looked out to the green belt. The house was well positioned to maximize the rotation of the sun.

At the time Douce designed his own dwelling he also designed five other substantial two storied concrete houses in Cambridge. They are all stylistically similar and all but one was built on a corner site.

Client Background

Douce retired to Milford on the North Shore of Auckland. He purchased one rood and one perch, lot 40 DP12137 portion of Allotment 84 in the Parish of Takapuna off William Reginald Williams. The land value was registered as £325 and Douce paid cash for the section.

---

370 The houses were: 94 Princes Street, 94 Hall Street, 158 Victoria Street and 1682 Hamilton Road.
Case Study Number Seven of 15

Name of the House: The Fisher House  Date of Construction: 1920

Original Owner: James William (Farmer) and Mary Beatrice Fisher

Street Address: 1567 Hamilton Road, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  Builder: Unknown

Fig. 48 The Fisher House
Background

In 1920 James Douce designed a house for James William Fisher situated on Hamilton Road. The Waikato County Council was the regional authority who issued Fisher with a building permit to construct his dwelling; there are no extant building permit records for this period. In 1921 the WCC rates register revealed that Fisher was the owner of the property at the end of that ratable period.\(^\text{371}\)

James William Fisher built his house on land that had previously been allocated as a Crown grant to George Henry Heigen on 29 March 1867.\(^\text{372}\) He was a sergeant in Fourth Waikato Company of the Third Waikato Militia. He enrolled on 23 September 1863 and his regiment number was 505. After his tenure in the militia he was allocated lot 382 in Cambridge East and lots 39 and 40 and 80 acres in the Pukerimu District on 22 September 1867.\(^\text{373}\)

On 1 September 1920 Fisher purchased lot 39 and part lot 40 from a man called Forest\(^\text{374}\) and procured a mortgage from him with the intention of building a residence.\(^\text{375}\) Fisher farmed at this address until he sold the property to Wallace Leith Sinton on 15 August 1952.\(^\text{376}\) Eventually the house and five acres were subdivided and issued with a separate title.

Tendering and Construction

At the beginning of the 1920s Douce designed two concrete houses in Hamilton Road for James Fisher and Innes Taylor. Only a single tender was advertised, therefore, it was unclear whose house it referenced. A court case between Taylor and the builder William White over the cost of construction of the Taylor house revealed that it was constructed sometime between March 1921 and March 1922.\(^\text{377}\) Therefore it is assumed that the tender referred to the Fisher House. On 23 October 1920 the \textit{Waikato Independent} reported that J.T. Douce had called tenders for the construction of a house in concrete in Hamilton Road.

\(^{371}\) Waikato County Council Rates Register for 1921 archived at the Waikato District Council, Ngaruawahia.

\(^{372}\) Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 1f 186 and Application Number 15275c, Date of Instrument, 29 March 1867.

\(^{373}\) The surveyor for the area was Bellair. Archives New Zealand, Reference AD 771, 1866 Army Department Land Register.

\(^{374}\) Forest was an early settler to the Cambridge district and had the distinction of a road named after him. Kay Carter, Fishers of Pukerimu (Cambridge: Kay Carter, 1998), p. .

\(^{375}\) Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 1f 186 and Application Number 15275c.

\(^{376}\) Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v551 r275.

Noted on the same day under the heading General News, ‘tenders were invited for the erection of still another concrete house in Cambridge’. The viewing of the plans and specifications could be undertaken at Douce’s office in Alpha Street; tenders closed at 5pm on Friday 5 November.

**Style and Layout**

The Fisher house was designed on a rectangle footprint. Even though the side elevations and the steep pitch of the roofline indicated height, the facade and rear elevations have given the impression the house was intended to be anchored to the landscape. In terms of architectural planning and technique Douce in the design of the Fisher house combined two American bungalow architectural styles; the front and rear elevations display the style of American Arts and Crafts and the side elevations exhibit the design of the American bungalows built on a square plan. As with previous houses designed by Douce porches featured strongly and there are a total of five fashioned into the design of this house. The porches all have concrete ledges and sills, with varying degrees of other style elements. The most important stylistic features were reserved for the front porch entrance; even though simplistic, compact and square in design it contains all the hallmarks of Douce’s porches such as a panelled door, lead-light window set to the side of the door, concrete columns and in this instance paired and joined at the corner with understated brackets. These have given the porch an arched appearance. Douce in the design of this house has offset the porch, which has given the overall facade an asymmetrical appearance. However, the dormer window aligns itself with the porch, keeping in mind the left hand side of the dormer was originally a porch (the dormer window and porch were similar in design to 94 Princes Street). It appears the largest downstairs porch located on the corner of the façade and the north elevation could have had some type of widow treatment as it appears as it acted as the transitional space between the formal lounge and dining room. The rear porch was also large and faced west. The original garage remains in situ.

---

379 ‘Tender’ The Waikato Independent, 23 October 1920, p.4.
380 Maddex and Vertikoff, pp.11-19.
381 Phillips, p.10.
382 Douce used this type of bracket in the design of his front porch.
The horizontal and the vertical combine to give a well-balanced design. Visually the horizontal is defined through the elongated roofline apex, the gutter line, the shed dormer, the windows and the window sills and the vertical with chimneys, columns and the fall of the roofline.

The internal subdivision illustrates the layout and it is unclear how parts of the original interior were arranged. The downstairs contained a study, a kitchen and four large rooms; keeping in mind there are no hallways connecting these rooms.\textsuperscript{383} Two are confirmed as the lounge and the billiard room; these rooms were accessed from the front entrance, however, the function of the other two remains unclear. One of the rooms led directly from the west porch to a large room with a fireplace; it was too large for a vestibule. The west porch was wide, large and may have been originally enclosed as the ceiling was constructed with batten and board that mirrored the type ceiling used in the construction of many bungalows; this indicated it probably was an internal porch. If this was the case and taking into account the layout of Douce’s other houses he designed, it appears the large room off the back porch was most likely the informal eating area because of its close relationship with the back porch and was the ideal space for farmers to enter the house.\textsuperscript{384}

This would have kept the public and private areas of the house separated.\textsuperscript{385} The last room indicated it was used as a formal dining room due to the fact it contained a dining hatch from the kitchen, it once had double doors that separated the formal and informal spaces and it too had a fireplace. However, the size of the existing kitchen appears too small for the 1920s and the arrangement of the windows bears this out; it may have originally been two rooms. This could point towards Mrs. Fisher having a cook. The only downstairs hallway was diminutive in length, it lead to a laundry and a toilet and to the outside. Coming back to the corner porch, it may have been the connection between the lounge and the dining room; in some respects this porch may have originally had opening widows but these appear to have been changed. If this was the case the porch acted as a transitional space to connect rooms

\textsuperscript{383} Phillips, p.10.
\textsuperscript{384} On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 2 April 2013.
\textsuperscript{385} The New Zealand bungalow was heavily influenced by American bungalows and many variants of the design were constructed throughout the country. The American bungalow was not hindered by etiquette, however, some New Zealand bungalows in their design still applied the villa architectural principals of separating the public and private areas of the house. *Making New Zealand: A Pictorial Survey of a Century*, v.2. No. 20, p.20.
as well as an area that promoted the American bungalow ideal of bringing the outdoors indoor and the indoors outdoor; this appears to be the way this house was designed.\textsuperscript{386} The stairwell led from the front entrance straight up to the upstairs. Not as wide nor as decorated as other stairwells Douce designed. The landing has given rise to its original design and function. At the top of the stairs there are two steps that lead through french doors onto a flat surfaced porch area; at the side of the stairwell landing there is a rather small room (perhaps a maid’s room) that also has french doors out to the porch. The doors look original but there are questions as to whether the original design of the porch has been altered.

Upstairs there are three bedrooms, a bathroom and a toilet. The hallway dissects the upstairs with the two main bedrooms, which are large and are located at either end of the house; the dormer bedroom was smaller in size. All bedrooms had wardrobes incorporated under the roofline. The east facing porch once open located within the dormer framework is now enclosed with casement windows. An interior window located on the hallway proves a dormer porch was part of the original design.

Typical bungalow features displayed in the Fisher house are: casement windows, lead-lights and cross hatching, panelled doors with knobs and back plates (1920s), the billiard room had window seats (not a common feature in Douce houses), batten and board ceilings and all four main rooms had a fireplace.\textsuperscript{387} The downstairs rooms had a stud height of ten feet and a lower ceiling height upstairs.

Typical of Douce’s houses was the use of a wide floor board either in rimu or totara and a structural porch wall suggests the house walls were built with a thickness of four inches; this was the general rule for all of Douce’s houses.\textsuperscript{388}

\textsuperscript{386} Maddex and Vertikoff, pp.19-26. and Chase, p.32.
\textsuperscript{387} On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 2 April 2013.
\textsuperscript{388} Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Relationship to Setting

The Fisher house was originally situated on Forest Road. However, access to the property is now off highway one, the main road between Cambridge and Hamilton. The house was built in an east west direction with the facade having a rural aspect that faced east towards Forrest Road. The Fisher, the Taylor and the two houses designed for the Watt brothers, are all strong architectural statements and all dominate their rural settings.
Client Background

James William Fisher was born on 22 March 1876 and was one of ten children born to John and Margaret Fisher. They were married in 1867 and farmed at Pukenimu, Cambridge. John Fisher enlisted in the 3rd Waikato Militia in Cambridge on 7 July 1866 and was a member of Colonel Nixon's Royal Cavalry Corps; he received the New Zealand War Medal for active service. James William Fisher (32) married Mary Beatrice nee Brown (38) in 1908; they remained childless. Mary’s brother was Wynn Brown, who at one time, was the master of the hounds for the Waikato Hunt Club.389 James William Fisher died on 25 March 1955 and his wife Mary Beatrice predeceased him in 1930; both are buried in the Tamahere cemetery. He left an estate of £15,000.00.390

390 Department of Internal Affairs, Birth, Death and Marriages and Archives New Zealand, Last Will and Testament, Item ID R16600023 Record No. 71/1968.
Case Study Number Eight of 15

Name of the House: ‘Craigneil’  
Date of Construction: 1921

‘Craigneil’ was the original name of the property; during the 1950s the name changed to ‘Brecon’ and became ‘Magnolia Cottage’ in 2002.

Original Owner: Gilbert McCandlish (Farmer) and Agnes Elizabeth Watt

Street Address: 60 Forrest Road, Cambridge (located on the corner of Forrest and Racecourse Roads)

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: Unknown

---

Fig. 51 The Gilbert Watt house

---

391 Waikato County Council, Rates Register 1922/23 archived at the Waikato District Council at Ngaruawahia.
392 Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 3F.147, 166 app no15256c recorded that Gilbert McCandlish Watt obtained a mortgage from Wells for the purpose of building a residence on 1 December 1920. Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v551 f254, and Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 3F.147, 166 app no15256c.
393 The house was renamed ‘Magnolia Cottage’ in 2002.
Background

In 1921 Gilbert Watt commissioned James Thomas Douce to construct a single storey concrete dwelling on prominent rural site located on the corner of Forrest and Racecourse Roads, Cambridge. In the same year Douce designed a house for his brother James Alexander Watt on the corner of Hannon and Racecourse Roads and tenders were called on 24 February 1921. The two houses were constructed at a similar time and both were designed along the philosophic lines of the Arts and Crafts movement of harmony with the landscape. Inferences and conclusions summarised that Douce was the architect of this dwelling. At first, partial primary documentation made it difficult to ascertain the house was designed by Douce.

On 25 April 1867 James Forrest who had enlisted in the 3rd Waikato Militia was allocated a Crown Grant of 80 acres located on the corner of Forrest and Racecourse Roads after his tenure in the militia. In addition a further grant of 20 acres was allocated to Forrest in 1871. In 1882 Forrest sold part of the property to a Mr. Nathan and further land to George Watt in 1910.

To confirm the date of construction information was extracted from the Deeds indexes located at the Land and Information Records Office in Auckland and through the certificate of title. As stated, George Watt had purchased land located on the corner of Forrest and Racecourse Roads in 1910. After his death part of the property at 60 Forrest Road, Cambridge was transferred to his son Gilbert McCandlish Watt in 1918. On 1 December 1920 Watt instigated the conveyance and procured a mortgage for the purpose of a ‘residence’.

Tendering and Construction

There were no extant Waikato County Council building permit records for the 1920s and research conducted through the Waikato Independent did not reveal a tender notice. To establish Douce was the architect conclusions were drawn from several sources such as;

---

395 Saylor, pp. 41-43. Interview, Brian Thomsen, 5 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
397 Archive New Zealand, Deeds Index 3F 147.
398 Ibid.
399 The words ‘for res’ were recorded in the Deeds Index vol 254 folio 254.
Gilbert’s brother’s house ‘Blairgowie’ was also designed by Douce and both houses were designed on similar lines to houses previously designed by Douce and were all built in concrete. Confirmation that Douce was the architect was through a former owner of the house who had possession of the home from 1943 to 1953. He also confirmed that Douce was the architect.

**Style and Layout**

The Watt brothers’ dwellings were the last two houses Douce designed on a rectangular footprint. In 1954 Valuation New Zealand (Quotable Value) carried out an assessment and recorded the floor area of ‘Craigneil’ as 248.97m2. The majority of the internal walls were built in concrete. The elongated appearance of the house and the walls not interrupted by a foundation wall further anchor the house to the land and appear to blend into the landscape. As a single storey dwelling the gradient of the roof pitch was not as steep as his two-storied house designs. Apart from this, the visual appearance of the facade exhibits a sense of symmetry. The south elevation revealed asymmetrical lines of the gables.

Douce emphasized the horizontal in the design of the Watt house and this can be visually seen in the: top trim on the chimneys, the elongated length of the pitched roofline, the gutter line, fanlight and casement windows, window sills and porch sills all highlight the lengthening of the house and drawing the house further into the landscape. The vertical elements such as the tall chimneys and columns are the only elements that pierce the horizontal. Craigneil consistently reflects consistent elements that are part of American Arts and Crafts residences. After the construction of this house Douce turned his attention to designing bungalows on a square footprint.

---

400 There were four rural houses designed by Douce in close proximity to each other: the Watt residences, the Fisher house and the dwelling for Innes Taylor. Douce did not leave Cambridge to live in Auckland until 1945. Interview, Mrs. Lauren Sinton, 11 April 2005 by Jennie Gainsford. Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v 551 f256.

401 A common feature of California Bungalows. Ashford, pp.32 and 38.

402 On-site analysis, 5 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
The exterior was designed in three clear distinctive sections and this aspect was replicated in the interior layout. It appears the house has undergone alterations. A recessed gap was located between the northern and middle sections of the house, and on reflection appears to be out of character; it looks as if an addition had taken place. The type of stucco used appears the same as the original so it could infer that alterations were carried out not long after the house was constructed. Another indication can be seen where some of the barge boards appear cluttered and this could be due to later additions. However, with the absence of architectural plans there was difficulty in substantiating the theory.
The interior was arranged with a central section and two distinctive wings. The northern section contained a porch (that appears to have been later converted to a sunroom), bedrooms, a bathroom, a toilet and a door that led out directly onto the recessed back porch. The middle section included a kitchen (scullery), an informal eating area, a lounge, a dining room and an office that had access to the outside. The southern section was the billiard room, which could be accessed to the front like the office.\textsuperscript{403} It appears the house was arranged to have clear distinctions between the public and private areas of the house; typical features of the villa period.\textsuperscript{404} The reason for the clear distinctions could be that all public areas were arranged on one side of the house for entertaining.

\textsuperscript{403} On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford. Interview, Brian Thomsen, 5 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
\textsuperscript{404} Stewart, p.49.
Recessed porches are a feature of Craigneil. A smaller square porch faced the street, one at the rear faced east and another faced north (french doors led from the main bedroom onto the porch).

As in typical bungalow fashion the decorative elements are reminiscent in Craigneil. The placement of brackets in the gables, simplistic barge boards (decorated with a simple three holed embellishment), exposed rafter ends, vertical porch columns with a column bracket similar to the dwellings that Douce designed for his and the Stapley house. The extended rectangular bay window was a feature in this house also the Stapley and Holmes houses and these are decorative and diamond pattern lead-lights and casement windows. The interior has batten and board ceilings, decorative plaster work and panelled doors.405

The interior layout of the house has been altered but not to the point where the original layout is hard to decipher. Except for the kitchen area, the rooms largely remain as they were when constructed. Distinctive features that are found in Douce houses and present

---

405 On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford, 5 September 2011.
here are: an office that could be accessed from the outside and from the interior and a billiard room. There were originally three chimneys but only two are extant. The rooms that had fireplaces were the kitchen, the dining room, the lounge and the main bedroom. This chimney was removed at some stage but the fireplace remains in situ.406

Douce designed his houses to have built in furniture. In this Watt house Douce had all wardrobes, linen and storage cupboards recessed into the wall cavities.407

Relationship to Setting

Geographically, the house was positioned in an east west direction with the back porch facing east and the front porch facing west and towards the street (the majority of houses Douce designed were constructed in this manner). Craigneil was built in a rural setting situated approximately five kilometres from the Cambridge Town Centre.

Client Background

In 1871 George Watt, Gilbert’s father, came to live in Cambridge. By November 1872 he had purchased a farm and established himself as a farmer. In the same year he enrolled as a trooper in the Cambridge Cavalry Volunteers. In 1873 he returned to Christchurch where he Married Elizabeth Clark McCandlish. Gilbert Watt was born in 1877 and was the eldest child and eldest son of George’s and Elizabeth’s 11 children (Jessie, James, Mary, John Alexander, Helen, Charles, Elizabeth Clark, George, Grace and Margaret). His father George was heavily involved in dairy industry and at one time operated a dairy factory.


406 Ibid.
407 Ibid.
Case Study Number Nine of 15

Name of the House: ‘Blairgowie’  
Date of Construction: 1921

Original Owner: John Alexander (Farmer) and Rose Anne Watt

Street Address: 171 Hannon Road (formerly Station Road), District of Pukeroro, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: Unknown

Fig. 54 The Alexander Watt House
Background

In 1921 James Douce designed a single storey house for John Alexander Watt to be constructed on the corner of Hannon and Racecourse Roads, Cambridge. John’s brother Gilbert also had a house constructed in concrete on the corner of Racecourse and Forrest Roads at a similar time. There are no records to substantiate the builder of John’s or Gilbert’s dwellings, however, there were several builders who were active in Cambridge area and the most prolific were: William James White, Hermann Stichnothe, Fred Potts and the building firm of SPND; a Hamilton builder, C.W. Cooper, built numerous houses in and around Cambridge during the 1920s.408

John Watt owned lot 17 and a portion of lot 18. Recorded in the Land Deeds index Edward Hirst was allocated a Crown Grant of 50 acres allotment 17 on 30 March 1867 and William Laird was allocated 46 acres 3 roods and 20 perches, a portion of allotment 18 on 19 June 1867. George Watt, the father of John Alexander Watt, had purchased land to establish a farm, which included lot 17 and part lot 18 for a farm in the Pukenoro district, and at this time he purchased a number of other militiamen’s farm allocations. John inherited lots 17 and a portion of 18 after the death of his father in 1918.409

A certificate of title was issued on 13 May 1932. Prior references were recorded in the Deeds Index.410 In 1952, two years after John’s death, Rose Watt sold the land to Mads Peter Skousgaard a Cambridge framer. In 1971 the farm was subdivided into six lots; Skousgaard retained seven acres one rood and 02 perches as lot 1 DPS15010 being part allotment 17 in the Parish of Hautapu. In 1977 the size of lot 17 reduced to 1.9750 hectares, and in 1978 reduced further to 1.0945 hectares.411

Tendering and Construction

The Watt house came under the jurisdiction of the WCC and there are no extant building permit records for this period, neither were they recorded in the WCC committee minutes. Douce called for tenders in the Waikato Independent for the construction of a house in

409 Archives New Zealand, Deeds Index 3F 253.
411 Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v551 f260 and 14C 389.
concrete located in Station Road in the district of Pukeroro, Cambridge on 24 February 1921. Tenders closed on 7 March at 5pm; however, the tendering process was extended to 10 March 1921. Plans and specifications could be viewed at the architect’s office in Alpha Street, Cambridge. In conjunction with the address, the date of construction and information drawn from the Cambridge Museum biographical indexes and the certificate of title the owner of the property was established as John Alexander Watt.

**Style and Layout**

The Watt family had the luxury to afford the services of an architect and in doing so created a house with an individualistic style. The style of architecture as seen in the Watt house conveyed the influences of the American bungalow style and architectural lines with emphasis on the horizontal and adherence to the principals of the building becoming one with nature and its surroundings. It showcased communication between the house and the land; it was planned to be low-slung and in conjunction with the roofline that extended over the eaves it had the effect of pushing the house further towards its site. Douce designed the Watt house in a manner he had previously used in other houses, by omitting a foundation wall the walls appear to disappear into its surroundings. The theme continues with the complex play of the roofline also giving the impression of the house nestling into the landscape.

Key characteristics of the Watt house are reminiscent of American bungalows. The Watt house included a low pitched roof, tall chimneys, wide eaves, brackets with decorated terminus, barge boards, exposed roof rafters, casement windows, shingles, lead-lights porches front and rear and concrete porch supports. Porches were a prominent feature in Watt house as they were in all of Douce designed houses. The incorporation of the porch into his design replicates the importance it played in the designs of American bungalows.

---

413 ‘Tender’ Waikato Independent, 3 March 1921, p.1.
417 Ashford, pp.32-54.
The Watt house had four substantial porches; the front entrance, one off the billiard room that faced north and east and two located on the west elevation.\textsuperscript{419} The elimination of unnecessary hall space was instrumental in the design of American bungalows. Douce eliminated hall way space for the public areas of this house and used the dining room as the pivotal area between the billiard room and lounge. A hallway led to bedrooms, which dissected the remainder of the house. There was a distinct separation between compartmentalised and open-plan living.\textsuperscript{420}

The façade was balanced and almost symmetrical. The twin identical projections had extended bay windows with casement windows and opening fanlights,\textsuperscript{421} with corrugated iron overhangs above the windows; enclosed within the gables were fish scale shingles and brackets. Positioned between the extended bays was the front entrance, which appears to have been designed to fit neatly between them both. It was complimented by two sets of identical squat concrete columns with square capitals and a concrete wall.\textsuperscript{422}

Over time additions and alterations have changed parts of the original interior layout of the Watt house. In 1990 the owner, Gary Francis Wackrow who owned a joinery business ‘Gus Wackrow Joinery’ in Cambridge, carried out exterior and interior additions and alterations.\textsuperscript{423} However, it appears the original design consisted of: a kitchen and pantry, a dining room, a lounge, three bedrooms, a bathroom, and possibly an office. The billiard room was probably an early addition where either a sunroom was enlarged or the large porch was reduced in size to incorporate this space. At this time a fireplace was added; there are indications on the outside wall that a window had been removed when the chimney was constructed.\textsuperscript{424} The overall style of the new chimney does not replicate the style of the original chimneys. In 1987 the owners of the house carried out considerable restoration and some additions and alterations. The kitchen porch and another that also faced west (included a sunroom off the main bedroom) were further enclosed to create rooms. A large and spacious room was

\textsuperscript{419} BRANZ, \textit{Renovate Bungalows}, pp.41-61.
\textsuperscript{420} Butler, pp.17-19.
\textsuperscript{421} Salmond stated the casement and fanlight window arrangement was a particular New Zealand idiosyncrasy. Salmond, p.187.
\textsuperscript{422} On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford, 5 October 2011.
\textsuperscript{423} Interview Gus Wackrow 2003and 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
\textsuperscript{424} On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 5 October 2011.
created in the roofline. A room at the end of the hallway had access onto the west porch. Floor area was 281.67 square metres in 1990.

The stylistic features found at the Watt house are common amongst the majority of bungalows in New Zealand, Australia and America. In the internal design of the Watt house there are many multifaceted lead-light designs, fancy plaster work, batten and board ceilings and decorative door handles. They were incorporated into main rooms; lesser complex designs were used for less important rooms.

Fig. 55 A selection of plaster cornices and centre light roses

---

425 Interview Gus Wackrow, 4 June 2003 and 2011 by Jennie Gainsford
426 Valuation New Zealand Hamilton, now known as Quotable Value.
427 Riddett, pp. 1–8.
Fig. 56 A selection of lead-lights and an example of the Arts and Crafts style used in the design of the door handle.
There are several features in the Watt house, which are common throughout Douce’s designs. In many of the houses the placement of an office appears to be of importance. In many cases they had direct access to an outside porch; in the Watt design the office opened out onto a sun porch that led to the outside. In a number of his designs Douce kept hallway space to a minimum. In two cases a toilet was positioned on the outside of the house. In addition to bungalow design there are indicators that follow villa etiquette; the keeping of the public and private areas of the house separate. The Watt house was divided between the private rooms and the public rooms of the house. The dining and billiard rooms and lounge were not connected by a hallway but flowed from one room to another. During the villa period the role of the vestibule archway was a demarcation zone between the public and private areas of the house. In the Watt house the arch in the vestibule is purely decorative and symbolic rather than denoting an area between public and private areas.

The lounge and the main bedroom, which replicated each other in design, were positioned on either side of the front door. Both of these rooms included rectangular bay windows with opening fanlights, built in window seats, lead-light ocular windows, fancy plaster work and fireplaces. Located between the two rooms was the central entrance way that lead directly into a small square entrance; off this was the central hall way.

---

428 On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 5 October 2011.
429 Stewart, p.49.
Relationship to Setting

The Watt house façade was positioned in a north/south direction on a prominent corner site. The dwelling was sited to allow maximum sunlight into the house throughout the day. The original entranceway with its concrete fence with iron railing, columns with capitals and dentils were placed on the corner of Racecourse and Hannon Roads. Original sheds and garages are located at the rear of the house on the southern side and face Hannon Road.⁴³⁰

⁴³⁰ In 1963 according to Quotable Value the original garage and shed measured 67.17 square metres. Quotable Value, Hamilton, Reference 4380 19200.
Client Background

The Watt family was part of an early group of pioneering families who came to live and work in the Cambridge District. John Alexander Watt was the son of George and was born in 1880 and the second son of George’s and Elizabeth’s 11 children (Jessie, James, Mary, John Alexander, Helen, Charles, Elizabeth Clark, George, Grace and Margaret). His father George was heavily involved in dairy industry and at one time operated a dairy factory. John was a member of the home guard and was balloted, and given the rank of private for reinforcements for WWI in 1917. John appealed his enlistment as he was a farmer and factory owner. John Watt married Rose Ann Copland in 1920. At this time John’s occupation was recorded as a farmer. On his retirement he purchased a house 26 Bassett Road, Remuera, Auckland. He died in Auckland on 24 August 1950; he left an estate worth £7173/2s/9 pence. Rose Anne Watt died in Auckland on 9 December 1957; her estate was valued at £22,000.00. Recorded in her will, her estate was divided amongst nine benefactors.

Fig. 58 Front gate constructed in concrete with columns, capitals and dentals

---

433 Archives New Zealand, Item ID. R938865 Record P1790/1950.
434 Ibid.
Case Study Number Ten of 15

Name of the House: ‘Highlands’  Date of Construction: 1921

Original Owners: William James (Builder) and Sarah Emily White

Street Address: 94 Princes Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  Builder: William James White

Fig. 59 The White House
Background

In 1921 James Thomas Douce designed a two-storied bungalow for Mr. William James White to be located on an acre of land in Princes Street, Cambridge. Mr. White was a builder who constructed a number of Douce houses in the Cambridge area including his own home. According to White’s daughter Dawn Cross, Douce and White worked on numerous building projects in Cambridge. The likelihood they collaborated on more building projects was possible but there are no known Cambridge Borough Council or newspaper records to substantiate the point.

Three important documents have recorded the historic footprint. These are listed within the (1864) British military subdivision plan for Cambridge East, the certificate of title and the survey maps disclosed historic ownership since 1864. It was noted on the military plan that allotment 338 was not granted to a militiaman but to a government agent, Thomas Finlayson. On fifth July 1920 the certificate of title recorded William James White of Leamington in the Province District of Auckland purchased lots four and five of allotments 338 and 341 in Cambridge East. At the same time White purchased lot 11, an allotment located on the south west corner of Thornton Road and Robinson Street; a short distance from his property in Princes Street. In 1943 White sold lot 11 to Frank G. Haydon and his Princes Street property to Lannes Fullerton (a Medical Practitioner) and his wife Dorothy Helen Johnson on 16 October 1944. In 1979 the property was sold to a Cambridge chemist who subdivided lots four and five, and the dwelling then occupied a third of an acre; the house still sits squarely on the site.

---

436 94 Princes Street postal residence was formerly 72; Cambridge Street numbering came into effect in the 1930s put reference.
437 Dawn Cross, 5 May 2003, Cambridge. Dawn Cross nee White was the youngest daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W.J. White.
438 After the Waikato Wars men who had served in the four Waikato Regiments as military settlers were allocated land according to rank. Each man received a town acre and one farm section through a ballot system; however, officers had first choice before the unlisted ranks. Vennell, pp.93-94.
439 Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title for 94 Princes Street, Cambridge.
440 Originally Leamington was a separate town and did not amalgamate with Cambridge East until 1958. Since its construction White’s house there have been seven property owners. For a period during the 1920s the house was let by Mr. White to a Miss tribe who operated a boarding establishment.
441 Cross, Interview, 5 May 2003.
**Tendering and Construction**

White applied for a Cambridge Borough Council building permit on 8 March 1921. This was the single reference that proved Douce was contracted to design the dwelling for White. No tender was let for the construction of the house as the original owner commissioned and built the house himself. The shortage of building supplies and cement (due to the import duty)\(^{442}\) was apparent in the length of time between the issuing of a building permit and the construction of 94 Princes Street.\(^{443}\) White subsequently named the property ‘Highlands’.

As recorded in the CBC records the house was constructed in concrete, which included a number of interior walls. The information recorded by the CBC for this dwelling was imprecise, however, it did record the roofing material was corrugated iron and the interior layout consisted of ten rooms plus a bathroom and a toilet. It also noted the build cost around £1500 to construct. The Cambridge Borough minutes in December of the same year noted that White was granted permission to concrete his paths and part of his yard; this indicated the construction of the house was completed.\(^{444}\)

**Style and Layout**

In his design of 94 Princes Street, James Douce has included a style of architecture similar to the features of American bungalows that were built in the early part of the twentieth century. Constructed on horizontal and vertical lines its bold appearance and its prominent architectural style would not be out of place in an American setting. However, it contained elements and characteristics such as ornate plaster work, which Douce used widely.

‘Highlands’ was the tenth house in the series of concrete houses designed by Douce. The exterior is classic American; however, the interior has design elements from American and English bungalows. There are close design similarities between this dwelling and the Douce designed Taylor family home ‘Glenfoyle’ on Hamilton Road. Research of a court case between Taylor and White revealed that both of these houses were constructed by White.\(^{445}\)

---

\(^{442}\) Cement shortage in the District. Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 30 July 1920, p.36.

\(^{443}\) ‘Cement Shortage’ The Waikato Independent, 13 January 1920, p.5., 20 January 1920, p.4. and 1 May 1920, p.4.

\(^{444}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 22 December 1921, p.184.

They have similar architectural features such as: they were both designed on a square plan and the exterior and interior had similar design features.

A principal key component of American bungalows was the arrangement of the interior space and the transition from one room to another.\textsuperscript{446} Douce adhered to this principle in all his designs, and this is evident in the interior layout of the ‘Highlands’. Generally in American bungalows the main entrance led directly into the living room but Douce on the other hand usually included a separate entranceway or hall (a common feature from the villa period) a feature of this house that remained strong throughout his career.\textsuperscript{447} The main entrance is the focus of the downstairs layout and all the rooms radiate from this area.\textsuperscript{448} This sequence is repeated upstairs with four bedrooms, a bathroom, a toilet and porch arranged around the landing and hallway, allowing ease of movement.

\textsuperscript{447} In the architectural plans of California bungalow’s the house is accessed directly into the lounge and not a central hall.  
\textsuperscript{448} Lancaster, p.120.
The house dominated the section; the front elevation was constructed to look directly out onto the street.\textsuperscript{449} The house was constructed in concrete, with a heavy textured rough-cast finish, and its solid appearance created a powerful architectural statement and presence in the streetscape. A steeply sloping roofline overhangs the porch, and tall chimneys complete the overall effect of height. Victorian villas saved ‘its public face’ for the street regardless of the position of the sun. In some instances this can be said about bungalows and like villas, the majority of bungalows were built for street appeal rather than the sun’s transition.\textsuperscript{450}

The front porch is a strong feature of this house and dominates the facade.\textsuperscript{451} Comparing American bungalow designs with Douce’s designs there are profound similarities. A substantial number of American bungalows of the Mid-West and California were constructed with wide covered porches, which became a typical bungalow feature. The Los Angeles bungalow demonstrated in plan 486, \textit{Practical Bungalows} designed by the Los Angeles Investment Company clearly illustrates the bungalow porch as a prominent feature in their designs.\textsuperscript{452} The philosophy behind the American bungalow porch was to provide a sense of

\textsuperscript{450} Stewart, p.38.
\textsuperscript{451} Los Angeles Investment Co., p.98.
\textsuperscript{452} Los Angeles Investment Co., p.40.
space and to connect the outdoors with the indoors.\textsuperscript{453} American bungalow rooflines were slung low over extensive wide porches and Douce used this feature to full effect in his own designs. The porches Douce designed were not as wide as their American counterparts, but the total effect of the facade demonstrates balance and harmony of the facade.\textsuperscript{454} The front porch Douce designed for White has three tall and impressive square concrete columns with square capitals that are graduated.

The exterior design elements of ‘Highlands ’are reminiscent of American bungalows. There were four porches; two facing south and two facing north. The east and west elevations incorporated two large triangular gables; at the apex of each gable are square lattice ventilator grills. The upper level has a shed dormer window and an arched porch, which is now enclosed with windows. The other two porches are located at the rear of the house.\textsuperscript{455} The upper story porch that faces north was used as a sleeping porch but is now part of the interior of the house.\textsuperscript{456} During the 1920s many porches were used as sleeping verandahs and the upper story back porch at this property was originally used as for this purpose.

There are aspects in the design of this house that clearly also reflect the villa period. The rear entrance led directly into the hallway not the kitchen and continued through to the front entrance hall.\textsuperscript{457} The upstairs hallway replicates the downstairs and dissected this level. This particular element was only repeated in the Stapley residence.\textsuperscript{458}

The footprint of the house was designed as a square. In some respects the house replicates the design of many Mid-West American bungalows, which do not disappear into the landscape. The height of the house dominates the site.

A concrete garage, including storage space was built at the back of the house. The outbuilding was unusually large and this was used by White for the storage of building materials. The property’s boundary line was contained by an original stucco concrete fence with iron railings, pillars and gates; these are still a feature of the property. A low stuccoed

\textsuperscript{453} Lancaster, p.120.
\textsuperscript{454} Ibid, p.13.
\textsuperscript{455} Wilson, pp.3-16.
\textsuperscript{456} Interview, Dawn Cross by Jennie Gainsford, 16 June 2003.
\textsuperscript{457} In the design of 94 Princes Street the kitchen was the domain of maid, and the maid’s room could only be accessed from the rear porch.
\textsuperscript{458} Case Study Number Two.
fence with iron railings and iron gates was constructed to complement the design of the house, to better advantage the view of the house from the street. Keeping front fences low or keeping the front yard free of fencing constraints was a holistic approach to American bungalow design not an English tradition.

The interior design of 94 Princes Street expresses simplicity of style but has a small number of embellishments. The interior has design features that were part of the design of American and English bungalows.\textsuperscript{459} The interior does not have built-in furniture, picture railings or panelled walls and the stairwell railings, the fire surrounds and the majority of the lead lights are quite restrained. The dining and living rooms were the only areas that were decorated.

The majority of the ceilings are of batten and board construction and are typical of the bungalow style. The dining room and lounge ceilings have Victorian motifs in plaster relief. In these two rooms the central rose has a circular pattern of flowers and each corner panel of the ceiling has a flower and fern design drawn together with a central bow in a French style, typical of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{460}

There are many features that give the house its own characteristics. In the downstairs the casement windows were placed 600mm from the floor level; this provided ample natural light and vistas from the downstairs windows. The upstairs windows were designed at 780mm above the floor level. The main downstairs windows were decorated with lead lights and the others had a stippled glass. The stairwell has curvilinear banisters with the railings having a tulip cut out motif. In contrast many of his houses of this vintage; the railings are a simple batten arrangement with the decoration reserved for the newel posts. There are two restrained fireplaces with wooden surrounds, one of which includes an extended built-in mantle typical of the bungalow era.\textsuperscript{461}

**Relationship to Setting**

The White house was constructed with the front elevation facing south towards the street. Due to its height, style and solidity it has presence within the street. A considerable amount

\textsuperscript{459} Saylor, pp. 129 & 151
\textsuperscript{460} The fern motif was popular in American bungalows of the 1920s. Ashford, p.62.
\textsuperscript{461} Los Angeles Investment Co., p.131.
of space between the house and the street enhances the street appeal. A low concrete fence frames the section and allows an uninterrupted view from house to the street.

The 2012 Waipa District Council ten-year plan recognised Highlands as an important heritage building in Cambridge and was classified as category B. In 2021 the dwelling will be 100 years old. It is not listed with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust.

Fig. 61 North and East Elevations

Client Background

William James White was born 15 June 1880 and was the eldest son of William and Sarah Anna White. In 1900, at the age of twenty, William James White joined No.3 Company of the Waikato Mounted Rifles as a private. He trained as a carpenter, and eventually established his own building firm. In 1903 he married Sarah Emily Dodd, and they had four children, a son and three daughters. He became a member of the Duke of Cambridge Masonic Lodge, and was a Noble Grand (1909) a position he kept until 1925. He was involved in local body

---

463 Waipa District Plan 2012.
politics and served on the Leamington Town Board from 1914 to 1920. He was a member of the first Cambridge Electric Power Board.\textsuperscript{464}

Mr. W.J. White suffered from bronchitis and was advised to leave the Waikato for health reasons; on the 13 March 1926 Mr. and Mrs. W.J. White left Cambridge to reside in Tauranga.\textsuperscript{465} The Whites rented the house to a Mrs. Tribe who operated a boarding house. Due to the effects of the depression White sold the farm in Tauranga and returned to live in his house in Princes Street, Cambridge. Sarah was involved in the Cambridge community and she received the King's Medal for her social work. Mr. White died on the 16 May 1953 aged 72 years and his wife Sarah died in Cambridge on 17 November 1957. \textsuperscript{466}


\textsuperscript{465} ‘Obituray’ The Waikato Independent, 13 March 1926, p.6.

\textsuperscript{466} Basil Hooper was one of New Zealand’s most influential arts and crafts architects. He came to live in Cambridge, from India with their father’s sister Elizabeth Hooper,, who had immigrated to Cambridge in 1885. Hooper at the age of 16 was apprenticed to William James White (the owner and builder of 94 Princes Street, Cambridge). During his stay Hooper designed a house for his aunt on part section of lot 145 located on the corner of Bryce Street and Hamilton Road, Cambridge. The dwelling would have been built by Hooper & White. Hooper’s education suffered due to his parent’s frequent missionary work in different parts of India. Aged 19 Hooper moved to Auckland to attend Auckland College to complete his education, before he embarked on a career in architecture in Dunedin. In the 1920s Hooper left Dunedin to reside in Auckland. If Hooper and White stayed in contact with each other inferences can be drawn that Douce and Hooper would have met. Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, Basil Bramston Hooper 1876 – 1960 and Allen, p.13.
Case Study Number Eleven of 15

Name of the House: ‘Kelburne’

Date of Construction: 1921

Original Owner: Sarah Ann McCann (Boarding House Proprietor)

Street Address: 92 Hall Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce

Builder: Herman Stichnothe

---

467 ‘Local and General News’ The Waikato Independent, 26 April 1927, p.4.

468 It appears Herman Stichnothe was the builder of the McCann boarding house. Architectural features that appear in the McCann house were the same design in the house that Stichnothe built for himself in Williams Street.
Background

In 1921 Sarah McCann commissioned Douce to design a boarding house to be located on the corner of Hall and King Streets, Cambridge. Prior to the construction of her boarding house in Hall Street Sarah McCann had sold a residence in William Street in 1919.\(^{469}\)

Sarah McCann’s boarding house was constructed on land that had been previously allocated to militiaman Arthur Wotton who had enlisted in the Third Waikato Militia as a private in Seven Company on 12 October 1863. After his tenure in the militia he received a town acre and 50 acres of farm land at Pukerimu (lot 129 and surveyed by Bellair)\(^{470}\) as well as 1000 feet (300 metres) of timber and rations for 12 months but was not paid. With no means of earning a living many militiamen sold their scripts and left for the goldfields.\(^{471}\)

The Deeds Index archives Auckland show that in 1917 Wotton sold lot 519 in Cambridge East to D. Stubbing a surveyor and he sold the section in Hall Street to Sarah Ann McCann on 7 December 1917. J. Burkett and D. Stubbing (the surveyor) surveyed several lots including lot 519, which eventually was the section Sarah McCann purchased.\(^{472}\) On her death in 1930 Sarah McCann’s sons in laws were the recipients of her will: Henry Conrad Bell, Norman Leslie and Cecil Gordon Tapp. In 1937 the land was subdivided and the house and section were sold to George Taylor (horse trainer) and Masei Margaret Hoskin Mitchell. In 1966 lots three and four were gazetted as taken for State housing.\(^{473}\)

Tendering and Construction

Douce submitted Mrs. McCann’s two-storied house plans to the CBC on 9 August 1921;\(^{474}\) the CBC approved and issued a building permit on 18 August 1921.\(^{475}\) No tender was advertised for the construction of this dwelling. According to CBC records the house was constructed in concrete with a corrugated iron roof at a cost of £2000.\(^{476}\)

\(^{469}\) ‘Tender’ The Waikato Independent, 23 August 1923, p.4.

\(^{470}\) Archives New Zealand, Wellington, AD 771, Army Department Land Register.


\(^{472}\) Department of Lands and Survey, New Zealand, Survey Map reference 2793 (3847A).

\(^{473}\) Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v550 f67.

\(^{474}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 9 August 1921, p.96.

\(^{475}\) ‘Council Meeting’ The Waikato Independent, 18 August 1921, p.5.

\(^{476}\) The Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 9 August 1921, p.96.
There was a nationwide shortage of building materials and cement when Sarah McCann’s house was in the planning process. However, Douce managed to acquire enough cement and building materials for the McCann house as well as several others that were constructed within a two to three year period.477

In the early 1920s Hall Street continuously experienced flooding issues due to Hall Street not having appropriate infrastructure in terms of roading and footpaths. Constant flooding occurred in the street after construction and Sarah McCann lobbied the CBC stating ‘that in wet weather the approach to her residence in Hall Street was impassable and requested that the borough supervisor give the matter attention’: the motion was carried by council.478 Douce, who had his house built opposite the McCann house, faced similar issues.

In 1923 the CBC required all boarding houses to be licensed. Sarah McCann took issue and protested to the council over this issue.479

Style and Layout

The McCann house was designed on the rectangle. In true bungalow manner the horizontal and the vertical were the key architectural design components at play. They combined to give the façade and rear elevations the impression the house was anchored to the landscape.480 However, the side elevations certainly illustrated the vertical and are reminiscent of Douce’s bungalows built on the square plan. As with all of Douce’s designs, porches are a strong feature which he continued to use in the design of all of his concrete houses. His house and the McCann’s have similar architectural elements as seen in the exterior and the interior of both.

Sarah McCann’s house was designed as a boarding house as observed in the layout and arrangement of rooms. The front entrance and the stairwell are a replica of Douce’s house.481 The entrance is small in size but a pivotal space that gave access to the kitchen, the lounges, the dining room and the upstairs; all were linked to this space. Keeping hall

478 Cambridge Borough Council Minutes, 4 July 1922, p.72.
479 ‘Council Meeting’ The Waikato Independent, 23 August 1923, p.4.
480 Duchscherer, p.19.
481 Case Study number six of fifteen.
space to an absolute minimum was pure American bungalow design. Douce did incorporate a small hallway that led from the kitchen to a room of which the original purpose remains unclear; however, its likely use was either a maid’s room or a bathroom. The original kitchen contained a fireplace, built-in pantry, built in safe and serving hatch and had direct access from the back porch. The laundry and a toilet were located either side of the back porch. The dining room was almost twice the size of the kitchen and had a fireplace that shared the same chimney with the kitchen. Off the dining were two rooms, which would have served as lounges. The dining room and one of the lounges had direct access to the front entranceway. The design elements were simplified; the ceilings were a simple batten and board construction, a dado rail, casement windows with crosshatched opening fanlights. The motifs used in the design of the dining room fireplace were reminiscent of those used by Herman Stichnothe’s in his house in Williams Street. This further suggests that he was the builder not Cooper.

![Fig. 63 Decorative fireplace column and opening fanlight with cross hatched pattern](image)

The upstairs layout clearly exhibits the function of this house as a boarding establishment. It was cleverly designed by Douce to incorporate six bedrooms, two porches and one bathroom. The bedrooms were arranged around a central hallway that dissected the

---

482 Craftsman Bungalows, p.56.
483 Fanlights are an Australian invention, which were present in New Zealand bungalows.
upstairs. All bedrooms had built-in wardrobes utilising space under the roofline, casement windows with stippled glass fanlights and batten and board ceilings. The two porches, front and rear, would have increased the capacity of boarders; porches were often used as extra sleeping space with canvas awnings. In this instance this would have been the case.\textsuperscript{484}

Overtime additions and alterations were undertaken but not to the degree where the original design appeared compromised. The kitchen was moved into the former laundry and the porch toilet was converted into the laundry. The two lounges that faced the street had french doors installed. Apart from those changes the house still reflects the original design.\textsuperscript{485}

\textbf{Relationship to Setting}

The McCann dwelling was constructed in an east west position with the façade facing east. It was located at the northern end of Hall Street, a short distance from the Cambridge Trotting Club. Historically, Hall Street was the main thoroughfare from the Waikato River to the CTC in Taylor Street to attend the local races. It was planted with oak trees around 100 years ago and has given the streetscape a sense of being a well established street.

\textbf{Client Background}

Sarah Ann McCann nee Wilson was born in Ireland in 1875. In 1880 Sarah's parents, John and Annabelle Wilson, immigrated to New Zealand. Sarah had four sisters and four brothers. On 12 April 1898 Sarah Ann Wilson married Alexander McCann;\textsuperscript{486} they had three daughters: Frances Emily born 1899 (married Norman Leslie Tapp in 1927), Isabel Minnie born 1902 (married Cecil George Tapp in 1928) and Mavis Winnie born 1906 (married Henry Conrad Bell 20 April 1927). Alexander died aged 48 years in 1910 and Sarah aged 55 years on the 17 June 1930.
Case Study Number Twelve of 15

Name of the House: The Stichnothe House  
Date of Construction: 1922

Original Owner: Herman Stichnothe (Builder)

Street Address: 85 William Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: Herman Stichnothe

Fig. 64 The Stichnothe House

Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Background

In 1922 Herman Stichnothe commissioned James Douce to design a residence on a level site in Williams Street, Cambridge.\footnote{Valuation New Zealand Records archived at Quotable Value Hamilton, Reference 4361 39000.} The house occupied one rood and eight tenths of a perch situated on the southern side of William Street near the intersection of Weld Street.

Militiaman John Turner was allocated lot 311 on 10 October 1866. There were several owners until it was purchased by Robert Morse, a Cambridge builder, for £87 on 24 October 1893. Morse sold the land to Matthew Lewis Watkins, a farmer in 1902 he sold it to William Albert Abercrombie, a mail carrier in 1903 and he sold it to James La Trobe in 1905. After his death part sec 311 was purchased by Stichnothe on 16 December 1918.\footnote{Land and Information New Zealand, Application No. 3081, Certificate of Title v.69 f104.}

Tendering and Construction

On 17 July 1922 Stichnothe applied to the Cambridge Borough Council for a building permit to construct a domestic dwelling, and on the same day approval was granted. The CBC recorded that the design of Stichnothe’s house was to be one and a half storey, to be constructed in concrete with a corrugated iron roof. The estimated cost of construction was £900. The interior layout would consist of seven rooms plus a bathroom, an outside laundry and storage shed. The downstairs comprised of three bedrooms, a kitchen, a dining room and a lounge and the upstairs contained one large bedroom.\footnote{Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit Register archived at the Cambridge Museum.} A garage was built to accommodate a Model T. Ford.\footnote{‘Council Meeting’ The Waikato Independent, 11 January 1923, p.5.} Stichnothe called tenders for the specialist job of constructing concrete walls and chimneys as well as the supply of gravel to the building site.\footnote{‘Tender’ The Waikato Independent, 1 July 1922, p.1.} Tenders closed on 10 July 1922; the house was completed by 11 January 1923.\footnote{‘Local and General News’ The Waikato Independent, 11 January 1923, p.5.}

The Stichnothe house was a replacement for a dwelling that succumbed to fire in 1918. The house had been rented and was insured for a sum of £200; it did not cover the total replacement cost of the house, which left a shortfall for the construction of a new dwelling. It
was four years before a replacement was constructed. It appears Stichnothe built houses for the rental market.494

Style and Layout

The exterior of the Stichnothe house has all the classic Douce architectural hallmarks. As in the previous houses designed by him, Americanism was at the forefront of the design.495 Douce designed two houses for Stichnothe, this house and another in Victoria Street. Both are similar in style and both were built in concrete, on a square footprint, steep pitched roofline with extensive side gables with exposed rafter ends, barge boards and brackets and front and back porches.496 Even though the other house was a single storey and this house was one and a half storey each evokes distinctive American craftsman style designs. The rear porch was recessed as the front was constructed to project from the house with a smaller gable and barge boards. The front porch faced the street and was open on three sides and enclosed by a concrete ledge with corner columns and a simple half round motif at the top of the columns.497 In 1952 Valuation New Zealand recorded the size of the front porch as 5.3 feet x 3.2 feet.498

Vertical and horizontal elements are present in the design of the Stichnothe house. The horizontal components are reflected in the roofline ridge, the gutter line, window sills and the front porch ledge. The vertical aspects are defined in the apex of the gables, the chimney and in the original design porch columns. In many respects Stichnothe did not indulge in superfluous exterior trimmings. A ventilator grill that was commonly placed at the top of gable in many houses to allow ventilation in the roof cavity, were not included in the design of the Stichnothe house. Instead Douce designed windows in their place either side of the house.499 These windows had window overhangs.

Douce designed the interior of the Stichnothe house to include distinctive American and English design elements. New Zealand bungalows became a hybridisation of American,

494 ‘Local and General News’ The Waikato Independent, 5 February 1918, p.4.
495 On-site Analysis by Jennie Gainsford 4 September 2011.
496 Allen, pp.16-21.
497 During the 1920s the porch was considered a place to entertain during the summer months. Butler, p.28.
498 Valuation New Zealand Records archived at Quotable Value Hamilton, Reference 4361 39000.
499 Interview, Terry and Joanne Buffrey, 4 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford, On-site Analysis by Jennie Gainsford 4 September 2011 and Butler, p.4.
English and to some extent Australian bungalows. The Stichnothe house has two distinctive architectural styles in its layout: the bungalow and the villa. The main rooms reflect the American bungalow: the kitchen, the dining room and the lounge were interlinked with no hallway space between the rooms. The front door opened directly into the lounge from the porch; a typical American bungalow feature but not common amongst Douce’s domestic houses. Clear markers of American design were used to reduce unnecessary wasted space by eliminating entrance foyers and by reducing hallway space. On the other hand the other side of the house clearly focused on English villa architectural traditions of a central hallway with the bedrooms compartmentalised on one side of the hallway. In this instance the hallway acts as the axis between the English influences and American bungalow designs. In many respects the design has made excellent use of the spatial interior space. The upstairs contained a landing and a bedroom and a small lounge. At the top of the stairs the roofline cavity created space for storage and a bookcase and in the bedroom it was used for wardrobes. The creation of cupboards and wardrobes under the roofline were strong features of American bungalows. The total floor area was recorded as 1232 sq feet = 114.4 square metres in 1952.

Typical stylistic features common amongst bungalows are found in the Stichnothe house but also there were features reminiscent of the Arts and Crafts period and the stairwell includes this type of motif. Other typical bungalow features are represented by batten and board ceilings with the stippled plaster board, casement windows with fanlights (grid with stippled glass), lead-lights, and fireplaces that were representative of the bungalow period.

---

500 Butler, pp.1-2.
501 Phone Interview, Pauline Morse, 7 March 2013 by Jennie Gainsford.
502 Craftsman Bungalows, p.56.
503 Stewart, p.49.
504 On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford 4 September 2011.
505 Valuation New Zealand Records archived at Quotable Value Hamilton, Reference 4361 39000.
Fig. 65 Newel post design replicated in the design of McCann's fireplace columns

Around 1989 extensive additions and alterations were undertaken. This did not alter the arrangement of the rooms. The front porch was enclosed with windows and a new front door was created. The wall between the lounge and the porch was removed to extend the space of the lounge and the door between the lounge, and dining was removed. The approved floor area was 181 m² and the cost of construction was $15,000.00. At some stage the fireplace in the dining room was replaced with a villa type.

In 1996 additions and alterations were undertaken at the rear of the property where the kitchen and the back porch were reconfigured. A Waipa District Council building permit was applied for on 14 November 1996 and was approved by council on 16 December of the same year. Originally the back door opened into the kitchen but was changed to open directly into the dining area. A scullery wall was removed in the kitchen to create more space.

---

506 House archives held by the owner. Interview, Terry Buffrey, 16 August 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
Relationship to Setting

The Stichnothe house was built in Cambridge East inside the confines of the town belt and within close proximity to the town. The Stichnothe house is currently surrounded by a mixture of former architectural styles such as the colonial cottage and the villa that are still extant in the streetscape. The house was built in a north south direction. The façade faced the street and north as did the lounge. The kitchen faced south and west and the dining also was cited in a westerly direction. The bedrooms faced east and the early morning sun.

Client Background

Mr. Herman Stichnothe was born on the 11 April 1877 in Fritjiehausen, near Alfeld, Hannoverland, Germany. In his home town he served an apprenticeship at a cabinet maker and joinery firm. He later worked in major German centres such as Halle, Brunswick, Dresden and Hamburg. He left Germany to work in Geneva and in Switzerland to refine his craftsmanship; he spent time in Freemantle, Western Australia and on his arrival in New Zealand he worked in Palmerston North, Levin and Auckland before he came to reside in Cambridge. He intended to stay for a short period; however, he enjoyed living in Cambridge and spent the rest of his life in the town. He never married and had no living relatives in New
Zealand. During WWII Stichnothe had his radio confiscated due to his German extraction. Mr. H. Stichnothe died 11 April 1962 at his residence in Victoria Street, Cambridge aged 85 years.\textsuperscript{507}

\textsuperscript{507} Cambridge Museum A-Z Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Case Study Number Thirteen of 15

**Name of the House:** ‘Glenfoyle’  
**Date of Construction:** Between March 1921 and March 1922

**Original Owner:** Innes Russell (Farmer) and Mary-Ellen Taylor

**Street Address:** 1705 Cambridge Road, Cambridge

**Architect:** James Thomas Douce  
**Builder:** William James White

---

509 The Cambridge Borough Council Building Permit records archived at the Cambridge Museum stated the builder was Herman Stichnothe, however, the court case between Taylor and White over the cost of construction noted William White was the builder. The Waikato Independent, 26 June 1923, p.4.
Background

In 1923 James Thomas Douce designed a two-storied concrete house for Innes Russell Taylor to be situated on a family farm on the west side of Cambridge Road on the outskirts of the Cambridge district. Innes Taylor parents James and Miranda Taylor paid for the construction of the house.\(^{510}\) Because the property came under the WCC jurisdiction they would have issued a building permit. Because they do not hold any extant records for this period to establish who the architect was, the cost of erection and the date of construction a court case between Taylor and the builder William White over the final cost of the build established that White was the builder and the final cost of construction was between £2000 and £2500.\(^{511}\)

On the 13 September 1882 Arthur A. Farham (name difficult to decipher) sold land, located in the Parish of Hautapu, to John Segar Buckland of Ohaupo. Buckland sold the land to Josiah Tutchen of Hautapu on 4 December 1891. Tutchen sold the land to Susan Banks, a widow, of Cambridge, on 22 October 1896 and she sold to James Taylor on 4 December 1921; James retained ownership and Innes managed the farm. In 1931 James Taylor sold Lot 3 DP 23846 to Adam Dale Hutchinson. Taylor sold a portion of his land (plan 25707) to St Peters Limited on 6 July 1935; it appears this was for the construction of St Peters Private Preparatory School for boys. On 8 September 1938 Taylor sold a further parcel of land to St Peters Limited. The Taylor house is now owned by St Peters School and is used as staff accommodation.\(^{512}\)

Tendering and Construction

On 23 October 1920 a tender appeared in the Waikato Independent for a house to be built in concrete situated in Hamilton Road, Cambridge. Douce designed two two-storied concrete houses on the Cambridge Road; therefore it was difficult to establish the date of construction for the Taylor and the Fisher houses. The certificate of title revealed that land was purchased by Fisher (September 1920) and a dwelling was to be constructed. Therefore, the tender referred to the Fisher house not Taylor’s. This was the 13th concrete house designed

\(^{510}\) ‘Building Dispute’ The Waikato Independent, 28 June 1923, p.4.
\(^{511}\) The Waikato Independent, 26 June 1923, p.5. and 28 June 1923, p.4. Mr. Innes Taylor contracted William White to construct a two storied concrete dwelling and out buildings. There was a discrepancy over the final price of the house and the matter went to court; William White sued Innes Taylor for the balance of payment.
\(^{512}\) Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v30 f53, v215 f155 and v616 f140.
by Douce, so in this instance it appears the relationship he had developed with local builders and concrete specialists did not warrant a tender.

**Style and Layout**

Douce, in the design of the Taylor house, created an architectural statement. Built on a square plan it dictated its presence on the landscape rather than nestling into its site. The Taylor house has many key characteristics that sum up the architectural features that were typical of the bungalow era. The exterior characteristics that define the Taylor house are demonstrated through a steeped pitched roofline, extended rafter ends, brackets, columns, capitals, casement windows, lead-lights, porches and extended square bay windows\(^{513}\) with simple cross hatched pattern lead-lights and appear at the front entrance and in some side windows.

The façade showcases the dominance through the extended downstairs and upstairs porches; they are the strong architectural features of the house. Supported by two substantial square columns with graduated square capitals (as used in the design of 94 Princes Street) that structurally bear the weight of the extended roofline and gable; this effect has given the impression the porches are recessed. This was in complete contrast to some of his concrete bungalows where he incorporated an extended roofline to cover the porch; a common American architectural feature.\(^{514}\) The house has five porches in total: three upstairs and two downstairs. Apart from some additions to the west elevation the overall design still exhibits all the hallmarks of a house designed by Douce.

---

\(^{513}\) The bay window owned its debt to English architecture and not from the American bungalow style. Salmond, p.194.

\(^{514}\) Rogerson, p.149.
Additions and alterations have changed the interior layout of the Taylor house. St Peter’s School altered the house to create three flats for staff accommodation. However, there are elements that still define the original design. There are architectural features that are still part of the original design, such as batten and board ceilings, panelled hallway, dado railing with dentals, bungalow style fireplace surrounds, and a decorative feature at the base of the stairs. There appears to have been three fireplaces, one in the lounge a second in the dining room and a third located in the kitchen area. The downstairs and upstairs hallway space was kept to a minimum; this is evident in the small reception entrance, the placement of the stairwell in the centre of the house and the upstairs landing. In this area rooms radiated away from the hallway rather than the hallway dissect it.515 This was a strong design feature common in American bungalows and one that Douce used in some instances.516 Douce, as he had with all his two-storied houses, utilised the space under the roofline with built in wardrobes and cupboards.

Because the internal layout has been greatly compromised, inferences established the main rooms, such as the lounge and the dining rooms, would have been located at the front of the house with the outlook to Hamilton Road; in this case the prominent extended bay windows517 most likely indicated the location of these rooms. The arrangement of upstairs rooms included three bedrooms, a toilet and a bathroom. The upstairs rear porch has been covered in and now serves as a bathroom and a laundry.

515 Interview, Keith Lang, 5 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford, and an on-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford.
516 On-site analysis by Jennie Gainsford.
517 These types of windows were designed to be a feature of the most important rooms in the house.
The Taylor house was orientated in an east/west direction and occupies a prominent site on the west side of the road between Cambridge and Hamilton. It was situated a short distance from the road but further than in an urban environment. The space between the road and the house was a transitional space between the public street and the private house. Even
though the land between the two spaces had no defined function it mediated the activities of the outside and the activities of the inside.\textsuperscript{518}

Client Background

Douce designed several houses for the Taylor Family in Cambridge and in Te Awamutu in the late teens and the early part of the 1920s. In 1915 the first house was commissioned by James Taylor but was built for a family member on the corner of Grosvenor and Taylor Streets. The style, design and type of dwelling was reflected in two other houses designed by Douce; the Matamata County Council Engineer’s house at Tirau (1914) and a house for Miss Almeria Edith Banks (1919) on the corner of Hamilton Road and Bryce Street, Cambridge.\textsuperscript{519}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{James Taylor, the father of Innes Taylor, had this house constructed for a family member; the original site was on the corner of Taylor and Grosvenor Streets (now situated in Taylor Street)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{519} Gainsford, 2003.
The Taylor house ‘Ngaroto’ in Te Awamutu was built around 1919 as an engagement present for a member of the Te Awamutu branch of the Taylor family. As yet Douce has not been confirmed as the architect but the house has all the characteristics and hallmarks of a Douce design; keeping in mind he designed all the Taylor family’s homes in Cambridge.
The Taylor family has an extended historical link with the South Auckland Province, which included the Waikato district. In 1875 William Innes Taylor of Tamaki estate ‘Glen Innes’ purchased 750 acres of swampy land from John Kirkwood in Cambridge, which consisted of a number of militia 50 acre allotments, which had not been settled.\footnote{Beer and Gascoigne, p.180., Barbara Rowarth and Kevin Wells, James & Miranda Taylor’s Bardowie 1880-2005 125th Anniversary (Cambridge: Barbara Rowarth and Kevin Wells, 2005), npn., and Cambridge Museum A-Z Biographical File archived at the Cambridge Museum.} The farm was established north of the town belt on the right and left hand side of Victoria Road near Hautapu for his son James Taylor (the father of Innes Taylor); the estate was known as ‘Bardowie’. The Taylors are one of the early Cambridge pioneering farming families to settle in the district. The swamp consisted of stunted flax and swampy growth and was under water most of the year. The farm became stocked with dairy cows and James also bred horses, cattle and sheep. The ‘Bardowie’ Estate’ was the place of many sporting events and social functions.
Innes Russell Taylor was born in 1884 and was the eldest son of James and Miranda Sarah Taylor. Innes Taylor married Mary-Ellen Wright (She was the daughter of Walter Wright, the artist), in Christchurch on 15 April 1915, and they had four children: Barbara, Isobel, Heather and James (Jim). In 1923 Innes commissioned Douce to design a concrete house on Cambridge Road, Cambridge. Originally the house had a tennis court located at the front of the house and was the site of the first golf club in Cambridge. It too was a place where many sporting events were undertaken.\textsuperscript{521}

Innes was a fine and competent horseman, was the captain of the Cambridge Polo team (1912), was involved in sheep dog trials and was a keen huntsman.


Mary-Ellen died in 1937 and Innes remarried Edith Cubitt. Innes Russell Taylor died in 1952.\textsuperscript{523}

Case Study Number Fourteen of 15

Name of the House: The Stichnothe House

Date of Construction: 1926

Original Owner: Herman Stichnothe (Builder)

Street Address: 157 Victoria Street, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce

Builder: Herman Stichnothe

Fig. 76 The Second Stichnothe House

524 Herman Stichnothe built his previous house in Williams Street; therefore it would be logical that he constructed his house in Victoria Street.
Background

Stichnothe was a Cambridge builder who speculated in the property market. Previously he had constructed a house in Williams Street but he did not occupy the dwelling.\textsuperscript{525} Both properties were sold in 1946.\textsuperscript{526}

Links to the historic subdivision are recorded in the early survey maps. In 1900 Mr. Wallace acquired militia lots 155, 156, 157, 158, 502 and 503.\textsuperscript{527} However, by 1919 lots 156 and 155 were subdivided into five sections\textsuperscript{528} and the surrounding lots were subdivided as late as 1965.\textsuperscript{529}

The Deeds index noted militia lot 156 on Victoria Street was granted to William George Jackson an Ensign in the Third Waikato Militia on 30 December 1863. He was also granted lots 72 -75 at Ngahinapouri. In 1901 the certificate of title recorded that lot 156 was purchased by Mr. Wallace a Cambridge settler;\textsuperscript{530} and was sold to Ellen Jane Shepherd in October 1908.\textsuperscript{531} In turn she sold the property to Mary Russel and Anna Dudley, both nurses, in December 1908. The certificate of title recorded that Stichnothe purchased lot 5 (156) on 9 February 1926; he sold the property to Jack Darius Clemow a Cambridge solicitor on 22 November 1946.\textsuperscript{532}

Tendering and Construction

Neither Stichnothe nor Douce called tenders for its construction. In 1922 Douce had previously designed a house in concrete for Stichnothe at 85 William Street, Cambridge and at this time Stichnothe called tenders for a specialist to undertake the concrete construction. On 9 February 1926 he purchased the land in Victoria Street and constructed a single storey concrete dwelling with a corrugated iron roof. The Victoria and William Streets properties are similar in style, layout, and construction materials. Because of the previous working connection between Douce and Stichnothe conclusions were established that Douce was the architect who designed this house for Stichnothe. The only building permit issued by the

\textsuperscript{525} Phone Interview, Pauline Morse, 7 March 2013 by Jennie Gainsford.
\textsuperscript{526} Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v154 f93 and v285 f125.
\textsuperscript{527} Department of Lands and Survey, Auckland District, Cambridge S.D 3387A.
\textsuperscript{528} Department of Lands and Survey, Auckland District, Cambridge S.D. 13966.
\textsuperscript{529} Department of Lands and Survey, Auckland District, Cambridge S.D. 10715.
\textsuperscript{530} Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v101 f192.
\textsuperscript{531} Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v101 f192 and v154 f93.
\textsuperscript{532} Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title v154 f93.
CBC that aligns itself with the construction of this dwelling was issued on 21 January 1926.\(^{533}\)

**Style and Layout**

Douce designed this single storey dwelling constructed in concrete on a square footprint.\(^{534}\) The Victoria Street property was designed as a simple understated bungalow with the addition of simplistic decorative components to break the monotony of the square with the façade adhering to the allusion of symmetry. The exterior was constructed in concrete with a pitched roofline that extended over the extended front porch. Other elements that were incorporated and are typical examples of bungalow design are barge boards, extended rafter ends, brackets, gable detailing and ventilator grills placed at the gable apex,\(^{535}\) casement windows, lead-lights with opening fanlights designed in the same pattern as the Williams Street house. The porch was constructed with paired corner columns with a simple half circular bracket at the top. In the design Douce incorporated a deep foundation wall but did not include ventilation vents in this area but instead added a series of open horizontal weatherboard trap doors to act as the ventilation vents.\(^{536}\) As witnessed in all of Douce’s concrete houses the window and porch sills were built in concrete. The original garage remains part of the property.

The original layout consisted of seven main rooms: a lounge, a dining room, three bedrooms, a bathroom and a kitchen plus a laundry, and a maid’s room. A small box room was placed under the roof line, which was accessed by a trap door and movable stairwell. There were two porches; the front entrance and one located at the rear. There were two double chimneys that served the lounge and the dining room and another that served the kitchen and the laundry. According to Henry Saylor, the Stichnothe dwelling would have adhered to Saylor’s principal of a true bungalow because all the bedrooms were arranged on the ground floor, and according to him this was the truest bungalow form.\(^{537}\)

\(^{533}\) Cambridge Borough Council Minutes 21 January 1926, p.141.  
\(^{534}\) Allen, pp.16-21.  
\(^{535}\) Ashford, pp.32-54.  
\(^{536}\) On-site inspection & March 2013 by Jennie Gainsford.  
\(^{537}\) Saylor, pp.5-10.
The front door opened directly into a hallway that continued the length of the house, which dissected the house in two defined spaces. The public areas were located on one side and the private areas on the other. The house has a compartmentalised look. The asymmetrical alignment of the front entrance was due to the public areas of the house being larger in size to the bedrooms. The kitchen, the laundry, the recessed back porch and maid’s room were located at the rear of the house and were perpendicular to the hallway. The front and back porches were the terminating points of the hallway.

Even though the interior of the house was compartmentalised like villas the rooms were well designed. They are mostly square and have built in cabinetry. The ceilings are of batten and board construction and the fittings and fixtures are pure traditional bungalow, the doors were typical bungalow even down to the door handles and lead-lights that fit into the repertoire of bungalow design.

The central hallway harps back to the Victorian era where it was the pivotal space between the public and private layout of the house. American bungalows minimised hall space, this was a prime component of and a key feature of their design. Douce applied this principal in the house he designed for Stichnothe in Williams Street but it was not applied to this house.

In 1990 major alterations were carried out to 157 Victoria Road by the building firm John Crayling & Maurice Jones, Cambridge. They added a stairwell and a second floor in the roofline including a shed dormer window that faced east. Three bedrooms and a bathroom now occupy this area. The kitchen was extended taking part of the back porch and the maid’s room was incorporated as part of house. The corrugated iron roof was replaced with a decramastic tile roofing material.
Relationship to Setting

The Stichnothe house was not sited on a prominent corner site as was the case with many of Douce’s concrete houses. The streetscape during the 1940s illustrated there were ten houses that occupied the land along Victoria Street between Clare and William Streets. A transition that clearly demonstrates the subdivision of the one acre militia lots along Victoria...
Street. At the time of its construction the house was surrounded by Victorian cottages, Colonial Regency villa, and bungalows. Often town planning did not adhere to the principals of preserving the curtilage of buildings and this was the case along Victoria Street.

The façade was orientated east and looked directly out to Victoria Street. In many respects it was positioned in the same manner as villas. The lounge and one bedroom faced east and received the morning sun, the remainder of the bedrooms and the bathroom faced roughly north and received sun during the middle of the day. The kitchen, the back porch and the maid’s room were subjected to the setting sun in the west.

**Client Background**

Refer Case study number 12
Case Study Number Fifteen of 15

Name of the House: ‘Dingley Dell’  
Date of Construction: 1928

Original Owner: William M. Esq. (Farmer) and Grace Vosper

Street Address: 398 Maungatautari Road, Pukekura, Cambridge

Architect: James Thomas Douce  
Builder: Speight, Pearce, Nichol & Davys

Fig. 79 The Vosper house
Background

The Vosper family was one of Cambridge's early pioneering and farming families. In 1928 William Vosper commissioned James Thomas Douce to design a two storied brick and concrete house to be built on his farm in Maungatautari Road, in the district of Pukekura, Cambridge. The house was a replacement for the Vosper family Victorian homestead, which had succumbed to fire in September 1927.\(^{540}\)

Historical research revealed that Every Maclean of Maclean & Company purchased a number of military sections at Maungatautari in 1877. He established an out-station, called ‘Dingley Dell’\(^{541}\) that became the headquarters of the company’s Maungatautari operations. William Vosper a Cornishman who was previously employed by MacLean as an overseer at Bleakhouse in Howick, Auckland purchased the property from Maclean.\(^{542}\) In 1902 Vosper purchased two adjoining parcels of land, making a total of 621 acres. Eventually Vosper increased the size of his farm to 800 acres. The Vosper family named both their houses ‘Dingley Dell’.\(^{543}\)

The Crown Grants and certificate of title recorded militia allotments purchased by Maclean & Company. These were previously issued to the following militiamen: allotment 184 was issued to Alexander Scott in May 1867, allotments 162 and 183 were issued to William Wallis on 2 April 1867, allotment 162 A was issued to a Mr. Gordon on 10 May 1872, allotments 163 and 182 were issued to Thomas H/Moley in March 1867 and allotment 186 was issued to William Jones in June 1867. On 21 December 1883 William Vosper purchased further land in Maungatautari Road in the Pukekura district\(^{544}\) from the Auckland Agriculture Company (James Williamson, Thomas Russell joined forces with Every

---

\(^{540}\) The night of the fire the Vosper family was at a function in the Cambridge Town Hall. A friend, while standing at the entrance to the town hall, noticed a fire in the vicinity of the Vosper farm. Gordon Vosper (William Vosper’s son) was informed of the situation; Gordon’s reply was ‘it was not our house and kept dancing’. The house and out buildings were insured for £1800 and the billiard table was insured for £750. Waikato Independent, 3 September 1927, p.4. and Interview, Margaret Vosper, 30 April 2003 and 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.

\(^{541}\) The McLean brothers were fans of Charles Dickens’ books; Every Maclean named his house ‘Dingley Dell’ from Pickwick Papers.

\(^{542}\) Land and Information New Zealand, Certificate of Title, v33 f267.

\(^{543}\) Beer and Gascoigne, pp. 335-336.

\(^{544}\) Land and Information New Zealand, Historic Certificate of Title, issued 1883.
Maclean to form the Auckland Agriculture Company). Parts of the historic certificate of title are difficult to decipher (in 2012 the farm consisted of 350 acres, which included allotments 161, 162, 162A, 163, 182, 183, 184 and 186 of the Parish of Pukekura, in 2011 ALLT 163 Pukekura Parish).

After the purchase of the land in 1883 William Vosper had a dwelling constructed. A year later the house was destroyed by fire and a Victorian villa was constructed. The villa originally consisted of five rooms, but overtime a further ten rooms were added. This was destroyed by fire on 2 September 1927.

**Tendering and Construction**

A tender notice was advertised in the *Waikato Independent* on 29 November 1927 (tenders closed on 14 December 1927 at noon). The original tender specified that the dwelling would be constructed in brick. The house was built using the double brick construction method then plastered with a rough textured stucco finish to resemble a concrete structure. The cost of construction was £3436/ 5 shillings and was built by Speight, Pearce, Nichol & Davys who were a prominent building firm in Cambridge.

The property was originally part of the Matamata district and the building permit would have been issued by the Matamata County Council. There are no extant MCC building permit records for this period, nor was the building permit recorded in the MCC minutes. The tender notice and the original plans are held by the Vosper family, which confirmed that Douce was the architect.

---

545 Maclean was associated with many land and agriculture companies, and had amassed 108,000 acres by 1881. Beer and Gascoigne, p.239.

546 Land companies in the Waikato had links to the Auckland financier Thomas Russell. Other land speculators and land developers in the Waikato were: James Williamson, Frederick Whitaker, Josiah Firth and Every Maclean. The principal companies were: the Waikato Land Association, the Auckland Agriculture Company and the Thames Valley Land Company. Patrick Russell Stephens, *An Encyclopedia of New Zealand* 1966, Waikato Land Companies, n.p.n. and the Cambridge Museum Archives.

547 Cambridge Museum Vosper File archived at the Cambridge Museum.


549 In 1908 Harold Speight purchased the timber department from Souter & Company. In 1910 Cambridge accountant Nichol joined the firm and Cambridge builders J. Davys and his son Henry E. Davys became partners in the firm that became known locally as SPND. Cambridge Museum SPND File archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Style and Layout

Dingley Dell like a typical American bungalow was designed to face the street; this was also a feature that was an important part of villa design. The façade was not symmetrical but has elements that indicate this conclusion; the two large rooms that occupy either end of the façade are identical and the upstairs dormer windows are symmetrical. The front of the house has a similar style but with different and extensive decorative elements that stand out in appearance.

The Vosper house was the last house in the series of this type of dwelling designed by Douce. A two storied dwelling built on a rectangular plan with a thick textured roughcast plaster. Douce in this instance did not apply the principals of the American Arts and Crafts of a building being one with the landscape. The inclusion of the foundation wall intercepted the flow of the downward movement of the walls and the house sits above the land rather than blending into the landscape. Instead the house makes an architectural statement due to the height of the building on an elevated site. The house was constructed with a combination of horizontal and vertical elements. The horizontal was represented in the roof line, gutter line widow and sills and the porch wall and the vertical lines are visible through the height of the chimneys, apex of the porches and dormer window and the vertical lines of the casement windows. The Vosper house east and west elevations clearly demonstrate the height of the house. There are some features that are unique to this property such as buttressing, the scale of the building and the smooth plastered band that wrapped around part of the house. The design still conveys the elements of Craftsman bungalows that Douce had used for the previous 14 houses he designed in concrete.

The front elevation was not designed to be symmetrical but was offset by the upstairs gabled dormer windows and the gabled porch entrance. There are some familiar elements

551 Stewart, p.38.
552 Thornton, pp.128-167.
553 On-site analysis, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford and Interview, Margaret Vosper, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
554 Douce and White house references.
that Douce had previously designed for other prominent businessman but in this instance the house was in a category of its own. 555

The exterior design of the Vosper house expressed solidity, a visible feature reminiscent of many America bungalows. In the Vosper house the elements that communicate this are: three large buttress-like chimneys with decorative terminating capitals, characteristic chunky concrete window sills, solid squat square columns, concrete porch supports, front and rear and the imposing gables at the sides of the house have solid brackets arranged at equal intervals up to the apex and a wide band of horizontal smooth plastered concrete breaks the imposing height of the house. The house has the original Marseilles terracotta roof tiles with a terracotta akaterion at the apex of all the gables. 556

![Fig. 80 East Elevation](image)

The exterior walls were built using the double brick method of construction with a plastered finish overlaid with a roughcast stucco finish to replicate a concrete dwelling. The inner and outer walls were four inches (102mm) thick and separated by a hollow two inch gap to allow moisture to be released. It appears Douce did not use this method in any of the other houses discussed in this thesis.

555 On-site analysis, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford and Interview, Margaret Vosper, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
556 Wunderlich Industry, *Forty Years of Wunderlich Industry*, edited by Ernst Wunderlich (Sydney: The publishing Department of Wunderlich Limited, 1927), pp.109 and 110.
It has a steep roof line with elongated eaves, decorative barge boards with a terminating finial, exposed rafter ends under the wide eaves, a shed dormer window, and a pitched roofline that extended over the downstairs windows of the façade and rear elevations. In this instance a scalloped fish scales timber effect was used on the face of the front gable and around the dormer window, ventilator grills and numerous casement and dormer windows with lead lights.

The porch was integral component of bungalow design and the Vosper house has an impressive front porch, which dominates the façade. The porch was designed as an extension of the house and was a departure from Douce’s usual designs where the porch was incorporated into an extended roofline as was the common practice of many American bungalows. The porch has five square brick columned pillars, two of which have tapering cylindrical columns with a square cap end to support its roof. There are two other porches, one by the kitchen and another at the rear, or southern side, of the house. A small concrete garage was built adjacent to the house.

The interior layout of the Vosper house replicated features that were common in the design of American bungalows. The interior arrangement of the Vosper house was almost symmetrical and well planned, which allowed for ease of movement within the house. It appears from his previous designs Douce liked to make the most of the interior space by limiting unnecessary hall space and making good use of the space in the roofline for cupboards and wardrobes. The ground floor hallway was kept to a minimum; however, the upstairs hallway dissected the house in two, not unlike a hallway in villa design. He also designed the rooms of a moderate and comfortable size to accommodate family living. The downstairs layout consisted of: a kitchen, two lounges, an office, a maid’s room and bathroom, and for the upstairs there were five bedrooms, a bathroom and a box-room.557

The ground floor hall is at the centre of the house and is dominated by a large and imposing stairwell. The stairwell has decorative newel posts with hand adzed railings. The original stairwell landing window was a large lead light, however, this was replaced by casement windows to allow better ventilation. There are five rooms downstairs. A small study is to the

left of the front entrance and two large rooms are placed either side of the stairwell facing east and west. The kitchen and farm hand/maids room (with bathroom and toilet) are at the back of the house, and have internal access into the kitchen.558

There are many features incorporated in the design at Maungatautari Road that are typical of American bungalow design. The plastered ceilings are supported by solid open bearers and smaller cross beams. A number of the ceilings have plastered central roses typical of the Victorian era. The dining room has a built-in china cabinet that extends from floor to ceiling.560 It has a mirror back and the doors are plain with grid pattern lead lights. The original fittings and fixtures, such as door and cupboard handles, have been retained in this house. All of the rooms have a picture rail and the hallway has a shelf for displaying ornaments. The fireplaces are large but plain; they are of brick construction with a narrow tiled hearth.

558 On-site analysis, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford and Interview, Margaret Vosper, 19 September 2011 by Jennie Gainsford.
559 Architectural plans courtesy of the Vosper family.
560 Maddex and Vertikoff, pp.11-33.
Relationship to Setting

The house was constructed on an elevated site on 1.61 hectares, which was situated 5km southeast of the township of Cambridge. The house was sited where the front entrance faced almost due north. Its prominent site allows visibility and dominance on the rural landscape and access to the house was via a tree lined driveway some distance from Maungatautari Road.

The Vosper house was an important vernacular building in the Pukekura district. The Vosper house and farm are still owned by the family; they have been an integral part of the Cambridge community for 129 years. The distinctive bungalow makes an architectural statement within the context of the rural landscape, and easily recognizable as a fine example of Douce’s work. In 2012 the Vosper homestead was again included WDC long-
term district plan as having heritage and preservation values. The property was classified as ‘B’; this category reflects its importance to the Waipa district community.\textsuperscript{561}

James Thomas Douce designed and oversaw the construction of many important Cambridge dwellings for prominent businessman and farmers. Douce and the Vosper families were part of the Anglican Church community. The population of Cambridge in 1926 was 2025 (categorised at the time as: 944 men, 1075 women and seven Maori) so the rural and urban dwellers became a close knit fraternity.\textsuperscript{562}

**Client Background**

In 1885 Vosper married Miss Grace Roberts the daughter of Mr. Ascot Roberts of Pakuranga. They had eight children: Francis Samuel, George Harold, Freda, Jessie, Elsie, Maud, Allan (died as a young lad in 1905) and Gordon who later married Helen Crowther.

The Vosper family hosted many sports events at their property in Maungatautari Road. Pre WWII the Polo club had many homes, and at one stage it was located on the Vosper farm. The club continued to use the front paddock for practice before the Polo Club was relocated to the Town Belt in Vogel Street after 1964. The property has been used by other sporting groups such as; for dog trials and as a rifle range.\textsuperscript{563}

\textsuperscript{561} Waipa District Council, 2012 District Plan.
\textsuperscript{562} Department of Internal Affairs 1926 Census for Cambridge.
\textsuperscript{563} Cambridge Museum Vosper File archived at the Cambridge Museum.
Overview

Each of the 15 houses assessed in this study have common threads that link them together as the work of one architect. Douce used two types of American bungalow design in the construction of his houses. The emphasis was on two footprints; the rectangle (7) to give the house the appearance of being low-slung and part of the natural landscape and a square footprint (8), which gave height and presence within its setting.

American craftsman influence is quite pronounced in the type of design Douce favoured. The exterior and interior design and finishes vary with each dwelling but some features are common to each house. High pitched roof lines give all these houses a prominent appearance. They were all finished with a heavy rough textured stucco cement plaster, tall chimneys, exposed rafter ends and gable brackets. Other common exterior features are casement windows, concrete window sills, and porch columns in either wood or concrete.

Facade porches come in varying forms. Two run the length of the house, 10 occupy a corner section of the dwelling and three are an extension of the roofline. Porch columns and capitals also vary in design from the solid and chunky to a simple wooden pier. However, porches are a major element in all 15 houses.

The interiors were all designed with well proportioned rooms and a layout for ease of movement within the house. The majority had fancy plastered cornice or ceiling roses. All have batten and board ceilings and Douce has used the space under the roofline for wardrobes and storage.

The arrangement of rooms varied from house to house but all had similar facilities. Kitchens, separate dining areas, lounges, bathrooms and multiple bedrooms were common throughout. Some incorporated additional spaces such as billiard rooms (6) and offices (9) and several had maid’s rooms. In the majority of cases a separate building was located at the rear of the house for the laundry.
Douce catered to the needs of his clients but maintained a distinctive design in all these houses that can be readily attributed to him.
Conclusion

James Thomas Douce was the most singularly important architect in Cambridge. His concrete bungalows designed between 1914 and 1928 are constant reminders of his talent as an architect. Iconic to Cambridge and markers of craftsmanship they illustrate how Douce was influenced by the American Craftsman bungalow and how he approached the design of his houses to create a style that held true to American philosophies. His architectural legacy endures as significant points of reference within the context of the Cambridge streetscape.

Research undertaken in 2003 uncovered the full extent of his architectural practice and commissions. This thesis is an extension of that work, which in this body of work has concentrated on a set of 15 concrete houses that he designed at the pinnacle of his career. These case studies are a major part of this thesis and the analysis of each building has endeavoured to showcase Douce’s architecture and give an insight into their construction, style setting and historical context.

Douce was a man of many talents. In England he embarked on a career as a carpenter and joiner. After a brief period working in Australia he immigrated to New Zealand and settled in Cambridge where he worked for George Dickinson’s funeral business. He established his architectural practice at these premises, married George Dickinson’s daughter and after the death of his father-in-law Douce ran the funeral business in conjunction with his architectural practice. During his career he was responsible for the design of over 80 commissions as well as additions and alterations to existing dwellings, villas and conversions of villas to bungalows. In terms of what influenced his architectural style there are clear indicators that point towards the American style of bungalow architecture, however, Douce also included elements of English architectural convention and design.

There is an absence of any personal documentation left by Douce and limited extant Cambridge Borough Council records. Other sources were required, for instance, certificates of title provided the historic link with the land and were of assistance to further substantiate the original owners. Local historical archival collections were important in establishing a historical background of the settlement of Cambridge and Council records gave an insight into the town’s infrastructure and its development including the subdivision of the militia one
acre allotments. The development of the bungalow in a New Zealand context and the influence of Douce’s contemporaries were important factors that built a picture of how the town developed and how the bungalow played a major role in the town’s architecture. All these sources added to the framework of discovery.

The bungalow became New Zealand’s first modern example of domestic housing and Douce was at the forefront of these ideals. The bungalow’s flexibility in design and its popularity amongst homeowners came at the time Douce was developing his architectural career in Cambridge. The 1920s was an era where everything American began to invade New Zealand society. Whether it was cars or technological inventions for the household, house styles or influence, which came in the form of magazines and newspaper articles all culminated in an enduring American flavour of New Zealand’s architecture.

Douce embraced concrete as a building material at a time when it was considered by many architects more suitable for commercial architecture rather than in a domestic situation. His first concrete dwelling was built in 1914 and he continued to use this material for most of his major works. At the time there were several factors that slowed housing construction. A shortage of labour and materials, a slowing New Zealand economy, and eventual depression resulted in a decline in the housing market. However, despite these shortages Douce continued to receive commissions for his work. In the early 1920s, when there was a shortage of cement, Douce overcame this problem and continued to build in this medium.

Douce’s concrete bungalows were either built on a rectangular or square plan. They incorporated the very essence of American style and these elements are found in the exterior and the interior that underpin their design. They were constructed with a rough textured stucco finish, sturdy columns, high pitched roof lines, and the extensive use of porches, which are distinctive in character. Although each dwelling is a different manifestation they all have distinct stylistic features that are recognizable as Douce’s work. They stand out as substantial, bold concrete homes in an otherwise typical urban setting.

Douce also endeavoured to create harmony between the house and the street by creating a space between both. These homes are set back from the road and face directly towards the
street. The extensive use of porches and low slung roof lines emphasise the American bungalow style that separates them from surrounding dwellings.

The arrangement of interior space was designed for ease of flow. Rooms are generally of a moderate size and arranged around a central hallway. Consideration was given to the efficient use of space including the use of the roofline for wardrobes and storage.

Douce also incorporated many features that are common in many New Zealand bungalows including, exposed rafter ends, wide eaves, decorative barge boards, brackets, ventilator grills, lead-light windows, batten and board ceilings, and plaster decoration. These elements were the architectural language of the bungalow and were the fashion of the day. Over decorative fenestration common in the villa period were reduced and kept to a minimum in bungalow design.

Douce played an important part in changing the architectural landscape in Cambridge. The majority of his commissions are still extant and readily recognisable as his work. They are clearly visible within the urbanscape and stand out amongst other domestic dwellings. Douce in the design of these structures has stamped his mark in urban Cambridge.

In 2014 the first of his concrete houses will be 100 years old; this will be the same year that Cambridge celebrates its sesquicentennial. Over the next few years all of his houses will reach the same milestone and can be considered of significant historical structures to the town.
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